

**UNIVERSITY SENATE**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**September 08, 2025**

The University Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in 111 Harrison Hall on Monday, September 08, 2025. Members absent: Murat Dinc, Bill Modrow, Corey Shank, Bev Wilgenbush

1. **Call to Order and Announcements and Remarks** – Nathan French, Chair of University Senate Executive Committee
  - a. Rosemary Pennington will be our representative at the Ohio Faculty Council (aka OFC), Rosemary will serve as Chair of the Ohio Faculty Council moving forward. So we will be very well served institutionally, and that council will be very well served with her leadership.
  - b. We are still in need of one Senate Liaison for the Committee of Internationalization. If you are a senator who has an interest in how we work with our international students, Global Initiatives, and study abroad, I would encourage you to check out the website and if you are interested in serving, please send me an email or let me know.
  - c. I wanted to inform you regarding the progress on the Mutual Defense Agreement; so far we have been met with limited interest in that. I will continue to update this body if there are any changes.
  - d. Reminder, we do have a reception to follow at Lewis Place. Hosted by President Crawford.
  - e. Welcome to the Senate as this is a remarkable time to be a part of this body. New members thank you for your service.
  - f. These are uncertain times in higher education. We are beset by repeated crises of confidence -- from the public, from politicians, from students, administrations, and colleagues. At times it can seem exhausting, unfamiliar, and, perhaps, even terrifying.
    - i. Over the summer, the state legislature and governor signed into law a series of changes that will affect the work of this Senate.
    - ii. This is a year of change for the Miami University Senate. We are working as a body that will be re-enabling itself. We are laboring alongside the recently settled collective bargaining agreement, and soon the reopening of negotiations over another contract. Any one of these things might threaten the work of a university senate. Together, if we are not careful, they might overtake this body.
    - iii. In such moments, I am reminded that public higher education is but one dimension -- yet an irreplaceable dimension -- of our experiment in constitutional democracy. For over a century, shared governance, variously defined, has been a foundational stability of higher education. And, so, I find myself turning to history. In part, there is comfort there -- I learn, often, that the stresses that today feel so unbearable have been faced by our colleagues in prior iterations of this institution.
    - iv. I keep returning to the 1960s as an analogue -- in part because so much feels familiar there. Then, as now, in our institution's history, students protested what

they considered an unjust war -- there in Vietnam and now in Gaza. Then, as now, faculty, students, and staff advocated for civil rights reforms to the institution. Then, as now, the question of shared governance was foremost in mind to politicians, administrators, boards, faculty, staff, and students.

- v. This weekend, I read through Larry G. Gerber's *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalization and the Modern American University*. I was surprised to learn that in 1962, John D. Millett, who was then serving as president of our university, published a book, *The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization*. The book, notes Gerber, was "a forceful call for shared governance on American college and university campuses. An exchange between leaders of the AAUP and Millett led to substantial conversations that culminated in the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* produced in 1966.
- vi. That statement noted that "legislative and executive governmental authorities" were taking an increased role in "the making of important decisions in academic policy" by virtue of their control over much of the funding of public colleges and universities. The statement emphasized the need for "inescapable interdependence" of boards, faculty, staff, and students, founded upon clear communication and a shared understanding of the objectives of an institution.
- vii. President Millett and Miami University played a central role in the negotiation of shared governance with national organizations such as AAUP. I hope we keep our institution's traditions of contributing to excellence in higher education in mind as we work this year.
- viii. The Executive Committee invites you to reflect on the following part of our mission this year.
- ix. *Miami University's Senate is an indispensable part of this institution.*
- x. *We are not a site for mere voluntary service, information, or consensus-taking, but act to achieve consensus on all matters of university business brought to our attention.*
- xi. *When we cannot achieve consensus either as a body or with our institution's executive authorities, we commit to principled advice and disagreement.*
- xii. *We are responsible stewards of shared governance and of this institution's public presence, its academic life, and its mission.*

2. **Approval of University Senate Minutes**

- a. University Senate Full Meeting Minutes\_05.06.2025 (Results: 44-Yes, 00-No, 04-Abstain)

3. **Consent Calendar:** The following items were received and accepted on the Consent Calendar:

- a. Curricular Items 08.27.2025
- b. Graduate Council Minutes 08.28.2025
- c. LEC Meeting Minutes 04.22.2025
- d. LEC Meeting Minutes 08.26.2025

#### 4. **Provost Updates**

- a. I am viewing my role in the Senate as one to try to act as a Liaison between the Board, Faculty, and Senate. As we are in a different environment with SB1 and with the budget bill. I understand the Board and where they are coming from, and I also understand you as a faculty member and where you are coming from. My goal is to try to repair the relationship as much as possible between the Senate and the Board. I don't know if I will be successful, but that is my goal. The Board does have the power to do what they want, and we need to show them we understand that and ask them to take our opinion into consideration when making decisions.
- b. SB1 - Hopefully, you have seen that Marko and Elise have done a nice job by putting up some talking points, trying to help people understand how to navigate the requirements of SB1.
  - i. You still have academic freedom to teach what you want.
  - ii. There is a policy in place for students to file complaints just like we have had for the past three years, and we have had zero complaints so far. Therefore, I don't see that it will be any different.
  - iii. Please look at the webpage if you have not done so.
  - iv. We have a plan regarding SB1 and the Civics Course. Flagg Taylor, the new Director, will attend a Senate session to go over the Center and the plan we have with this.
  - v. We are also working on getting Software for posting your Syllabus to a public webpage easier for you.
  - vi. We have the three additional standard questions that will be added to end of the semester student evaluations.
  - vii. Many of the policies required by SB1 have already been taken care of in the CBA and I will use that agreement as the guideline. I'll share the proposed policies with Senate before submitting them to the Board.
- c. Evaluation of Administrators' Policy
  - i. I have worked with our General Council on this process, and we have revised the process.
  - ii. It will include anonymous quantitative feedback, from Faculty, Staff, and Colleagues. We will take written comments but those have to be signed to be considered. We will also continue to have listening sessions.
- d. Ohio University announced program closures in alignment with SB1
  - i. We have gone through this already and as we know, any major that graduates less than 5 students a year has to be eliminated. Other universities had not done that yet so that is what you are seeing. But we now have to repeat this process every year to look at the three year running average. As of right now we don't have any more that need to be eliminated.
- e. A request was received to add the VPRI to the University P&T Committee. This is how it used to be, and I am not sure why the VPRI came off. I believe it is better that the VPRI be on this committee, because otherwise, the VPRI would receive all the packets right after UPT saw them. Then they were able to provide input to the President and Board right after UPT. I

would much rather be in the room when someone is making comments about someone's P&T dossier so we could have a conversation about it. I would not perceive this as a worry personally, I think it is not going to be an issue. The VPRI is not on UPT yet as I am currently reviewing how we should proceed with this request. Once I have confirmed the next steps, I will inform you of the outcome.

- f. HB96 requires that the Board of Trustees not delegate their power over a number of topics
  - i. They have control over the curriculum
    - 1. How do I think it is going to work:
      - a. I think it will still go through the Department, Departmental Governance, College Governance, University Curriculum Committee, where faculty will have input.
      - b. I don't foresee there being any issues; unless there is a program the Board or President thinks we need, that you as a body don't agree with. What you will need to decide is if that is the case, whether you want to wait and vote against it or provide input early and help shape the way it ends up
      - c. I encourage everyone to pay more attention early on when curriculum is coming up in the divisional curriculum committees and then going to the university. The time to effect change is early on and point it out early so we can stop it in COAD or Divisional level. Waiting until it gets to Senate and making a statement by voting no will not go over well with the BOT in my opinion
- g. I have received questions regarding how programs for elimination will be handled. I believe we are going to handle them the same way. Right now there is no talk about closing departments to get rid of faculty.
- h. Senator Question and Comments
  - i. Senator: How do we get involved earlier?(A) Associate Deans and curriculum committees should be sharing things as they show up in CIM. There have been a few senators who have come to us about how the Senate should reimagine its role in this process and as we talk about our enabling act here in a moment, we can discuss the different ways the senate can be earlier in the process instead of late in the process.
  - ii. Senator: Why should we vote on curriculum then in the Senate?(A) That is something that you need to decide on. The curriculum belongs to the faculty, but yes the board can do whatever they want. However, I think we need to find a way to maintain faculty input, while keeping in mind the boundaries that we have. Figuring out where we can have the most impact is what I would recommend you do.
  - iii. Senator: This really just adds another level of approval, that is already in existence. (A) We didn't really realize it but the Board has always had the authority and they delegated it. But you would see it here and there when there

were certain things that the Senate voted no on, but it still went through. So it is still sort of the same thing.

- iv. Senator: You listed several committees before it gets to the BOT for curriculum and voting. How many committees are there? (A) Departmental, College, University and COAD and Liberal Ed is in there somewhere if it is a Liberal Ed requirement.

5. **New Business**

- a. *SR 26-01 Ad Hoc* Committee on the University Senate Enabling Act, Nathan French, Chair of Senate Executive Committee- ***Presentation only; Discussion and Anticipated Vote on September 22, 2025***
  - i. Senate Enabling Act
    - 1. “University Senate is the primary University governance body where students, faculty, staff, and administrators debate University issues and reach conclusions on the policies and actions to be taken by the institution. It is the legislative body of the University in matters involving educational programs, requirements, and standards; faculty welfare; and student conduct. The Board of Trustees delegates to the Senate primary responsibility for curriculum, programs, and course offerings and advisory responsibility on all matters related to Miami University.”  
Miami University Senate, “Introductory Article,” Enabling Act
  - ii. Ohio Revised Code, ORC 3345.457
    - 1. Passed through H.B. 96, entering into effect, September 30, 2025
      - a. The board of trustees of each state institution of higher education has ultimate authority to establish new academic programs, schools, colleges, institutes, departments, and centers at the institution. Notwithstanding anything in section [3333.0420](#) of the Revised Code to the contrary, the board of trustees may not delegate the board's authority to adopt a curricular approval process under this section or to approve or reject academic programs.
      - b. The board of trustees of each state institution of higher education shall adopt a curricular approval process to establish and modify academic programs, curricula, courses, general education requirements, and degree programs. The process developed under this division shall do all of the following:
      - c. Grant the faculty senate, or comparable representative body, the opportunity to provide advice, feedback, and recommendations on the establishment and modification of academic programs, curricula, courses, general education requirements, and degree programs;
      - d. Clarify that all feedback and recommendations by the faculty senate, or comparable representative body, is advisory in nature;

- e. Retain the board's final, overriding authority to approve or reject any establishment or modification of academic programs, curricula, courses, general education requirements, and degree programs.
  - f. Each board of trustees shall complete the initial curricular approval process developed under this section not later than six months after the effective date of this section, unless the institution's president grants a one-month extension, and every five years thereafter. The board of trustees shall submit each completed version of the approval process developed under this section to the chancellor of higher education.[NB: The "curricular approval" also requires a revisitation of the general education curriculum, to be discussed later in the retreat.]
- iii. Collective Bargaining
  - 1. Article 8, "Management Rights," Section III
    - a. "The parties agree that the University has the right to exercise sole authority on all decisions involving academic matters. Academic matters are the essential elements of the student educational experience. These academic matters include but are not limited to class size, class schedules, programs, course curriculum, learning goals and outcomes, grading practices and policies, graduation requirements, modality of instruction, introducing new methods of instruction and new work methods and facilities, and decisions regarding who is taught, and who does the teaching"...
    - b. "Nothing in this Article is meant to restrict the role or authority of established institutions of shared governance at the University Senate and Faculty Assembly, and campus, school and department shared governance bodies, from exercising their rights to create and/or recommend policies and practices regarding the operation of the University."
- iv. Senate Enabling Act
  - 1. "University Senate is the primary University governance body where **students, faculty, staff, and administrators debate University issues and reach conclusions on the policies and actions to be taken by the institution.** *It is the legislative body of the University in matters involving educational programs, requirements, and standards; faculty welfare; and student conduct. The Board of Trustees delegates to the Senate primary responsibility for curriculum, programs, and course offerings and advisory responsibility on all matters related to Miami University.*" Miami University Senate, "Introductory Article, " Enabling Act
- v. "Re-Enabling" Senate
  - 1. ORC 3345.457 requires the University Senate to reconsider and amend its Enabling Act.

2. Equally, experience from other institutions suggests that faculty unionization, collective bargaining, and the delineation of management rights can significantly alter the function of faculty or university senates.[1]
  3. [1] See Bucklew, N., Houghton, J. D., & Ellison, C. N. (2012). Faculty Union and Faculty Senate Co-Existence: A Review of the Impact of Academic Collective Bargaining on Traditional Academic Governance. *Labor Studies Journal*, 37(4), 373–390.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0160449X13482734>
  4. If Miami University's Senate is an indispensable part of this institution, how do we re-enable Senate?
  5. Article 7, Sections 1, 2, 3, 4 of Miami University Senate's Enabling Act discusses amendments to the Enabling Act. Process:
    - a. Proposal to consider amending the *EA* receives affirmative vote of a simple majority of members of University Senate, at a duly called meeting, with quorum
    - b. A hearing for the proposal is announced in the minutes, with a hearing to follow at a specified time and place no less than 10 days after distribution of the summary and not more than 15 days. 20 Senators must attend the hearing – *any* faculty member, student, or administrator may comment at the hearing
    - c. At the next meeting after the hearing, a motion to amend the *Enabling Act* is placed on the agenda in accordance with the proposal. Must receive two-thirds vote of the membership of Senate.
    - d. Such action is subject to challenge by the Faculty Assembly as provided in Article 6, sec. 6. Article 6, Sec. 8 may also be used to amend the Enabling Act.
- vi. Senator Question and Comments
1. Senator: My concern is the limit of voices on this committee from the Senate. It seems that it is stacked in favor of the Senate Executive Committee and not the Senate. (A) Do you have a friendly amendment?
  2. Senator: How about 2 members from the University Senate membership?(A) I accept this friendly amendment.
  3. Senator: Is there any indication that the Board will redo this for us while we are working on this process?(A) They did have the notion to do this and I asked them to wait as I knew this was coming, and they did agree to wait. So they will not just do it without your input at this point.
  4. Senator: Is that related to the process remaining for curriculum making? I know that it has been said that the process will stay the same but there is language in the document saying that the BOT has control over that process. (A) For now the process will remain, with the thought that ultimately we will create a modified process that will reflect what the law is. It is my understanding that they will wait for your input, and as long as your input meets the letter of the law and it has what they think

is reasonable, they will go with it. They take the fact that they have ultimate responsibility very seriously.

5. Senator: Will this Ad Hoc team be challenged with outlining that whole process?(A) If there is going to be a reenabling of this body into an advisory body the status quo will not work. I would like us to become a body that hears curriculum early and provides feedback to it. As with other decisions in the University, as there are a lot of smart people in this room I would like to see our voices heard a lot earlier in the process as opposed to later in the process. That is my personal opinion but I would trust the work of the committee to determine how that would unfold.
6. Senator: Given that we are thinking about curriculum, I feel like we need some people from some curricular committees as they know how these things operate. Sometimes I feel like we have opinions on things that we don't really do. So I think we need people who know how things operate so they can make good recommendations to us on what a good process would look like. (A) How many faculty are you thinking 2,3, or 1? What do we think as a body?
7. Senator: How about 2?(A) Yes, I will accept that friendly amendment.
8. Senator: Can we consider alternative names of the body?(A) Yes, we can add that.
9. Senator: Will there be someone on COAD? (A) My preference is to allow senators to make this decision and to consult with COAD later in the process. (Senator) I am fine with consulting with them later in the process.
10. Senator: When a new curriculum is proposed to the Senate, there is also a request from the Senate to include budgetary impact as it should be included? Could we add that in or something to think about? As I believe that the BOT is also concerned with this. (A) Yes, I think we can include that language here.
11. Senator: What advisory role would be affected on our committees and how does that work fit into the landscape of today? (A) I will add it here with specific attention requested on the matter of University Senate committees and their service to the institution.
12. Senator: Should we not informally engage with FAM and should we put that in here with COAD, LEC, and Registrar? As I think we should have conversations with the Faculty Association. (A) The comment is heard, and we can discuss that at our next Executive Committee meeting on how to navigate that.
13. Senator: Instead of trying to make sure the charge is as correct as possible. Maybe have them report to the Senate their findings as much



as possible? (A) They have less than a month to return to us with a proposal.

14. Senator: Student Senate did their own by law and constitution rewrite in Senate and the Ad Hoc committee informed the committee maybe once throughout the whole process. I would advise that they inform us at the end, and that we put our faith in them and trust the process. Cause if they try to update us throughout the process it could make it go on forever.
15. Senator: Is it possible to vote today so that they have longer to meet?  
(A) Is that a Motion (Senator) Yes
16. Waive 10-day waiting period (Results: 48-Yes, 00-No, 00-Abstain)
17. Motion on Floor to approve with Friendly Amendments added.
18. Senator: How are we getting their membership formed? (A) We can do that today for some representatives, but not for all of them. ASG would need some time as we would hate for either senators to miss out on giving their opinion on something as important as this and their first meeting isn't until tomorrow.
19. Motion on Floor to approve with Friendly Amendments added (Results: 47-Yes, 00-No, 01-Abstain)
20. Motion to nominate representatives today (Results: 47-Yes, 00-No, 01-Abstain)
  - a. 2 Representative from Senate - (Results: 47-Yes, 00-No, 01-Abstain)
    - i. Kevin Reuning
    - ii. Cheryl Young
  - b. Past Chair of SEC (Results: 47-Yes, 00-No, 01-Abstain)
    - i. Thomas Poetter - Past Chair 2022-2023

## 6. **Special Reports**

- a. Miami Plan Revision Committee, Update - Liz Wardle, Roger and Joyce Howe Distinguished Professor of Written Communication and the Director of the Howe Center for Writing Excellence & Marko Dumančić, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
  - i. Increased Power for Board of Trustees - [ORC 3345.457](#), becoming effective **September 30, 2025**
    1. **"(B) The board of trustees of each state institution of higher education has ultimate authority to establish new academic programs, schools, colleges, institutes, departments, and centers at the institution. Notwithstanding anything in section [3333.0420](#) of the Revised Code to the contrary, the board of trustees may not delegate the board's authority to adopt a curricular approval process under this section or to approve or reject academic programs. (C) The board of trustees of**

each state institution of higher education shall adopt a curricular approval process to establish and modify academic programs, curricula, courses, general education requirements, and degree programs. The process developed under this division shall do all of the following: (1) **Grant the faculty senate**, or comparable representative body, **the opportunity to provide advice, feedback, and recommendations** on the establishment and modification of academic programs, curricula, courses, general education requirements, and degree programs"

- ii. BOT, President, and Legislature Priorities
  - 1. Miami's board and president as well as Ohio's legislators are moving toward:
    - a. Fewer mandated requirements for graduation,
    - b. Less complexity,
    - c. Quicker time to graduation and
    - d. Clear professional outcomes.
- iii. As Demonstrated in Recent Ohio Legislation - Ohio state legislature passed new budget that requires boards of trustees to:
  - 1. Formally **review and evaluate their institutional general education curriculum** (by December 2026)
  - 2. "Enhance content that furthers the state's postsecondary education attainment and workforce goals" (by March 2027)
  - 3. "Adjust" the curriculum in: **(1) civics, culture, and society; (2) artificial intelligence, STEM, and computational thinking; (3) entrepreneurship and the principles of innovation; and, (4) workforce readiness** (by March 2027)
  - 4. Adopt a resolution summarizing changes to its institution's general education curriculum resulting from its evaluation process and submit a copy to the Chancellor.
- iv. The Task - Things being what they are, now what?
  - 1. How might we re-imagine the Miami Plan to respond to the current context; ensure MP is sustainable, nimble and relevant in the future; while acting from Miami's mission and values?
- v. Committee Members
  - 1. **Co-Chairs:** Marko Dumančić (Provost Office) and Elizabeth Wardle (Howe Center, English, Senate)
  - 2. **FSB:** Annie Farrell (Accountancy)
  - 3. **CCA & OLE:** Elizabeth Hoover (Music and Interim Director, OLE)
  - 4. **EHS:** Sam Morris (Sports Leadership and Senate)
  - 5. **CEC:** Jessica Sparks (Chemical, Paper, and Biomedical Engineering)
  - 6. **CAS:** Nathan French (Comparative Religion and Senate) and Mike Brudzinski (Geology and Environmental Earth Science)
  - 7. **Regional campuses:** Whitney Womack-Smith (Languages, Literatures,

and Writing)

- vi. Our Approach
  - 1. Ground in history and scholarship
  - 2. Act from shared principles and values
  - 3. Draw on design thinking: ideation, gathering feedback from stakeholders, prototype with testing, revision
  - 4. Seek approval through the established channels
  - 5. Stay in communication with all stakeholders throughout the process
  - 6. “Act with speed but not haste” (Elaine Maimon, *Leading Academic Change*)
  - 7. “Power is relational” (Greg Dern yesterday on the sidewalk)
- vii. Our Timeline
  - 1. **August 2025:** Gather and explore research, engage at Senate and LEC retreats, gather feedback from other stakeholders
  - 2. **Sept/Oct 2025:** Engage in ideation; several off-week explorations with Senate; continued ideation at LEC meetings (Hoover)
  - 3. **Oct/Nov/Dec 2025:** Prototype options
  - 4. **Jan/Feb 2026:** Seek feedback from stakeholders and revise prototypes
  - 5. **March/April 2026:** Seek approval from LEC and Senate
  - 6. **May 2026:** Seek approval from BOT
  - 7. If Miami Plan revision is approved, new plan would begin **Fall 2027**
- viii. Miami Plan’s History
- ix. Miami Plan: Controversies from Inception
  - 1. Senators and students criticized various aspects and a brutal proposal and approval process ensued (1988-89); School of Business demanded reduction in hours (1988). One senator led a years-long campaign against the plan.
  - 2. The first Liberal Education Council resigned *en masse* in 1994.
  - 3. 2010 Revision.
  - 4. 2021 Revision.
- x. Constraining Variable: Much of the Miami Plan is State-Mandated by OT36
  - 1. OT36 (formally known as the Ohio Transfer Module or OTM) is a subset of general education courses that, when taken in its entirety, is **guaranteed to transfer from campus to campus** and provides a student the means to make substantial progress on general education requirements.
    - a. **English Composition and Oral Communication:** Minimum 3 semester hours
    - b. **Mathematics, Statistics, and Logic:** Minimum 3 semester hours
    - c. **Arts and Humanities:** Minimum 6 semester hours from two different disciplines
    - d. **Social and Behavioral Sciences:** Minimum 6 semester hours
    - e. **Natural Sciences:** Minimum 6 semester hours

- f. 12 hours of electives
- xi. And in the New Civics Requirement
  - 1. Mandatory Course:
    - a. Senate Bill 1 mandates a new three-credit-hour course focused on American civic literacy.
  - 2. Target Audience:
    - a. This requirement applies to all students pursuing a bachelor's degree at Ohio public institutions.
  - 3. Graduation Requirement:
    - a. Students must complete this course to be eligible for graduation.
  - 4. Content:
    - a. The course will include a study of the American economic system and capitalism, along with foundational documents like the U.S. Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and key Federalist Papers.
  - 5. Potential Waivers:
    - a. Students may be exempt if they have completed a similar college-level course in high school (e.g., College Credit Plus or AP) that covers the required material and is approved by the Chancellor.
- xii. Constraining Variable: New RCM Budget Model Incentivizes Teaching Majors and Disincentivizes Teaching Miami Plan Courses
  - 1. Departments offering Miami Plan courses not required for a major will receive approximately half the revenue they used to (starting F' 2026).
- xiii. Next Steps With Senate
  - 1. Today: Your ideas on Ideation Station Post Its
  - 2. **Sept 15:** Report back to and further ideate with Senate (Senate off-week)
  - 3. **October 13:** Report back to and further ideate with Senate (Senate off-week)
  - 4. Look for updates in Weekly 3, on our website here, and via Senate reports and working sessions
- xiv. Ideation: Your Feedback
  - 1. What skills, experiences, knowledge do all Miami grads need, regardless of their major or career path?
    - a. Where do students acquire these?
    - b. What gets in the way?
  - 2. Where and how do (or could) Miami students gain the abilities to think critically and solve problems, whatever their field?
  - 3. How important is it for students to gain broad exposure to knowledge from outside their specialized area of study?

4. If you had to name some values or principles that define a Miami education--which we should adhere to going forward--what would they be?
5. If you could change one thing about the current Miami Plan, what would it be and why?
6. What would it take for students and faculty to experience the Miami Plan as both cohesive and valuable?



7.

xv. Senator Question and Comments

1. Senator: Is that only for Majors? (A) Yes, those are majors only.
2. Senator: Are these meetings just for Senators? (A) Yes, for now do to space restrictions
3. Senator: Will we get calendar invites for these meetings? (A) Yes, we will work with Tammy to get those sent out.

**7. Adjournment**