CALL TO ORDER

Senate Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

Chair Williams asked if there were any objections to putting a 2-minute speaker limit in place for each motion for the entirety of the meeting; hearing no objections, she stated that a timer would be displayed on the screen during discussion to help speakers gauge their time.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES, MARCH 1, 2022 MEETING (ACTION)

Chair Williams asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the March 1, 2022, Senate meeting. Hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

SEC Update
Chair Williams stated that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) met on March 14, 2022 and approved the items on the agenda for the meeting, including the Review of the Interim Emergency Pass/Fail Guidelines and the Proposal to Create Policy for Equitable Access to Scholarly Articles Authored by University Faculty. She noted that the SEC was also able to reschedule the Special Order presentation on the University's Current and Future 5G/6G Campus Initiatives by Axel Persaud to this meeting since he was unable to present at the February meeting. She also stated that the SEC approved a time-sensitive addition to the agenda for the meeting last weekend, which was another Special Order on Supporting Faculty Through COVID by John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Committee Volunteer Period
Chair Williams stated that the online system to sign up to serve on one of the 10 Senate standing committees for the upcoming academic year is now open. She stated that one need not be a Senator to be a member of one of these committees. Applicants interested in student, faculty, and staff affairs, as well as educational and campus affairs, and other important topics are welcome to apply for these committees. She noted that the deadline to volunteer is **April 30th**.

She stated that anyone interested in volunteering, can go to the Senate website to submit a volunteer statement and select three committee choices. Applicants can describe their interest and say a few words about what they feel they can contribute, in their volunteer statement. The Senate's Committee on Committees will select volunteers to serve on each committee and will notify selected volunteers over the summer.

Remaining Senate Meetings
Chair Williams stated that following this meeting, the Senate only has two more meetings left in the academic year: April 26th and May 4th. She noted that two meetings are held in April because the May 4th Senate meeting is the *Transition Meeting* where all newly elected Senators begin their

terms, the new chair-elect is elected, and the election process is started for all elected committees and councils. She noted that this means the April 26th Senate meeting is the final meeting for any outgoing Senators with a term ending in 2022. It is also the final Senate meeting for Senate committees and University councils to have their reports approved by the Senate. Thus, Senators should be prepared for a very busy meeting on April 26th. She asked Senators to plan to review all of the materials before the meeting so that they are ready to have an informed discussion on those items.

REVIEW OF THE INTERIM EMERGENCY PASS/FAIL GUIDELINES (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-15) (ACTION)

John Lea-Cox, Chair of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee presented the recommendations on the Review of the Interim Emergency Pass/Fail Guidelines and provided background information.

Chair Lea-Cox explained that on March 30, 2020, the University moved to a virtual learning environment due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The University's grading policies, including its pass-fail guidelines, were adapted to support students and faculty through the remainder of the Spring 2020 semester. He noted that all students were automatically opted in to the pass-fail option for all of their courses and were required to ask for a letter grade.

Chair Lea-Cox further stated that in Fall 2020, the University returned to standard grading and pass-fail measures, but student advocacy made it clear that there was still a significant ongoing impact from the pandemic. He stated that in response, Provost Rankin worked with a variety of stakeholders through the Fall semester and ultimately with the Senate leadership and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) in January 2021 to:

- Amend the University of Maryland Grading Symbols and Notations Used on Academic Transcripts Policy, to change the Pass minimum grade equivalent from a "D-" to a "C-"; and

- Develop Emergency Pass-Fail Guidelines with provisions for students to take up to seven credits pass-fail and associated guidelines that could be invoked by the President and Provost for any future emergency.

He noted that President Pines approved both items on an interim basis pending formal Senate review, so that the new provisions would be in place for students during the Spring 2021 semester.

Chair Lea-Cox stated that the interim Grading Symbols & Notations Policy and the Emergency Pass-Fail Guidelines were then charged to the APAS Committee sequentially, instead of at the same time. He noted that Interim Provost Wylie wanted to give the APAS Committee the latitude to consider whether the interim change in the policy to revise the Pass minimum from a "D-" to a "C-" had any unintended consequences, but also wanted to see the outcome of that review, before the committee was charged with reviewing the interim Emergency Pass-Fail Guidelines. He noted that once the committee's recommendation to codify the Pass minimum grade equivalent at a "C-" was approved by the Senate and President Pines in September 2021, APAS was then charged with reviewing the Interim Emergency Pass-Fail Guidelines with a focus on whether the Guidelines were

general enough to be used for any type of emergency, address all relevant principles during an emergency, and have a positive or detrimental impact on the short and long term educational goals of students.

Chair Lea-Cox noted that following a thorough review and deliberation, the APAS Committee made the following recommendations:

- The current Interim Emergency Pass/Fail Guidelines be removed;
- The University follow a broad set of principles to help guide the development of any future academic guidelines, based on the type of emergency that the University is facing at the time;
- The University communicate with or engage all relevant areas, based on the type of emergency – including student affairs, faculty affairs, academic policy, mental health, and staff experience;
- The University's process for Crisis Management for future emergencies should include consideration of impact on academic affairs and marginalized communities, through the engagement of academic leaders and shared governance organizations;
- During any major future emergency, the University should consider implementing best practices in Crisis Communication; and
- The University should continue to seek input from affected groups and entities and communicate changes in procedures in a clear and timely fashion.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the proposal. Seeing none, Chair Williams called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 97 in favor, 4 opposed, and 8 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PROPOSAL TO CREATE POLICY FOR EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SCHOLARLY ARTICLES AUTHORED BY THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY (SENATE DOCUMENT #21-22-32) (ACTION)

Adriene Lim, Dean of the Libraries and Ex-Officio Member of the University Library Council, presented the Proposal to Create Policy for Equitable Access to Scholarly Articles Authored by the University Faculty on behalf of Brian Butler, Chair of the Library Council and provided background information.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Hill, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities (ARHU), stated that he had sent the proposed policy to the academic writers in the School of Music, noting that nearly all of them had serious concerns regarding the proposal. One of the concerns is as follows:

- The proposal states that the University has irrevocable access to all articles written by faculty and that an exception must be requested proactively for each article. Given that the field of music does not have much externally-funded research that would allow for publication with a limited access distribution. This would place undue burden on faculty in this field compared to others in more well-funded fields who can afford to have their articles published with unlimited access. The current fee to write an article for the GRME, which is a major open-access music education journal that is comparable with this policy due to its no prior publication mandate, is

over $3,000. Unless the University is willing to give a grant to each unfunded article so that thy can publish in open-access journals, the School of Music representative should vote "no." This concern comes from someone who considers themself for open science. That said, this policy seems unworkable in its current form.

- Another concern points to the website for music theory spectrum, from the flagship journal for the Society for Music Theory, the largest international English-language society in the discipline, published by Oxford University Press. Their fee for each open-access article is $3,696, which must be paid by the individual authors.

Senator Hill continued that there are a few exceptions, but his constituency is unsure of how much support there is for people in their financial situation. He stated that there is significant concern about how this proposal would affect people in the School of Music.

Dean Lim responded that there seemed to be a misunderstanding about what the policy aims to achieve. She stated that professors in the School of Music could choose to publish in "traditional" journals that have article processing charges (APCs) for articles that are open-access, but the policy does not mandate that the APCs would have to be paid. In fact, it avoids having to pay them at all. She directed Senator Hill to the frequently asked questions page on the UMD PACT website, pact.umd.edu, where he could find information regarding his concerns. She stated that faculty members do not have to publish open-access, they are merely providing copies of their work to be stored in an online repository that has rarely caused problems with societies or journals. She noted that even if there were prohibitory policies on a publisher's site, this policy would preempt it.

Senator Dougherty, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences (BSOS) and member of UMD PACT, added that the policy doesn't require that anyone change their publishing practices. Faculty can continue to publish in whatever journals they typically publish in.The only thing that would change is that they would submit a digital, peer-reviewed, author-accepted version of their scholarship to the Library so that a copy would be available to anyone in the world, regardless of whether it is published in a paywall journal or open-access.

Philip Cohen, member of UMD PACT, added that there is a possibility that a journal may have a policy that denies publication of articles if the author-accepted version is also available on a university website. He stated that, in a situation such as this, it would be very easy to waive the required submission to the DRUM repository. He noted that it was never the idea for people to incur open-access fees. He stated that at Harvard and other institutions with similar policies, it was found that most journals do not turn away research just because a university has the rights to the author-accepted version, even if they have a policy that says otherwise. He added that he has been doing work in the open-access arena for about ten years, and the beauty of this policy and the reason that he is so happy to support it is that it allows for increased equitable access to faculty scholarship without damaging any faculty member's career, without damaging the University's ability to get its work into all of the venues that it needs. He stated that this policy is the sweet spot of not challenging every aspect of the publishing system whilst making an important step towards increasing public equitable access to research.

Senator Hamilton, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical, & Natural Sciences (CMNS), asked if this policy was a requirement of all researchers, if every manuscript that they publish must go into DRUM, or if it was optional. He stated that if it is mandatory, there are concerns about the associated time pressure, as faculty publish many articles each year, so this would just be one more thing to do.

Dean Lim responded that in order to gain the benefit of collective action, the policy has to be all-in, with, of course, the opt-out waiver. She stressed that it would be a commitment across all faculty, but there wouldn't be a punishment or follow-up if a faculty member decided not to submit their author-accepted article. She stated that policies of this nature have increased open-access by many percentage points; she noted that when the NIH's policy was opt-in, open-access was at 4%, but after they moved to a similar structure to this policy, it jumped to more than 30%.

Senator Bradley, Faculty, the Libraries (LIBR), stated his support for this policy. He reiterated that faculty would not be required to pay APCs and noted that they wouldn't be forced to publish open-access; he stated that these are important things to keep in mind. He also stated that this policy aligns not only with the University's mission as a land-grant university, but also with the mission of the new Strategic Plan, which lists "service to humanity" and "values-driven excellence" as guiding principles. He added that it also lists as a goal "amplifying impactful research, scholarship, creative activities, teaching, and service work through communication, visibility, and translation." He noted that this policy targets impactful research and scholarship, both by preserving it in DRUM and by making DRUM more accessible through open-access and the indexing services that DRUM connects with, like Google Scholar. He stated that faculty will become more discoverable and accessible to other researchers. He added that misinformation is far too easily accessible, so in order to counteract the misinformation, steps must be taken to make truth and knowledge more accessible as well.

Senator Sly, Faculty, LIBR, stated that UMD PACT and the speakers had made clear how the policy benefits faculty. He highlighted some of those benefits:

- The visibility of scholars of all levels, but particularly young scholars, can gain through the interconnectedness of DRUM and Google Scholar. He stated that this is incredibly valuable because it can help scholars avoid platforms like Academia, Research Gate, and other sites that can be harmful.
- This is a terrific step towards a more open and equitable research apparatus, both in the University and among global partners. This aligns with the goals set out in the Strategic Plan and the University's mission as a land-grant institution, as it betters the knowledge of local and global communities.
- It gives greater institutional leverage to protect intellectual property rights when challenged or in the case of IT theft.
- It provides better institutional strength and bargaining power as faculty continue to navigate the increasingly hostile publishing industry and demonstrates the faculty's rights as authors.

Senator Wolfe, Emeriti Faculty, CMNS, stated that in the old days, faculty would submit papers to journals and, if accepted, the publishers would send the authors reprints to distribute as they desired. He requested clarification on the current publishing practices of various journals and how they disseminate work online.

Dean Lim called on Daniel Mack, Associate Dean of Libraries for Collections and member of UMD PACT, to provide a brief explanation. Mack noted that over the past couple of decades, the public has demanded that taxpayer- and tuition-funded research be made available freely, which is where open-access comes in. There are a variety of models for open-access, which is what is being discussed, but it refers to research that can be accessed freely online. Publishers have responded by instituting article processing charges, which range from a few hundred dollars to several thousand. If authors pay that fee, then the publisher will make the research open-access. This policy does not require that anyone pay the fees, it just asks that faculty submit a pre-published

version of their work to DRUM so that their work is available to the world, free of charge. He stated that it only takes a couple of minutes to deposit something in DRUM.

Senator Brewer, Faculty, ARHU, stated that the most important thing that this policy does is allow faculty to provide access to their near-final article in a way that allows the public to access the article, free of charge. She stated that unless one is in academia, it is nearly impossible for a member or the general public to access scholarship without paying fees. She stated that the DOIs on the author-accepted version and the published version would be a bit different, but readers could be rerouted. She concluded by saying that because this is a public university, the public should be able to access the work that comes out of it.

Senator Neely, Faculty, ARHU, stated the concerns of his constituency: In the areas of music theory and music history, it is common that copyrighted information, such as an excerpt of music, is included in an article. The copyrighted information is prohibited from being made open-access. This means that most articles in music theory would have to opt-out of making a submission to the repository. Some smaller publishers may be willing to consider open-access, but this limits how the work can be distributed. He stated that most major publishers are unwilling to allow open-access, with or without APCs. Senator Neely also stated that, due to costs, many MUSC faculty will be asking for exceptions to the open-access rule. He asked if the University would ever start putting the faculty under pressure to start submitting their work to the repository, putting them in a position that they can't support.

Dean Lim assured Senator Neely that there would be no coercion whatsoever. She stated that the waiver request is very easy and automatic and includes no vetting process. If asked for, the waiver will be given.

Senator Sunderland, Faculty, A. James Clark School of Engineering (ENGR), echoed Ross Salawitch's question: If the DOIs are not the same on the open-access versions, then readers will not be citing the correct paper and the citations will not be tracked to the faculty authors. He stated that he does not like the idea of people citing a non-final version of his work that has incorrect page numbers.

Senator Dougherty, Faculty, BSOS, member of UMD PACT, stated that this policy realizes the faculty's obligation as part of a state university and as members of the scientific community working for the greater good. The greater good is realized when research is made maximally accessible to the public; without this policy, the greater good is not realized. Right now, the great majority of people are unable to access any articles, as they are behind prohibitive paywalls. He stated that many other institutions have policies like this, including several in the Big Ten.

Philip Cohen, member of UMD PACT, stated the DOI question is interesting. He noted that such things would need to be worked around, as the obligation to promote maximal access to research is greater than that. He also stated that several thousand pre-print versions of articles are put into circulation each year, and when the articles are published by journals, the pre-print DOI can be associated with the published DOI so that sites like Google Scholar can know that there are two versions of the same paper and aggregate the citations. He added that the manuscript submitted to DRUM could state that it is a pre-published version of an article and provide the journal in which it is published, as well as the published DOI for citations. He added that most people don't use page numbers any more, and if they do, they won't be for long.

Seeing no further discussion, Chair Williams called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 84 in favor, 16 opposed, and 15 abstentions. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

SPECIAL ORDER

Axel Persaud
Assistant Vice President, Division of Information Technology
Current and Future 5G/6G Campus Initiatives

Mr. Persaud began his presentation by providing some background information. He explained augmented and virtual reality, as well as bandwidth and latency. He introduced the members of the 5G/6/g Working Group Committee, who strive to identify ways for the University to become a leader in developing research and applications that make use of 5G/6G technology. He then described the cellular technology timeline, stating what technology was readily available over the last several decades. In the 1980s there was 1G, which is analog voice. In the 1990s, there was 2G, which includes texting, digital voice, and two-way paging. In the 2000s, there was 3G, including voice and data. 4G, high-speed data was introduced in the 2010s, which is when streaming content became popular. In the 2020s, 5G became available, which includes enhanced broadband, the Internet of Things, and low latency (wait times). Since "G" stands for the generation of the technology, the group has tried to look ahead and see what innovations might be included in the next generation of technology, 6G.

Mr. Persaud provided examples of challenges that the working group encountered. He talked about Low-E Glass, used to construct buildings on campus, which rejects UV rays and solar heat while allowing heating and cooling to remain inside the building. While visible light passes through, most wireless signals are reflected off of the glass, resulting in low signals indoors. He stated that while the Low-E glass is highly energy efficient, it is equivalent to up to two feet of concrete, in terms of how difficult it is for wireless signals to pass through. Other challenges included technology limitations, including signal strength and maximum distance; infrastructure limitations, including density and fibers; coordination with multiple providers, meaning technology on campus is not uniform; and aviation, due to our close proximity to the College Park Airport. Mr. Persaud stated that the working group is looking into ways to work around these challenges.

Mr. Persaud then explained why 5G/6G efforts are important to the University. He stated that it can expand and enhance the following areas:

- Research opportunities, as researchers can explore novel methodologies for network management and new applications;
- Health and safety, by way of enhanced augmented reality and emergency notifications;
- Transportation, by way of autonomous vehicle deployment and enhanced traffic management;
- Athletics, through enhanced fan experiences, wearables, and improved injury response;
- The arts, by enabling real-time collaborations over long distances;
- 5G enabled drones, which could expedite deliveries of sensitive information and medical supplies, as well as land surveying; and
- Student experience, by providing real-time building and event information, as well as virtual tours.

These areas utilize edge computing, ultra-high data rates, ultra-low latency, augmented reality, security, reliability, increased bandwidth, virtual reality, and low-power Internet of Things.

Mr. Persaud noted that the University is working with the Wireless Infrastructure Association (WIA) to set up the Center of Inclusive Growth and Excellence on campus. He noted that through the WIA partnership, the University would be able to offer training and resources to the community on how to

do 5G installations and work the equipment, preparing them to be the future workforce that deploys this technology. Mr. Persaud stated that the University is currently making vendor site visits in order to identify locations on campus to do 5G deployments, as well as finalize requirements. Next steps include DC/FS approval, contract amendments, and commencing work. He noted that the entire deployment, from start to finish, is likely to take 12-18 months.

In addition to the physical deployment of 5G on campus, the University is also making strategic partnerships with various cellular carriers, such as AT&T and Verizon. These partnerships will be based on which locations are chosen for deployment, including on campus, the Baltimore Avenue corridor, and the Discovery District. One deployment will be used as a testbed for researchers, so that they can continually alter the technology to see which levels are optimal, while another deployment will be more permanent and can be used for application testing. Additionally, Mr. Persaud noted that student internships may be set up with partnering companies in order to give students experience in the field.

Mr. Persaud concluded by stating that anyone who wishes to learn more about the initiative or get involved should contact Joseph Jaja, the Interim Chair of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Chair of the 5G/6G Working Group Committee, by email (josephj@umd.edu) or phone (301-405-3683).

Chair Williams opened the floor for questions.

Miriam Sharp, Exempt Staff, Division for Administration (VPA), stated that the University is in an FAA no-fly zone for drones, and asked if this is being considered on a higher level. She also asked if there were plans to do a systematic survey of signal dead zones which currently impact emergency response, noting that there are certain shielded buildings that limit incoming and outgoing calls, especially as more people move away from using landlines. She asked if there would be increased blue-light phones in those dead zones for emergencies.

Mr. Persaud responded that they are looking into the fact that the University is in a no-fly zone and are working on solutions, though it may take time. He stated that they are also looking into the shielded buildings and dead zones on campus, noting that as he works with cellular carriers on the outdoor improvements that they are looking to do, he is also negotiating with them to work on some of the more challenging buildings on campus. Additionally, as the wireless connections are improved on campus, Mr. Persaud noted that calls could be made using Wi-Fi. In terms of the blue-light phones, he asked that those who know of unserviced areas let him know so that it can be rectified, either by adding a blue-light phone or other technology.

Senator Baden, Faculty, CMNS, stated any time there have been significant upgrades to IT, there have been significant capital costs. He asked what the initial cost would be to add 5G/6G to the campus, as well as plans to come up with funding. He also asked if there would be ongoing costs to the upgrades, noting that current ongoing IT costs are borne by the departments.

Mr. Persaud responded that to enhance cellular coverage, the carriers will foot the entire bill. Only if the University decides to go beyond what the companies deploy would it incur any costs. He added that it is possible for the University to make money from this deal, as it makes money from the existing cell towers on campus. He stated that the wireless upgrades are completely separate, but he is trying to do all 5G/6G enhancements with little cost to the University.

Seeing no further questions, Williams thanked Mr. Persaud for his presentation.

SPECIAL ORDER

John Bertot
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, Office of Faculty Affairs
Supporting Faculty Through COVID

John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, began his presentation by commenting on the impact of COVID-19 on the campus community, especially the faculty. He stated that the impact could be broken down into categories: the immediate impact in March 2020, the ongoing impact, and the impact as the campus begins to emerge from the pandemic. He noted that the University wanted to review how it addressed this impact, and how it intended to address it going forward.

Bertot stated the initial actions taken by the University during the COVID pandemic:

- A special COVID tenure delay was implemented through June 1, 2021;
- The University issued temporary promotion, tenure, and periodic review guidance;
- The University implemented an optional COVID impact statement for inclusion in tenure and promotion reviews;
- Guidance was issued for unit heads on how to balance the impacts of the pandemic on faculty;
- the faculty were given the ability to annotate their annual activities reports in Faculty Success to contextualize their activities;
- The care@work benefit was established to support those with caregiving responsibilities.

Bertot noted that the impacts of the pandemic have been disparate. He stated that some faculty have had their careers accelerated due to the pandemic or explored lines of inquiry only made possible through the pandemic, while others have faced both personal and professional challenges that have altered their anticipated trajectory, likely for quite some time. Bertot stated that listening sessions were conducted in the various Schools and Colleges, as well as in the Libraries. The findings of the listening sessions include:

- The impacts are both long-term and cumulative;
- Some faculty have yet to fully set up their labs due to supply chain disruptions;
- Those reliant on community-based human subjects research have not been able to return to their communities and may have to reestablish their contacts;
- Many faculty members' doctoral students and postdocs have been impacted, thus delaying their progress; and
- Faculty members indicated that teaching expectations required substantial additional time and effort, not only due to the sudden pivot to online teaching, but also because students needed tremendous additional support throughout the pandemic.

Bertot outlined the University's intended actions for the next several years. He stated that the University is addressing promotion reviews by offering a second COVID tenure delay through 2026; continuing the optional COVID impact statement, with modifications to implementation; including in dossiers a unit COVID field impact statement that is developed and reviewed by faculty; and developing a University timeline of COVID research events to be sent to external evaluators. Additionally, modifications will be made to the external evaluator letter request in order to more directly address the impacts of the endemic on candidates, and guidance will be provided to units on how to consider the impacts of the pandemic on candidates. Bertot stated that the University intends to expand the use of the COVID impact statements to include periodic reviews. Additionally, updated guidance will be given to units on how to consider the impact on candidates as part of annual, merit, or other periodic review processes. He noted that the University is considering implementing a seed grant program and other reliefs to assist faculty in their research.

Bertot concluded by providing a timeline for next steps. He stated that by April 15, 2022, both guidance and updates regarding promotion guidelines would be issued, while additional supports would be implemented by May 20, 2022.

Chair Williams opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Goodman, Faculty, CMNS, stated that the impact of COVID in his unit, Physics, was very diverse. He stated that his unit does not want there to be a single statement that says, "This is the experience of Physics." He also stated that the Provost had previously had regulations that all startup funds be spent on a particular schedule, and he hopes that this regulation is rethought because the time frame in which the money had to be spent did not best fit the unit's needs.

Bertot responded that the issue of the required timelines for startup funding had been raised several times, noting that he would take it to Provost Rice and VPR Ball. He stated that his office had been working with the associate deans to issue guidance that acknowledges that not all fields can put out one impact statement. If a discipline has multiple sub-disciplines, the unit statement may look like a sub-discipline statement. He noted that they are actively working on a solution.

Senator Dougherty, Faculty, BSOS, stated that there have been significant lingering effects in the social sciences, especially surrounding data acquisition, diverse communities, and human-subjects work in general. He noted that all of these things, in addition to those that Bertot mentioned, would likely remain challenging for the foreseeable future. He asked if Bertot pictures resources applying to just current faculty, or if it would apply to future faculty as well. He added that he agreed with Senator Goodman's question on startup funding and timelines.

Bertot stated that the second tenure delay would be offered to those who have already received it, as well as any future faculty members who join up though June, 2026. He stated that the idea is to have the resources and support in effect through June, 2026, but that there needs to be flexibility in case something else needs to be implemented along the way. He stated that this flexibility of implementation could be achieved through periodic assessments to tell what modifications, if any, need to be made. This could include putting more time on the clock; he stated that the University's tenure delay policy allows for delays for personal or professional reasons, so people can apply for additional delays as needed. He stressed that endless delays are not the solution and that multiple solutions are being looked at simultaneously, noting that the administration is still feeling its way through the situation.

Seeing no further questions, Chair Williams thanked Associate Provost Bertot for his presentation.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 p.m.