

Michael J. Grant Campus

# Academic Assembly

**March 30, 2021 Zoom Meeting Minutes**

1. Call to order (Alexander Kasiukov) at 3:30
2. Approval of [February 23, 2021 meeting minutes](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-02-23/assembly-2021-02-23-minutes-draft.docx) Approved unanimously, without correction.
3. [Chair's Report](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/index.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22Grant-Campus-Academic-Assembly) (Alexander Kasiukov)
	1. SUNY is requesting feedback on 2 proposals that were forwarded to you. Please complete the feedback – the deadline is coming very soon. The first one is for Awarding Academic Credit by Evaluation and is due April 8th. The second is about Revisions to the SUNY Gen Ed Policy and is due April 26th for the institution. So, your feedback will due sooner so that the institutional information can be assembled and sent to SUNY. We also have the nominations for the Governance Awards. Please nominate your colleagues that deserve it.
4. Resolution and update from the [College-wide Academic Standards Committee](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/academic-standards/index.jsp) (Jill Giresi​):
	1. [Resolution 2021-02-[04]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_04-casc-include-physical-education-courses-in-unrestricted-electives-list.docx) Approving the College-wide Academic Standards Committee Proposal to Include One and Two Credit Physical Education Courses in Unrestricted Electives Course Offerings List Approved (35-2-2)
	2. Update Revisions of College’s [Absences and Attendance Policy](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/college-academic-standards-2021-03-25-draft-of-revised-absences-and-attendance-policy.docx).
		1. Jill Giresi – Subcommittee on the Absences and Attendance Policy – The current revision is linked above. The first change was done by legal because it stated that we can withdraw a student for lack of attendance, but we cannot. We can fail a student for lack of attendance. The next change is for online attendance. The subcommittee researched the policies of other community colleges and SUNYs. One of the concerns addressed is that logging into an online class is not sufficient by itself to demonstrate academic attendance. These policies are the College’s broadest stance on attendance, your syllabus clarifies what it means for your class. Please share any comments or feedback with me.
5. Resolutions from the [College-wide Curriculum Committee](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/index.jsp): (Janet Simpson)
	1. [Resolution 2021-02-[05]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_05-curriculum-revision-aa-las-social-sciences.docx) Approving the A. A. in Liberal Arts and Sciences: Social Sciences [Curriculum Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/a.a.-las-social-sciences-curriculum-revision-proposal.pdf) Approved (44-0-3)
	2. [Resolution 2021-02-[06]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_06-curriculum-revision-aa-las-social-sciences-2.docx) Approving the A. A. in Liberal Arts and Sciences: Social Sciences [Curriculum Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/a.a.-las-social-sciences-curriculum-revision-proposal-2.pdf) (2) Approved (47-0-5)
	3. [Resolution 2021-02-[07]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_07-curriculum-revision-aa-las-humanities-creative-writing-english.docx) Approving the A. A. in Liberal Arts and Sciences: Humanities – Creative Writing / English [Curriculum Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/a.a.-las-humanities-creative-writing-option-curriculum-revision-proposal.pdf)  Approved (48-1-1)
	4. [Resolution 2021-02-[08]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_08-curriculum-revision-aas-paralegal-studies.docx) Approving the A. A. S. in Paralegal Studies [Curriculum Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/a.a.s.-paralegal-studies-curriculum-revision-proposal.pdf) Approved (46-0-2)
	5. [Resolution 2021-02-[09]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_09-new-course-col-115-career-exploration.docx) Approving the COL 115 Career Exploration [New Course Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/col115-career-exploration-new-course-proposal.pdf) Approved (47-3-2)
	6. [Resolution 2021-02-[10]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_10-course-revision-hum-114-mythology.docx) Approving the HUM 114 Mythology [Course Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/hum114-mythology-course-revision-proposal.pdf)  Approved (49-2-2)
	7. [Resolution 2021-02-[11]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_11-course-revision-hum-116-wst-116-gender-and-humanities.docx) Approving the HUM 116-WST116 Gender and the Humanities [Course Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/hum116-wst116-gender-and-the-humanities-course-revision-proposal.pdf)  Approved (50-1-1)
	8. [Resolution 2021-02-[12]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_12-course-revision-hus-101-introduction-to-social-welfare.docx) Approving the HUS 101 Introduction to Social Welfare [Course Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/hus101-introduction-to-social-welfare-course-revision-proposal.pdf)  Approved (51-1-2)
	9. [Resolution 2021-02-[13]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_13-course-revision-rdg-101-critical-reading.docx) Approving the RDG 101 Critical Reading [Course Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2020-2021/rdg101-advanced-reading-skills-course-revision-proposal-final.pdf)  Approved (52-0-0)
6. Resolutions from the [Grant Campus Curriculum Committee](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/grant-assembly/curriculum/index.jsp):
	1. [Resolution 2021-02-[14]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_14-curriculum-revision-aas-hvac.docx) Approving the A. A. S. in Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration Technology [Curriculum Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/grant-assembly/curriculum/documents/2020-2021/aas-heating-ventilation-air-conditioning-and-refrigeration-technology-curriculum-revision-proposal.pdf) (Jim Leopard) Approved (46-1-1)
	2. [Resolution 2021-02-[15]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_15-curriculum-revision-cert-hvac.docx) Approving the Certificate in Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration Technology [Curriculum Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/grant-assembly/curriculum/documents/2020-2021/certificate-heating-ventilation-air-conditioning-and-refrigeration-curriculum-revision-proposal.pdf) (Jim Leopard) Approved (50-1-0)
7. Added to the Agenda: Adjunct serving on the Curriculum Committee (Alex Kasiukov)
	1. Alex Kasiukov – There is an adjunct member who would like to serve on the Curriculum Committee. Last semester we approved giving a seat to an adjunct on the standing committees of the Assembly and the Executive Committee, but we don’t have a mechanism to elect a representative. For the standing committees, the representatives are elected by the departments. For adjuncts that model may not work. The adjunct is not representing a department, but all adjuncts. Maybe we could elect adjuncts from the floor of the Assembly. It would be a public process of approval. Jeanneth Sangurima-Quiles would like to be the adjunct representative on the Curriculum Committee. I would like to make a suggestion that we hold elections for her, if not today, then at the next Assembly meeting for this committee and the other committees.
	2. Janet Simpson – Alex I don’t think this is right. I don’t think you can change procedures of the Grant Campus Curriculum Committee for determining membership on a whim. This has to be part of our procedure and part of our Constitution and By-Laws.
	3. Alex Kasiukov – It is part of the Constitution to have an adjunct representative on the standing committees. There is a disconnect.
	4. Janet Simpson – It was not addressed in the Grant Campus Curriculum Committee’s Constitution how that would be done. That needs to happen first because we elect someone to that committee. Let us bring it to the Curriculum Committee, get it installed, as part of what the Committee accepts, and then the Committee has to approve it. I am asking that it gets put up to the next Assembly meeting.
	5. Alex Kasiukov – I am not forcing it down your throat to do it at this Assembly meeting at all. I just want to hear the opinions.
	6. Dawn Tracy-Hanley – I have a question. If it’s in the By-Laws that adjuncts serve on committees, which committees?
	7. Alex Kasiukov – There are 4 elected committees where we have the representatives.
	8. Dawn Tracy-Hanley – My suggestion is this – have the Executive Committee figure out how to go about doing this. Perhaps that should be their purview. The Executive Committee comes together and comes up with a procedure of how adjuncts are actually elected.
	9. Alex Kasiukov – That sounds like a good suggestion. But I want to hear from others – what is your sense about the best way to go about this? I want to make it representative of the adjuncts. How should we elect adjuncts to each of our elected committees? The memberships of the volunteer committees are open.
	10. Dawn Tracy-Hanley – Alex, I find it weird that there is no procedure if they have a seat. Perhaps we have to go back. I’m not against adjuncts serving, I want them to serve. I just surprised that there is no procedure. Does anyone know the history here?
	11. Marc Fellenz – That was the issue I raised when we brought the resolution to the Assembly to revise the Constitution to allow the adjunct reps but there was no indication about the process so it made no sense that we approved that change without thinking about these details. I think we have to be really thoughtful about what would be a fair process. How many adjuncts know this is even a thing? How many adjuncts know that this is even a possible service opportunity for them? I don’t think we’ve had the opportunity to communicate this to the adjuncts at-large that this is even a possible. So putting an election procedure together without thinking about other adjuncts that might be interested or inform them is rushing things.
	12. Alex Kasiukov – I agree that we need the procedure, but I also want to stress that it shouldn’t be up to the individual committees to decide that procedure. It should be up to the Assembly as a whole rather than the elected committees. I think it is something that has to be done in a uniform way for all of the elected committees. I would say to that to discuss it at the Executive Committee meeting is a more viable way of doing it.
	13. Joshua Wolfson – So Danielle DiMauro and I are currently chairing the Adjunct Task Force (ATF) so this falls on us to put something together. To Marc’s point, yes, he did voice those concerns. We do need a voting mechanism in place. That was something we overlooked at the time. We thought it would go according to a certain procedure, but by not putting it in the resolution, it did bring the call to question it. Danielle and I spoke today after hearing about Jeanneth’s desire to serve on the Curriculum Committee, but even though she may not be a member of the Curriculum Committee, she can still attend the meetings without voting until a voting mechanism can be out in place. Danielle and I intend to have a resolution prepared and sent to the EC for their next meeting and to be proposed at the next Assembly meeting. If it’s approved then implement the voting mechanisms. That’s where the ATF is at this time.
	14. Alex Kasiukov – The Committees with the exception of the Executive Committee are open to public, so anyone can attend without voting. That sounds like something that we can work on. I would like you to think about how we can best incorporate adjuncts into our Assembly works, so if you have any suggestions, please contact Josh, Danielle and me.
	15. Janet Simpson – One thing, Josh, that you and Danielle need to be mindful of is that the Committee’s By-laws. The Curriculum Committee has a procedure for membership and it goes to the departments and the disciplines in those departments and gives them purview over nominating people to serve on the Curriculum Committee. So just keep that in mind. I don’t know what Standards membership procedures are, so that just going to be a complicating factor for you.
	16. Alex Kasiukov – I think there is something unresolved in those by-laws because the seat for the adjunct member is reserved.
	17. Janet Simpson – That’s not in debate Alex. What’s in debate is how you go about electing adjuncts and it has to be consistent with the structure of my committee.
	18. Alex Kasiukov – But you have to remember that this is not a member that can be elected by the department because there is no department of adjuncts. So there needs to be a change and the change must be uniform for all of the committees.
8. [Resolution 2021-02-[16]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/assembly-resolution-2021-02-N_16-liberal-arts-and-sciences-program.docx) Calling for Shared Governance of Liberal Arts and Sciences Program (Tat Sang So, Joshua Wolfson) Approved (21-16-8)

For reference: [Fall 2016 Liberal Arts and Sciences: General Studies Emphasis/A.A. Degree Program Review](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2021-03-30/2016-09-general-studies-program-review.pdf)
	1. Tat Sang So – This resolution recognizes a few things. LAS:GS is by far the largest program at the College and could potentially affect every department. Whatever comes out of the program committee will eventually have to come through the Curriculum Committee which is a governance process. Since the program is so widespread, this resolution is suggesting that governance be a part of the process earlier rather than later. In 2016, a program review was submitted to Academic Affairs and nothing has been done with it. This resolution seeks to remind everyone that the Program Review is still out there.
	2. Melissa Adeyeye – Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf on the committee. I want to recognize the work of our faculty on the Committee. I understand where this resolution is coming from and its intention, but I do need to clarify some inaccuracies. About the characterization about the committee and what the members are and have been doing. In Dr. Beaudin’s college brief, he introduced the members of the committee and that we were starting this program. He also foreshadowed that we would be creating a home for this program. This is largest program at the College that affects so many of our students. A program that has had no direction and has had no place on our campus. In September 2019, we went to the departments that have a required course in the program. We asked you to vote and send a person to be a conduit between the department and the areas to facilitate communication. The charge of the committee was also sent out to the campus. There’s a history to what we have been doing. In Dr. Beaudin’s email, he addressed the comprehensive nature of the program. I think the term committee gets misunderstood and how it’s working. When we get into the charge of the committee it talks about us as a department, just as any other academic department. We are tasked with not only looking at the program, looking at the curriculum but also working for our students in the major. Because it is a major there is also the mischaracterization that this is general education. Every program has general education requirements but General Studies is a major. So, this is the beginning of our charge. We are to work in a similar way to what other academic departments or programs do at the College. The membership is coming from those departments where there is a required course in the curriculum. Our goal and focus is always on our students who have been left in the cracks, left to figure it out on their own, students who we are trying to retain in various ways. Our job is to bring that together. Thank you to our members of the committee who have been working, coming to meetings and going back to your departments to keep you informed. Most of the members are here tonight. There are a couple of poignant lines in the resolution that speak to a past program review. I would first like to address the 4th whereas: the first step of any program review should be to review the report. I want to clarify that this is not a program review committee. This is the department of General Studies. So the department has the purview to go through the program for the benefit of the students and that is what we’re doing. At our meeting last April after doing research with the faculty and the student body, priorities were set for how the committee would go through looking at its program. Again to retain our students, to make sure they have a home. The program review has been considered and been read. It is part of our process. The recommendations of a past program review, need to be fully considered in the context of the time. We reached out to the 2016 program review committee members for context, wisdom and guidance. We are taking that work to the next step. We are in the middle of that process. We have considered constructive comments that we have received and are going through them. It is a slow and arduous process that is necessary.
	3. Tat Sang So – Thank you Melissa for the background. Thank you to the committee for your hard work. We are not criticizing your work. We are a governance body and governance is about process. I am asking that the process for both curriculum and program review be followed. That particular program review was produced by a governance committee. It was a College governance committee. Therefore, I think it is also part of our governance body. I think one thing that a program review acknowledges is the history of a program. I don’t how long General Studies has been offered at the College, but I wouldn’t be surprised if it was the first program offered at the College. I don’t think it’s a very useful thing to forget our history, and start over. I know you said that you’ve spoken to a lot of people, but that’s not the same as having a process that perpetuates into the future. Curriculum similarly is a process. Eventually, Curriculum will review any proposal that comes out of the committee. I think it’s a better idea for us to be in it earlier rather than later. We know that this is a program that touches almost everyone in the College.
	4. Lauren Tacke-Cushing – Thank you to Melissa and the Committee. There are a couple of points in the resolution that I wanted to address on behalf of Academic Affairs about process. I don’t want to the assumption to be that in any way the committee has tried to go around the curriculum process. I wanted to explain that the PLO revision process has been a process that goes through the Office of Academic Affairs. That it is not a process through the curriculum revision process. New curriculum – yes. But not in curriculum revisions. The General Studies Committee is following an existing process that has been utilized prior to my arrival here. I also wanted to point out that what you are saying about program review, that the Committee is referring to the prior Program Review and have discussed recommendations that were made in the program review.
	5. Alex Kasiukov – I think that what Lauren mentioned is the key. What we have discovered through this program review is a deficiency in our curriculum process. I think that our energy would be better spent if we directed it to our curriculum process and included PLOs as part of the curriculum process. I think it’s the overall curriculum review process that’s a problem, not the work of this committee.
	6. Marc Fellenz – First that language that you used that your program is in effect a department. That’s the first time I heard that language. That certainly not what I thought was the purpose behind the creation of the committee. I’m concerned about what’s behind that. The analogy that what chemistry or psychology do in a program review and what General Studies does not hold together. A program review by the psychology faculty does not require a college-wide committee. The same case can’t be made for General Studies since it affects so many departments and disciplines. That was part of the reasoning behind making the GS program review committee a faculty governance committee. To make sure that a committee that has the potential to be so impactful has as much participation and collaboration as possible. The recommendations about the PLOs in the 2016 program review are very detailed. Bringing the program some identity, not using it as a dumping ground for students who are not sure what to study, to ground the curriculum in General Studies on a concept of liberal education. Making sure that it maps to our institutional educational goals. All those things were taken into consideration very thoughtfully. In the proposal, it says that these should go to the Curriculum Committee. When it goes to the Curriculum Committee, a formal process is triggered. It triggers open debate, formal votes, and formal opportunities to weigh in. I know that your committee has representatives from different areas, but it’s not the same as having a formal process in place that the resolution speaks to. As for the PLOs that are coming out of your committee, I didn’t know that was something that was being discussed. I didn’t see agendas that have been posted or formal opportunities to weigh in. That’s the problem, it’s about process. That’s why I support the resolution.
	7. Paul Beaudin – I want to follow up to what Marc said. The program doesn’t exist in a department, but it is department-like. We moved forward with this because the CGC ceased to exist. Someone needed to provide a home for this large program. We had a request from an Ammerman English professor that wanted to provide a curriculum revision but it could go no place. We had to say at the time, there is no place to move this forward for you and for the students. How do we move things forward unless LAS:GS lives in a department-like organization? That’s a sincere question. I don’t know where we go with this if we don’t create something like we have created and we’ve invited faculty who are in departments that have required courses in LAS:GS to be part of the department-like structure.
	8. Marc Fellenz – I appreciate that problem. I understand there needs to be some sort of mechanism to handle these types of proposals but I think there are multiple options. That McKay dissolved the CGC that shouldn’t be the end of the discussion. I think that the structure of General Studies Committee – it was a subcommittee of the CGC – the abolition of the CGC doesn’t undermine the way in which that committee was structured or proposed to work. It doesn’t mean that the committee couldn’t have been reformed in some other way. It’s a matter of process. The formal processes that have to be followed by a governance committee is very different from how this committee is operating. I think that’s problematic. It allows faculty purview of our largest program to be undermined. I’m not saying that’s anyone’s intention or motive, I’m sure you’re sincere. But I think lacking the structure and processes that the resolution calls for is problematic.
	9. Tat Sang So – Paul thanks for joining us and weighing in on this – your voice is crucial here. I want to point out that it was very recently that I heard that this was a department and it seems to be a surprise to many. I’m not saying that shouldn’t have been done or wouldn’t have been done in the future but what the resolution is pointing out is the seams in the process that are being revealed. One seam is the PLOs another is making GS a department. This is not my area but the FA contract has something to say about departments. I know you and the College have been talking to the FA about that and I don’t know if that issue is resolved. If I was on that conversation I would want to know how these departments fit into the FA contract as well. In a larger sense a department that literally has faculty from all over the College.
	10. Paul Beaudin – So, Tat, I would say that it is department-like. It is not a department because we don’t have department chairs, we have program administrators who function along with those people that were chosen by the departments that feed into the program. It is department-like to do the essential work to move things forward of creating a home for our students. I wouldn’t call it a department because the responsibilities of the Program administrator are different than that of a department chair who is supervising specific departmental faculty.
	11. Melissa Adeyeye – Going off what Dr. Beaudin was saying, and asking for clarification in what’s called the process what we’re not following in the process? The committee has been following the process. The members were voted be each academic department and area that has a required course in the program. A notice was sent to the entire College community that we were operating in the same way an academic department would. Also, we received support from every academic area that we asked to participate. They are here now. I appreciate governance on Grant and the way it works where everyone is involved. It is not the same across the campuses. Yet, the GS Committee is consistent throughout the College. It takes a long time to get the communication back and we are having the conversation where we have draft PLOs and we have one word that someone is concerned with and we discuss it. We are following an articulate process in our charge and communication structure.
	12. Jean Anastasia – Thank you Alex for inviting me to attend the meeting. I wanted to comment on the process a governance committee would have that we’re not following. I feel we’ve been very transparent with our committee members and with what we have been doing. We not pushing anything forward until we have everyone on board. We are in the middle of this process and even if the process was changed and PLOs would go through Curriculum Committees, we’re not even at that point. We discussing changing the PLOs as any department would.
	13. Jill Giresi – I think this is an excellent conversation and we have exhausted both sides, so I’m moving to call the question.
	14. Tat Sang So – I’ll second that.
	15. Alex Kasiukov – Calling the questions requires 2/3 vote. The motion carries 33-5-5. We will move to vote.
9. Discussion: Funding Priorities of the College (Tat Sang So)
	1. Tat Sang So – This is about the federal money coming into the College. I’d like us as a governance body to make suggestions on spending. I’d like to call for the Assembly to form an Ad Hoc Committee for this purpose – generating ideas for spending the money within the parameters that are given. We should spend the money to help our students recover from the pandemic, help with our retention, help with our enrollment. I think we as a faculty should take on some of the responsibility for that. I’m making a motion to create an Ad Hoc Committee to help spend the federal relief money.
	2. Marc Fellenz – I’ll second. Just as a general point it’s a budget issue but it’s still legitimate for governance to weigh in on budgetary matters. We should make sure that money that is coming our way is earmarked for things that academically serious and important.
	3. Alex Kasiukov – Is this for a Grant Campus committee or for a College committee?
	4. Tat Sang So – I am calling for a Grant Campus committee but the other campuses are open to join. An Ad Hoc Committee of the Assembly.
10. Motion from the floor to form an Ad Hoc Committee of the Assembly regarding spending of Federal Stimulus Aid Received by the College (Tat Sang So) Passed [26-9-5]
11. Discussion: Assembly Meetings Format and Calendar (Tat Sang So)
Suggested reading: [6 Things We Can't Afford to Lose When Campus Life Resumes](https://community.chronicle.com/news/2504-6-things-we-can-t-afford-to-lose-when-campus-life-resumes) (Ginny Horan)
	1. Tat Sang So – The Executive Committee is looking forward to the fall semester and what that would look like. We’ve done a year and a half online – a year on Zoom – and some of the things we’ve done we don’t want to stop doing. I think that having an ability to call in if you can’t attend is valuable. The way we have been doing voting on Zoom has been going very well. I’d like to bring forward at the next Assembly meeting Constitutional amendments regarding how we will hold Assembly going forward. We’d like everyone’s input. What would you like to see going forward? The way the governance calendar is set-up is to have the different governance meetings on different days so that someone from administration could attend all 3. Zoom makes it easy to attend all 3, so there’s no reason to have the meetings on different days. There are awkward things with that structure. If we have one college common vote, it should be simultaneous. If we have a College issue, we could have 1 College meeting where the issue could be discussed. We should get College governance back. Would you be willing to move the meeting from Tuesday to Wednesday?
	2. Alex Kasiukov – Would you like feedback at the meeting or before?
	3. Tat Sang So – Before – just email me or any EC member.
	4. Informal poll in favor of moving Assembly meetings to Wednesday [12-15-9]
	5. Ginny Horan – I wanted to speak more broadly. This idea that we have been so far apart for so long. We had a dysfunctional administration. Now we are in limbo. I think it’s really important that we really try to reconnect with one another as colleagues, chairs, etc. I’m wondering if we can start thinking about that and who we want to be.
12. For the Good of the Assembly

Meeting adjourned at 5:16