

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting: February 14th, 2022 (12:30- 1:30 PM)

Faculty Senate Meeting: February 21st, 2022 (12:30 PM – 1:45 PM)

**Faculty Senators in attendance**: Darina Lepadatu (Faculty Senate President, Sociology & Criminal Justice), Doug Moodie (Management & Entrepreneurship), Daniel Ferreira (Environmental Science), Andrea Knowlton (Dance), Todd Harper (President Elect, English), Jim Davis (Theatre & Performance Studies), Austin Brown (Data Science & Analytics), Lantz Holtzhower (Construction Management), Ying Wang (Robotics and Mechatronics Engineering), Ann Mills (Library Resources), Jennifer Dickey (History & Philosophy), Humayun Zafar (Information Systems & Security), Mary Beth Maguire (Nursing), Lin Li (Industrial & Systems Engineering), Rebecca Hill (Interdisciplinary Studies), Cameron Greensmith (Social Work & Human Services), Steve Collins (Political Science & International Affairs), Cristen Dutcher (School of Accountancy), Diana Gregory (School of Art & Design), Jillian Ford (Secondary & Middle Grades Education), Heather Pincock (Conflict Management, Peacebuilding, & Development), Hassan Pournnaghsband (Software Engineering & Game Development), William Griffiths (Mathematics), Kenneth Hoganson (Computer Science), Chris Sharpe (Public Services), Dabae Lee (School of Instructional Technology and Innovation), Noah McLaughlin (Foreign Languages), Giovanni Loreto (Architecture), Jeff Yunek (Parliamentarian, Music), Jennifer Dickey (History & Philosophy), David Bray (Economics, Finance, & Quantitative Analysis), Daniel Rogers (Psychological Science), Peter St. Pierre (Health & Physical Education), Nicholas Ellwanger (Honors College), Glen Meades (Chemistry & Biochemistry), Randy Stuart (Marketing and Professional Sales), James Gambrell (Inclusive Education), Sumit Chakravarty (Electrical Engineering), Mohammad Jonaidi (Civil and Environmental Engineering), Monique Logan (Technical Communication and Interactive Design), Mike Dishman (Educational Leadership), Jeff Wagner (Electrical Engineering), Satish Gurupatham (Mechanical Engineering), Monique Logan (Technical Communication)

**Ex-Officio Members:** LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey (ex-officio member, Assistant VP for Faculty Affairs), Kat Schwaig (ex-officio member, Interim President), Ivan Pulinkala (ex-officio member, Interim Provost).

**Guests**: Amy Buddie, Lesley Netter-Snowdon, Thierry Leger, Tricia Chastain, Nwakaego Nkumeh Walker, Pam Cole, James Taylor, Ugena Whitlock, Robin Cheramie, Julie Ayers, Sonia Toson, Alexander McGee, Ian Ferguson, Jeff Delaney, Aaron Howell, Anissa Vega, Sara Giordano, Daniel Farr, Monica Swahn, James Stincholm, “Jennifer,” Vanessa Slinger-Friedman, Wendy Sanchez, Liang Zhao, Catherine Kaukinen, Andrew Payne, Kevin Gwaltney, Kadian Callahan, “Justin”

**Agenda**

# Opening Remarks

Welcome – Darina Lepadatu **Meeting called to order at 12:30 p.m.**

**Online Faculty Senate Meeting Expectations**

1. Please complete the attendance survey (link in the chat window) if you are a senator or a guest.
2. Voting will be carried out electronically (link will be available in the chat window) and will be tracked. **Please only vote if you are a senator.** A non-senator voting will result in an immediate permanent ban from the faculty senate.
3. Use the “Raise your hand” feature in order to be recognized. iv. As we move forward with our senate meetings, the FSEC has heard from its members and agrees on the need to hold to correct parliamentary procedure. Motions will be preferred over discussion items so that we typically have action items on the floor. We would like to point out that there will be less time in our meetings used to announce our business items, so it will be more important than even to be familiar with all documents pertaining to our meeting. To further promote discussion, the president of the faculty senate will begin by calling for dissenting opinions. If there are no dissenting voices, we will be able to call for a vote directly and increase efficiency in our meetings.
4. Please get familiar with Robert’s Rules of Order: <https://assembly.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/roberts_rules_simplified.pdf>

**Old Business:**

1. Motion on Make-up Work for Student Athletes (Daniel Niederjohn; tabled for the March mtg)
   1. **This has been tabled until the March Faculty Senate meeting.**

**New Business**

1. Approval of Faculty Senate January 22 Minutes. (James Gambrell 12:30)
   1. **Notes approved by voice vote**
2. Presidential Search Update (Darina Lepadatu 12:35- 12:40)
   1. Search committee held interviews and selected semi-finalists. All semi-finalists are excellent candidates and fulfill the requirements of the search. The decision has moved on to the USG and the campus search committee have completed their portion of the process. The USG will now complete the search. The search is confidential so the campus committee cannot list the names of the 3 finalists or anything about the USG portion of this (partially because they do not know the details once it moves beyond the campus committee).
3. New PTR Review Policy from USG (Todd Harper 12:40-12:45)
   1. PTR/Student Success committee has held 2 meetings. They will be meeting every other week throughout the semester and then doing extensive work in June/July. The hope is to bring the revised *university* guidelines to the Faculty Senate at August meeting for approval.
4. Resolution Defending Academic Freedom to Teach about Race, Gender, Justice and Critical Race Theory (Heather Pincock 12:45-1:00)
   1. [Please note that I leave the language of the motions below in the appendices to improve readability of the notes.]
   2. Heather Pincock (Conflict Management, Peacebuilding, & Development) Several bills are being discussed and voted on in Georgia and 30+ other states focused on teaching of race, gender, sexuality, and other “divisive” topics. House bill 377 includes higher education in this topic. Resolution from Dr. Pincock is based off of a template, and she is willing to accept friendly motions. HB 377 goes beyond even teaching to trainings and other positions and there have been requests from the legislature to know how much money and time are spent on race, gender, equity, social justice.
   3. Glen Meades (Chemistry and Biochemistry)—Some of the language of the proposed *legislation* (not Dr. Pincock’s motion) is “absurd.”
   4. Mike Dishman (Educational Leadership)—This motion is important and goes to academic freedom. He wishes we would have received this sooner to discuss with faculty in our respective departments. He cautions that we are in a year where we may get raises that we may be singled out like we were in 2018 to not get raises based on the perception of advocacy.
   5. David Bray (Economics, Finance, & Quantitative Analysis )—He wants to second what Dr. Dishman said. He appreciated that this is important to academic freedom, but is against university forcing university-wide trainings about topics that vary by academic field.
   6. Mike Dishman (Educational Leadership)—Would you consider a friendly amendment to re-focus on *curriculum*? Given that this may impact the raises of every faculty, we may wish to be careful. He offers a friendly amendment to postpone the vote by 2 weeks. Parliamentarian suggests a motion to table to the next meeting. Faculty Senate President recommends senators send amendments/suggestions to Dr. Pincock.
   7. Heather Pincock (Conflict Management, Peacebuilding, & Development)—Can we vote now and then if it fails we can continue deliberation? She encourages friendly and other motions to come forward.
   8. Humauyn—I am worried about the loss to potential raises as well.
   9. Motion to call the question fails 2/3 threshold.
   10. Nicholas Ellwanger (Honors College): To whom would we make suggestions if we table? Darina Lepadatu: to Dr. Pincock.
   11. **Motion to delay discussion to March Faculty Senate meeting passes 20-15**
5. Motion on Optional Reviews for Non-Tenure Track Faculty (William Griffith 1:00-1:15)
   1. William Griffiths (Mathematics)—Wishes for lecturers to have an *option* of having a 3rd year review. The current handbook policy on the college is that everyone does it or nobody does it. KSU Legal suggested language amendments. Dr. Griffiths suggests that we *recommend* (to the administration) that faculty be allowed to have a 3rd year review and then it can go on to the Handbook Committee.
   2. Humayun Zafar (Information Systems and Security)—Can you explain the idea of why current policies state that it must be everyone or nobody receiving 3rd year review in an academic unit? Griffiths: He is unaware of the legal ramifications, but his motion allows the faculty member to decide, rather than the college. Some lecturers do not seek promotion, some do. This is up to the individual faculty. Zafar: Could the lack of a 3rd year review be held against them? Griffiths: No. it is *optional* and *cannot* be used against them (whether they decide to do it or not).
   3. Mike Dishman (Educational Leadership)—Could this be seen as an additional burden to a department P&T committee? Griffiths: This could add labor to the department P&T committee, but he sees it as a way to serve our non-tenure track colleagues.
   4. Randy Stuart (Marketing and Professional Sales): She remembers that there is a legal issue of inequality of some of the faculty in a unit being required to or not to do a 3rd year review. Griffiths: This is why legal added the terminology that it cannot be used or held against the lecturer.
   5. **Motion passes 34-2**
6. Motion on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Conducting Research (Darina Lepadatu 1:15-1:30)
   1. Darina Lepadatu (Faculty Senate President): Proposes minor addition to faculty handbook (see below) to add similar language for Research and Creative Activity that mirrors service language in handbook. Other universities across Georgia allow non-tenure track faculty to conduct research as part of their load.
   2. Jeff Yunek (Music)—This allows chairs and deans more flexibility on how to utilize faculty (as it still needs to be approved by supervisors).
   3. Humayun Zafar—Is this solely about grants
   4. Daniel Farr (lecturer)—This codifies opportunities for lecturers as there exists variability across departments and colleges. Having language that indicates that lecturers *can* is not saying they *must*.
   5. **Motion passes 33-2**
7. Provost’s Taskforce on Course Evaluations- please send nominations by 2/25 (1:30-1:35)
   1. Please nominate yourself or a colleague to serve on the Course Evaluation Committee by 2/25 (3 faculty and 3 administrators).
8. Informational Item: Notes from USG Faculty Council February meeting with Interim Vice-Chancellor Rayfield (Doug Moodie)
   1. This was overlooked or skipped due to time.
9. Update from Interim President Kat Schwaig (1:35-1:40)
   1. The academic learning center is open. There will be a ribbon cutting ceremony on Wednesday.
   2. Excited to see USG approval for a new PhD in computer science at KSU.
   3. There will be a watch party Tuesday for a KSU graduate who will be on *Jeopardy*.

# Update from Interim Provost Ivan Pulinkala (1:40-1:45)

* 1. Responding to Faculty Senate motion on ranking finalists: **denied**. From the perspective of the KSU administration, this motion circumvents the shared governance of the hiring administrator who is ultimately responsible for the hire. Search committee perspective is not comprehensive enough to rank candidates. Sometimes the hiring administrator may be required to hire a 2nd or 3rd choice due to confidentiality issues/negotiations in hiring. The hiring administrator cannot share the rationales, so this practice puts the institution at risk.
  2. Motion on lecturers doing research: **denied**. Interim Provost understands the rationale. This motion is not necessary as the current Faculty Handbook allows a chair or dean the flexibility to *allow* a lecturer to conduct research. However, the administration wants it clear that it is the expectation that a lecturer is hired for teaching, so research should be as an exception/outlier rather than a norm.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:45**

**Supplementing Documents:**

**5. Resolution: Defending Academic Freedom to Teach About Race, Gender, Justice and Critical Race Theory**

[Template courtesy of the African American Policy Forum Truth Be Told Campaign: <https://www.aapf.org/truthbetold-call-to-action> ]

RATIONALE: Current bills in the GA Legislature primarily SB377 which currently includes University System of GA, as well as several targeting K-12, HB 888, 1084, SB 375

**WHEREAS** state legislative proposals are being introduced across the United States that target academic discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities.

**WHEREAS** the Faculty Handbook (Section 2.1) affirms the importance of academic freedom to the proper functioning of universities, citing the American Association of University Professors’ [1940 statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](https://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure).

**WHEREAS** faculty have responsibility for the curriculum at their universities, as stated in Section 3 of the KSU University Handbook.

**WHEREAS** the term “divisive” is indeterminate, subjective, and chills the capacity of educators to explore a wide variety of topics based on subjective criteria that are inapposite from the goals of education and the development of essential critical thinking skills;

**WHEREAS** educating about systemic barriers to realizing a multiracial democracy based on race or gender should be understood as central to the active and engaged pursuit of knowledge in the 21st century to produce engaged and informed citizens;

**WHEREAS** educating about systemic barriers to realizing a multiracial democracy based on race or gender are necessary for maintaining degree program accreditation in fields such as education;

**WHEREAS** over seventy organizations, including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), issued the [Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History](https://www.aaup.org/news/joint-statement-efforts-restrict-education-about-racism#.YT6FBJ5Kgqw) (June 16, 2021) stating their “firm opposition to a spate of legislative proposals being introduced across the country that target academic lessons, presentations, and discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities . . . In higher education, under principles of academic freedom that have been widely endorsed, professors are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject. Educators, not politicians, should make decisions about teaching and learning.”

**WHEREAS** the Kennesaw State University’s mission is “help students succeed through exploration, collaboration, and rigor, uniting a diverse spectrum of backgrounds and talents.”

**WHEREAS** the KSU Presidential Commission on Racial and Ethnic Diversity’s purpose is to “to shape appropriate plans, mechanisms, forums, and/or events for a continuing dialogue on issues of race and ethnicity on the KSU campus” and the KSU Presidential Task Force on Race affirms that “college campuses must address the issues of racial inequality” and that “KSU fully supports and values an inclusive, welcoming, and affirming community complete with visible and meaningful representations of diversity”.

**WHEREAS** ​in a nation that has for centuries struggled with issues of racial inequity and injustice, many students do not have adequate knowledge of BIPOC and LGBTQI history and the policies that contributed to inequities, Kennesaw State University has a responsibility and opportunity to help build equity and social justice.

RESOLUTION:

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that Senate resolutely rejects any attempts by bodies external to the faculty to restrict or dictate university curriculum on any matter, including matters related to racial and social justice, and will stand firm against encroachment on faculty authority by the legislature or the Boards of Regents.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Senate stands with our K-12 colleagues throughout the country who may be affected by this pernicious legislation when they seek to teach the truth in U.S. history and civics education.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that Senate calls upon Interim President Schwaig and Interim Provost Pulinkala to affirm that they reject any attempts by bodies external to the faculty to restrict or dictate university curriculum on any matter, including matters related to racial and social justice, and will stand firm against encroachment on faculty authority by the legislature or the Board of Regents.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that Senate affirms the [Joint Statement on Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism](https://www.aaup.org/news/joint-statement-efforts-restrict-education-about-racism#.YPnfOFNKg6g), authored by the AAUP, PEN America, the American Historical Association, and the Association of American Colleges & Universities, endorsed by over seventy organizations, and issued on June 16, 2021.

Background:

* [Scholarly Groups Condemn Laws Limiting Teaching on Race](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/16/arts/critical-race-theory-scholars.html)

(New York Times, June 16, 2021)

* [Texas 'critical race theory' bill limiting teaching of current events signed into law](https://abc13.com/texas-critical-race-theory-bill-gov-greg-abbott-signs-limiting-teaching-of-current-events-what-is-in-schools-hb3979/10795073/)

(ABC13, June 16, 2021)

* [Republicans Want Federal Funding Cuts to Schools Using ‘1619 Project'—But There’s a Twist](https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/republicans-want-federal-funding-cuts-to-schools-using-1619-project-but-theres-a-twist/2021/06)

(Education Week, June 15, 2021)

* [Critical race theory battle invades school boards — with help from conservative groups](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/critical-race-theory-invades-school-boards-help-conservative-groups-n1270794)

(NBC News, June 15, 2021)

* [Teachers across the country protest laws restricting lessons on racism](https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2021/06/12/teachers-protest-laws-restricting-antiracism-lessons-in-school/)

(Washington Post, June 12, 2021)

* [‘Children deserve to be taught’: Teachers in 22 cities are planning protests over laws restricting racism lessons in schools](https://www.usatoday.com/in-depth/news/education/2021/06/11/critical-race-theory-bills-nationwide-teacher-protests/7620025002/)

(USA Today, June 11, 2021)

* ['Critical Race Theory Is Simply the Latest Bogeyman.' Inside the Fight Over What Kids Learn About America's History](https://time.com/6075193/critical-race-theory-debate/) (TIME Magazine, June 24, 2021)
* [Uncovering Who Is Driving The Fight Against Critical Race Theory In Schools (LISTEN)](https://www.npr.org/2021/06/24/1009839021/uncovering-who-is-driving-the-fight-against-critical-race-theory-in-schools?t=1624802316489) (Fresh Air, June 24, 2021)
* [How the media's helping GOP fuel critical race theory hysteria](https://pressrun.media/p/how-the-medias-fueling-critical-race?token=eyJ1c2VyX2lkIjozNDU1Mzc1LCJwb3N0X2lkIjozNzg5NDIzMCwiXyI6InlLNEJKIiwiaWF0IjoxNjI0NDcxMjg1LCJleHAiOjE2MjQ0NzQ4ODUsImlzcyI6InB1Yi0zMzE4Iiwic3ViIjoicG9zdC1yZWFjdGlvbiJ9.iAknGZXxYvnE__ja0IP25S9Y_fo2A5_krcW02Pv4PHU)

(Press Run, June 23, 2021)

* [Critical race theory has been around for decades — why’s it a powder keg now? (LISTEN)](https://www.marketplace.org/shows/make-me-smart-with-kai-and-molly/critical-race-theory-explained/)

(Marketplace, June 22, 2021)

* [VIDEO: Creator of term ‘Critical Race Theory’ Kimberlé Crenshaw explains what it really is](https://www.msnbc.com/the-reidout/watch/critical-race-theory-explained-as-not-marxist-or-racist-by-its-leading-scholar-kimberle-crenshaw-115226693996)

(MSNBC/The Reid Out, June 21, 2021)

* [VIDEO: The truth about ‘critical race theory’: co-founder breaks down GOP gaslight](https://www.msnbc.com/the-week/watch/the-truth-about-critical-race-theory-co-founder-breaks-down-gop-gaslighting-115157061613)

(MSNBC/The Medhi Hasan Show, June 20, 2021)

* [Fox’s anti-“critical race theory” parents are also GOP activists](https://www.mediamatters.org/fox-news/foxs-anti-critical-race-theory-parents-are-also-gop-activists)

(Media Matters, June 17, 2021)

* [Critical Race Theory: What It Means for America and Why It Has Sparked Debate](https://www.wsj.com/articles/critical-race-theory-what-it-means-for-america-and-why-it-has-sparked-debate-11623956268)

(Wall Street Journal, June 17, 2021)

* [Why are states lining up to ban critical race theory?](https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20210612085115831)

(University World News, June 12, 2021)

* [The New York Times’ Culture-War Definition of Free Speech](https://newrepublic.com/article/162674/new-york-times-aclu-free-speech-culture-war)

(Melissa Gira Grant, The New Republic, June 8, 2021)

* [Guest Blog: Where Does the Bizarre Hysteria About ‘Critical Race Theory’ Come From? Follow the Money!](https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/just-visiting/guest-blog-where-does-bizarre-hysteria-about-%E2%80%98critical-race-theory%E2%80%99-come-follow)

(Inside Higher Ed, June 3, 2021)

* [Opinion: Why Conservatives Really Fear Critical Race Theory](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/05/26/why-conservatives-really-fear-critical-race-theory/)

(Christine Emba, The Washington Post, May 26, 2021)​

* [(VIDEO) What critical race theory is really about](https://www.cnn.com/videos/politics/2021/05/18/critical-race-theory-explained-carroll-dnt-vpx.cnn)

(CNN/Don Lemon Tonight, May 17, 2021)​

**6. On Optional Reviews For Non-Tenure Track Faculty (William Griffith)**

Faculty handbook, section 3.10, subsection B, paragraph 2, on Faculty Performance Expectations for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, begins with the following language:

Departments and colleges with non-tenure track lecturer faculty must incorporate into their guidelines the criteria for the promotion review for these faculty members. Departments and colleges may also establish an optional third-year review for non-tenure track faculty to provide feedback for an optional promotion review.

It has been the practice of at least part of the administration to interpret that the third-year review is optional for the entire department; that is, a department or college may establish an optional third-year review for all lecturers or no lecturers. With clinical faculty numbers rising, this adds further impetus to allow for optional third-year reviews for all non-tenure track faculty.

**Motion:**

**The Faculty Senate recommends that all non-tenure track faculty be allowed the opportunity to complete an optional third-year review to provide feedback for their optional promotional reviews.**

History: We have already passed such a motion, with suggested language for the catalogue. Our recommendation was sent through legal, who responded with the following suggested language. It has since been requested for our shared governance bodies to review this language. Instead of this, I have deliberately crafted the motion without language so the intent of the body is not lost in said language.

What follows is the language suggested by legal for section 3.10 of the faculty handbook. It has been noted that similar language changes may be necessary in sections 3.6-3.10, but I will leave that for the handbook committee.

Departments and colleges with non-tenure track lecturer faculty must incorporate into their guidelines the criteria for the promotion review for these faculty members. Departments and colleges may also establish an optional third-year review for non-tenure track faculty to provide feedback for an optional promotion review. The third-year review is a developmental review for lecturers and other non-tenure track faculty.  The purpose of this review is to provide feedback from colleagues as to their preparedness for submitting a promotion portfolio.   Third-year reviews are not required by BoR policy and therefore are optional.  Non-tenure track faculty must make their own decision to submit a portfolio and assume all consequences for their decision.  As the third-year reviews is not a required action, timing of these reviews is not monitored by Academic Affairs and non-tenure track faculty will not receive any notification from Faculty Affairs as to when a third-year review should be submitted.  Therefore, it is the sole responsibility of the faculty member to request a third-year review and for their chair to ensure that the faculty affairs team is notified of the request.  Third-year reviews must follow the same timeline and procedures as the Pre-tenure review.

**7. Motion on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Conducting Research (Darina Lepadatu)**

**Whereas,** the overall mission of KSU is to be “student-centered” and “research driven”,

**Whereas,** the principles of academic freedom should allow scientific exploration and innovation to be embedded in the teaching, advising and mentoring at KSU, we resolve that non-tenure track faculty should be eligible to pursue research and creative activities. These RCA activities may be counted as: professional service to the discipline, RCA load, overload, summer work load or other workload arrangements.

In addition, we propose the following edits to the KSU Faculty Handbook, section 3.10:

Faculty Handbook section 3.10 General Expectations for Non-Tenure Track Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

“In most cases, a lecturer’s or senior lecturer’s primary responsibility is teaching and therefore, is expected to be a highly effective teacher. In most cases, those responsibilities will primarily be devoted to teaching multiple sections of the same undergraduate courses. The heavy teaching load of such individuals constitutes a full workload and offsets the absence of a full range of regular faculty responsibilities that normally rounds out the typical full undergraduate faculty workload at KSU. In rare cases, the responsibilities assigned to a lecturer or senior lecturer may be individualized and differ from the typical lecturer or senior lecturer workload described above. In such cases, the responsibilities must be specified in the FPA.

Unless otherwise set forth in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA), there are no expectations for scholarship, **but scholarship may be pursued optionally**. **However, in order for RCA to count towards a lecturer or senior lecturer’s review, it must be negotiated with the chair and dean in the faculty member’s FPA and workload.** Service responsibilities may be limited to the minimum necessary to successfully teach their assigned courses (e.g., attendance at relevant department meetings and participation on appropriate department committees).

#### A. Promotion for the Non-Tenure Track Lecturer

The criteria for promotion to senior lecturer are evidence of highly effective teaching ability inside and/or outside of the classroom environment and value to the University in the area of teaching and student learning (**as well as** **research and creative activity**, highly effective professional service and/or administration and leadership for lecturers/senior lecturers **if they have these responsibilities).”**

**9.Informational Item: Notes from USG Faculty Council February meeting with Interim Vice-Chancellor Rayfield (Doug Moodie)**

1. Final PTR policy went out last night
   1. Implementation is now for 23 calendar year (Jan 24 AR)
   2. 2 meetings a term for PIP not once a quarter
   3. New language for administrators to fit in with their expectations (360 every 5 years)
   4. New language on yearly PIP assessments, to take account of scholarship taking more than one year to publish, etc.
   5. New language on 5-point Likert scale.
2. New policy passed by BoR on allowing full or partial Leave of Absence for entrepreneurial activities. Details like healthcare provision to be sorted out at institution level.
3. BoR looking at how to deal with the acute nursing shortage.
4. 4 bills on CRT. USG meeting with legislators over freedom of speech, etc. issues.
5. Budget slower than forecast but $5000 still likely.
6. USG Covid guidance on in-person, online ratios withdrawn. Decisions left to institutions to decide on.