

2-20-2018

February 20, 2018

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 20, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1094.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1094

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

EIU Faculty Senate Session Minutes
20 February 2018 ▪ 2:00-3:50 p.m.
Witters Conference Room 4440, Booth Library

The 2017-2018 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available at <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>.

Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

Senators present: T. Abebe, S. Brantley, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, K. Hung, N. Hugo, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, J. Stowell, B. Young, R. Cash

Senators absent: G. Sterling, C. Wharram, J. Williams

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (Provost), David Boggs (CGS Chair), Tim Zimmer (Facilities Planning and Management Director), Steve Pamperin (Charleston City Planner), Greg Culp (Charleston Public Works), Luke Young (Student Government President), Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes from February 6, 2018

Motion to approve by Eckert, seconded by Bruns

Discussion: none

Vote: 10 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions – motion carried

Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: This Thursday there will be another Shared Governance Visioning Committee meeting – there will be a vote on the Faculty Senate renaming proposal at the Naming Committee meeting next week – thank you to the organizers of last week's Faculty Forum – CUPB meeting coming up next Friday – I reached out to several of our Council of Illinois University Senates colleagues for input as to how their senates are constituted, what tasks they perform regarding curriculum

Shared Governance Visioning Committee Update

STOWELL: We (major committee chairs on campus: CGS, CAA, COTE, CASL, Faculty Senate, potentially General Education) are evaluating our current structure and envisioning a more collaborative structure in the future; we're almost to the point of having a preliminary draft model to be shared with committees this semester; by the end of the semester we'll have solidified the proposal so that next year we can start making that transition, if there is one

Committee Reports

Elections Committee

STOWELL: We have 29 open positions on 10 committees for next year; deadline for submitting a nomination is next Monday; a reminder was sent out yesterday

Nominations Committee

OLIVER: Update on activities of nominated committees: I've distributed a list of contacts [*runs down list; committees are meeting unless otherwise specified below*] – in terms of ATAC, our representative may need to be more proactive; who chairs, is it John Henderson?

GATRELL: They had a meeting on February 9

OLIVER: Campus Recreation Board has no contact person, no meetings, no director since Ken Baker retired years ago; I need to follow up with Sarah Daugherty – Brand Champions: no meetings?

ECKERT: It was an envisioned committee but it was never actually constituted

STOWELL: They've never actually met; [former VPUA] Bob Martin proposed it, but we couldn't get any traction with it

OLIVER: Environmental Health and Safety Committee ...

STOWELL: Hasn't met since that person retired in 2012

OLIVER: No contact, no meetings for Office of the Registrar Advisory Committee

GATRELL: Does anyone know what the mission of the committee is?

OLIVER: Parking Advisory and Parking Appeals meet as needed – Proposal Initiative Fund Council is anticipated to meet in Spring but I didn't actually hear back – Student Fee Review Committee: the only increase is room and board, which is automatic, so not needed yet – Student Government External Relations Committee: determining whether they need/want faculty representation, so we'll hear back from Sen. Bruns and Rebecca Cash on that in the near future; Sen. Sterling pointed out that on the city website the committee listing mentions faculty, I emailed the mayor but haven't heard back yet – University Union Board: no director of the union, but deputy director Cathy Engelkes is attempting to call a meeting in the Spring – the majority of committees are meeting, but there are a few question marks to take a look at

HUNG: We've been batting around revising the number of committees and committee assignments; for example, if the parking committees aren't meeting regularly, can we combine that into one position? – we need clarification if committees that haven't been meeting are on hiatus or no longer needed; if the latter, then disband

ECKERT: Case in point, the Environmental Health and Safety Committee: there was an IGP; there was a retirement and it wasn't clear who would replace; the committee seems to be important, but who takes care of these issues now

OLIVER: It's IGP 156; the chain of command goes back to the Vice President for Business Affairs

ABEBE: We need to remember that we've had a change of personnel in many offices all over campus – unless that individual calls a meeting, it doesn't happen

ECKERT: That's also the case with the Textbook Rental Advisory Committee

ROBERTSON: I had a conversation with Anna Cromwell about the External Relations Committee, where we were informed that the committee hasn't needed faculty input for the past 20 years, not needed now or in the future; we pointed out to the city that their website listed faculty involvement on that committee; they've since updated their website and there's no longer any mention of faculty

GATRELL: I would suggest an executive decision to eliminate Brand Champions – curriculum is governed by CAA and CGS, the oversight is already there, so the Office of the Registrar committee seems duplicative

BRUNS: Isn't Brand Champions about branding?

ECKERT: Yes, but it never met ...

STOWELL: I suggest that the Nominations Committee come back with a list

Faculty-Student Relations Committee

BRUNS: Rebecca is checking into student government bylaws about the External Relations Committee, so we're going to confer and try to resolve it – we invited Luke Young to come today to talk about the bike path

CASH: Hopefully you saw in the paper about the panther statue; it was approved by a vote of 12-7; a lot of the funding is coming from our Speaker, who can't accept his full scholarship amount because of ROTC

L. YOUNG: It's going right in front of the library facing the union

BRUNS: They were talking about the statue at the Master Planning Committee; Luke and Derek [Pierce] gave a presentation; the statue will sit north of the library, with a concrete path off the sidewalk, a pad that gives space to stand for pictures, and pavers spelling out EIU; the statue stands on a base, with the panther crouching on a tree; total height approximately 8 feet including pedestal; the committee voted to approve but did want to ask Sculpture faculty about the size (proportion) – the committee also looked at potential bike paths through campus

Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report

Awards Committee

HUGO: Applications are due this Friday; I haven't received any yet ...; we had six nominations last year

Faculty Forum Committee

ABEBE: We had our forum; I want to thank those who made the presentations last week; I wish the attendance was a bit better; it was video recorded, and that's now been posted, faculty can go there and check it out; valuable information was shared; the response from the audience was mixed but appreciated – we should all be concerned when people tell us that campuses outside of EIU are also part of the problem; we should also be concerned that 2,000 students left the state of Illinois in 2002, as of December 2017 that number was 50,000; the concern is that's not a state likely to replenish retiring people; our share of those 50,000 students

could be significant; as a Senate and as faculty on campus, our response to the enormous pressure building up ought to be very strategic, rather than saying we don't care about what other people think

Budget Transparency Committee

ROBERTSON: Sen. Sterling was unable to attend today but will have some items for our next meeting

Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics: No report

Conversation with David Boggs, CGS Chair

BOGGS: CGS meets at the same time as Senate, Vice Chair Missy Jones is handling that meeting today – when I came to EIU, I found the availability of information on the website very good; that's a good place for information about CGS – primary duties of the Council on Graduate Studies: the vast majority of the work we do relates to curriculum issues, new course proposals, revised courses, new programs, changes in delivery – other duties, from the bylaws (not dealt with on a day to day basis because they don't change that often): exclusive council-level responsibility for academic regulations and requirements that apply to graduate programs, approval of graduate programs, making recommendations concerning the status of graduate programs; also responsibilities related to graduate students: regulations and requirements, academic load limit, graduate assistantships; graduate faculty: what we've been dealing with more than rules and regulations is faculty without PhDs needed to do graduate work or lead a thesis, more requests for temporary service in those capacities ... – ten members of CGS: two from each of the four colleges (from different programs), a member appointed by the Graduate Dean, and a graduate student member [*reads names of current members*] – other things we're addressing right now: First Choice programs, established by Bob Augustine when he was Dean of the Graduate School, continued with support from Dean Hendrickson; designation recognizing programs that achieve high quality performance, evaluated in several ways including types of students brought into the program, faculty qualifications and engagement, student research; the process [of applying for] the designation is a lot of work; the designation lasts for five years, then has to go up for renewal (School of Business and Communication Disorders are up for renewal this year) – another item I would like to highlight is the encouragement of graduate student research: CGS is active in encouraging and supporting, making contributions to decisions on awards and travel; graduate awards ceremony each year – dual degree programs and Professional Science Master's: dual study in a STEM program with Business; opportunity for continued improvement in our graduate offerings – delivery methods of courses: a lot more online offerings, in addition to hybrid and traditional offerings; only a few years ago it required many steps of approval just to teach online; a change was made so that can be done with executive actions; very rapid growth for new programs, such as in Education – one thing I overlooked about First Choice: one reason to pursue is additional graduate assistantships provided for programs designated First Choice – accelerated programs: we've had a discussion this year on accelerated graduate programs; initially, language of 4+1 was used; programs are designed to give strong undergraduate students the opportunity to take a few courses that will apply to graduate programs, so they can add a year to their program of study at EIU and graduate with a master's degree – I mentioned earlier that our number one activity is reviewing course and program proposals; we have recently worked with CAA and others on a policy to give guidance to those wanting to develop new programs; the Provost would be notified of an intention to bring forward a program before these go to CAA and/or CGS – we work with CAA regularly, 4750-4999 courses are approved both at CAA and at CGS because they're available for undergraduate and graduate students – what connection does CGS have with Faculty Senate: Faculty Senate handles the elections each Spring (members serve 3-year terms, rotated); also when we have a member who becomes unavailable it requires a special election, handled through Faculty Senate as well

ABEBE: CGS does a good job, but the First Choice program marketing has not been of any use to the institution – in its design it's a political tool; Economics was not recognized as a First Choice program until Augustine stepped down; "First choice" among what? Does that mean everything else is a bad choice? The naming itself is a conundrum – I would like to suggest that it's time to undergo new assumptions with regard to the whole conception of First Choice; the only advantage to departments is the additional scholarship awards; the amount of work departments do for that purpose is not worth it, it's not cost-effective – if you would entertain: we have a new Provost, we have a new way of thinking about things, and we are challenging assumptions, so it would be a good thing under your leadership to try to do that

BRUNS: The description of First Choice sets up a competition among graduate programs, implying that some are better than others; all of our graduate programs are substantial – if there are additional monies for assistantships, putting that toward underserved populations would be more positive – about membership, is there a way for Library Services faculty to serve on CGS?

ECKERT: Library Advisory Board is represented (Nora Pat Small)

BOGGS: There is CGS representation on the LAB, but not library faculty on CGS

BRUNS: In the library, as faculty we do a lot of work with graduate programs and graduate students, so I'd like to see a stronger connection

HUNG: On the First Choice award, I concur that with the suggestion of rethinking how that pot of money can be best put to use – I suggest that we keep a formal level of recognition of departments that go above and beyond in crafting strong graduate programs; recognition is good for morale, but maybe not tied to monetary gains or rewards – As undergraduate enrollment has taken hits, how are graduate programs doing: commensurate reductions, holding steady, expanding? I know there's a problem in the last year or two with international students being a larger percentage in our graduate population than it is in our undergrad population, can you comment about that?

BOGGS: Our number of graduate students was close to 1,600 in 2011; we have not experienced declines in the way that undergraduate programs have; I don't recall our exact number for this year

HUNG: Our department has experienced an increase in graduate enrollment and a decrease in undergraduate enrollment; that places a different demand on our curriculum, we have more need for faculty to teach graduate level courses so we're pulling away them away from some of the undergraduate courses, which we then have to staff with Unit Bs; in certain disciplines within our department it's difficult getting faculty to teach the graduate courses in demand because they're also in demand for undergraduate core requirements – Have you considered recommendations or guidelines, for example, cross-listing? That was discouraged in the past to make a sharper distinction between graduate level and undergraduate level courses; has that been revised, or do you have additional suggestions for departments to juggle staffing demands?

BOGGS: There are 4750-4999 courses for graduates and undergraduates – also accelerated programs designed to allow undergrads to take graduate courses and receive both graduate credit and undergraduate credit for it; that results in some cross-listing – there are different requirements for graduate students; when we do new course review, we look at: have expectations for graduate students versus undergraduate students been clearly delineated? – I think we're doing what you want to see us doing

ROBERTSON: I've witnessed people who did thesis advising but were not able to sign the student thesis because they were Unit B or not full-time, although they did have terminal degrees; our colleagues who do the work should be able to be acknowledged – we have the hurdle of applying to the graduate faculty every few years; all full-time faculty, when hired, should be qualified to be graduate faculty; I'm wondering if that's administrative bureaucracy we've maintained, can we phase that out for full-time faculty and come up with a system to account for people who don't have terminal degrees or are less than full-time so it's more streamlined?

GATRELL: HLC has a definition of graduate-qualified faculty, and there are some discipline specifics that we need to be mindful of, but I do think there would be a way to streamline that process

BOGGS: Research and creative activity is a distinguishing feature between those who are qualified to be graduate faculty and those who are not; it's the unusual case where a person with expertise may lead a thesis but not have a PhD, I hope it doesn't become overly common

GATRELL: HLC criteria requires a terminal degree

ABEBE: I get to apply every five years to be graduate faculty; what's the point?

BOGGS: If you did no research, if you just got your doctorate and checked out ...

ABEBE: That's not what I said; I get to apply every five years, the last time you approved it, does that mean you throw that away? The research done five years ago doesn't count anymore?

BOGGS: It's a policy; there's an expectation of currency – technically, even though it's five years, it could be 30: we have faculty who are hired and might serve 30 years; the fact that they have two publications and got tenure, does that mean for the next 30 years they never open a book, are they graduate-qualified faculty? I would be against them being so (this is my personal opinion, not speaking on behalf of CGS)

OLIVER: Workloads across campus are very different; I've worked in a department for 15 years where I've taught 27-30 CUs, 5-6 or 6-8 of those are a graduate class each semester with more than 10 students; I've had a chance to present and to publish here and there, but I'm not sure what the load is elsewhere, it may be less – I readily accept the classes so the students can stay on track for graduation, but that's significant time I could be putting toward research and maybe I'm not going to because classes come first – before we draw this hard line every five years, very different circumstances in colleges and departments need to be considered

ECKERT: I've worked at research universities where everyone was considered graduate faculty, no one had to prove anything – here we have to prove that we're graduate faculty; I find it bureaucratic and somewhat silly – I teach graduate classes, it takes away from my research time, but in order to teach the graduate classes I'm supposed to show [proof of research]; it's ridiculous

GATRELL: We have a policy, we have to follow it; for a policy change, we would have to have a broader discussion; there are disciplines that have specific benchmarks for scholarly productivity to maintain accreditation, so if we want to have a broader discussion, we have to be mindful that those standards have to be maintained – in 2008 there were 1,779 students in the Graduate School; it steadily went down until about 2014, when it was 1,273; currently (in the Fall of 2017) it's 1,462, so there's been growth in graduate education over the past two years, both in international students and online students

HUNG: On the graduate faculty qualification issue, for faculty on campus who are going for tenure, promotion, PAI, ACA, each time we have to document our productivity and ongoing scholarship – can we link the systems, roll people over into the eligible pool if they've submitted a successful application because they've already demonstrated scholarship – if someone is out of that cycle and wants to be graduate faculty, then it triggers a review – those of us actively in our career paths don't have to duplicate the effort, CGS will still have evidence that people are qualified in their scholarship to lead a thesis and it doesn't create extra paperwork for the faculty

OLIVER: There are significant differences from DAC to DAC

BRUNS: It goes to UPC

HUNG: If you haven't had a successful personnel action in the last five years, then you might need to submit extra material for consideration if you want to lead a thesis

ABEBE: I don't think there are people who have been denied—can you cite one?

BOGGS: I'm aware of denials; that's normally handled at the department level; CGS says these are our policies, department policies have to align

ECKERT: Are you saying that graduate status is granted by the department?

BOGGS: I recall voting on unique applications for graduate faculty status, when they don't have the standard qualifications; I do not have a recollection of ever voting on faculty who have the qualifications – just like the DAC is done at the discipline level, it's my understanding that graduate faculty status is also done that way within the broader university guidelines – School of Business has different research standards, we have higher standards [than those for tenure or promotion], for graduate faculty status we have to go above and beyond those minimum requirements

ABEBE: It's not my understanding, in Economics: we fill out a form every five years, it goes to CGS and they decide – it's a waste of time, I don't understand why that process shouldn't be eliminated

HUNG: It sounds like there's a disconnect between the departmental level and CGS, that might need to be looked into and solved

ABEBE: The application doesn't go to the department, it goes to them [CGS]; it's your form we sign

ECKERT: It's signed by the department chair and the college dean

BOGGS: We review every course proposal, we do not go through every faculty member application for renewal of graduate faculty status, but we do go through and carefully look at the exceptions – I encourage anyone with strong feelings about something to pursue it; I'll bring these forward, but if there's not somebody putting forward a motion to make a change, it'll be discussion but it won't be a vote and a policy change unless somebody takes action

Provost's Report

GATRELL: The Student Success Taskforce document has been shared with you; the final document was reviewed by President's Council; each of those recommendations is not necessarily a plan, they are discussion points for subsequent action; I have worked with members of the committee and the deans to identify leads, I'll have updates later in the year – I met with CUPB this morning to talk about the WG8&9 review document; discussion focused on broad implications of the document, which apparently was perceived as a plan but really is a feedback document; the review team provided their best assessment of the environment as it relates to the various options available and provided additional feedback – I want to thank Dr. Abebe for the faculty forum; the dialogue was constructive and collaborative

ABEBE: I read the document, it's a pretty good document and the learning communities idea is a really good idea – two minor points, 1) my personal experience with the early alert system: I used to send those alerts; I didn't know what happened, until the end of the semester; my evaluations were lower in the classes where I sent the alerts than in the other classes, and the comments made were "he reported me," so I quit doing it; perhaps there may be other faculty members on campus who feel that way – 2) a comment about students learning quantitative skills: a statement was made that the Math Department should do something in consultation with others; what was recommended is not only quantitative skills but also financial skills, yet the recommended departments do not

include those that deal with financial skills; it gave me the impression that the people writing it do not know where things are being done on campus

GATRELL: That was based on our current gen ed and the quantitative literacy math requirement; my view of quantitative literacy is much broader; I have referred that specific piece to Dean Klarup, with the expectation that he will consult the chair – I think we need to have a broader discussion about general education; there's a committee working on that, but that's going to be a multi-year process, because you can accomplish those outcomes in a variety of courses – one thing that became clear with the experience of the Student Success Taskforce is that maybe we need to rethink some very fundamental things as it relates to the curriculums, but that properly rests with the faculty

ROBERTSON: The Provost will be presenting on the geography of beer at the music and microbrew collaborative "Brass and Brew" next Wednesday, February 28 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Charleston Country Club

GATRELL: \$8 a flight, food and drink available as well

Discussion of Proposed Bike Path

ROBERTSON: Very briefly at our last meeting we discussed the proposed Charleston bike path expansion; Luke Young has joined us, as well as Tim Zimmer and colleagues

L. YOUNG: Student Government has been working on this, in conjunction with everybody else; we're excited to see a bike path come through campus, we think that this could be a good way to showcase campus and connect to the community; we see a lot of benefits but we're also very aware of the logistics that need to happen – Chief Martin, Tim [Zimmer], our University Enhancement Chair for Student Government and I rode around campus in a golf cart, they shared ideas and we gave feedback

BRUNS: Several different options for plans were discussed at the Master Planning Committee meeting

ZIMMER: *[introduces Pamperin and Culp]*

PAMPERIN: The City of Charleston has been working on different pieces of bike planning: things going on at Lake Charleston trails; we've gotten money to pave the rock trail between Mattoon and Charleston (12 miles, called the Lincoln Trail), hopefully we'll start that construction by the end of this year, maybe early next year; where we're lacking is a network inside the city – we've been working with Ride Illinois (bike consulting group out of Chicago) and the Lumpkin Foundation to put together a bicycle and transportation plan for the city of Charleston; a huge part of that is getting through campus; we don't just want to make this transportation from A to B, we want to make this interesting as people are going – we reached out to Student Senate and to Tim, who is on our bike committee; as part of the city's effort we want Eastern's input to come up with a route through campus – from the city's perspective, we have to look at our infrastructure, our public works and how to do a better bike network through the city; we also want to encourage bike riding – from an economic development perspective, there's not a whole lot to do in Charleston, so we want to enhance tourism; we're also looking at how we can help with EIU recruitment and retention – we're trying to figure out the engineering of a network through campus: we're going to come down 6th St., find a way to safely cross Lincoln Ave. north and south, and back up on 7th St.; we can get to Old Main's front door and we can get out the back door down Roosevelt Ave. but what do we do through campus, that's where we're asking for your help – we have a second draft we've put together; our goal is to get this before the zoning board in April, with a public hearing with some of our recommendations, and then get it to City Council in May – we are constantly going out for grant money and different funding sources to do this stuff; the City of Charleston would like to partner with Eastern to try to make some of those things happen

ZIMMER: Greg's role from the public works perspective is contacting us to collaborate on something identified in master plan; we work closely with him on signage, paving, marking; there could be some collaborative effort in establishing trails on campus; we're working on several initiatives – grant money is available for transportation (not sightseeing), but if they come through campus, what interesting things can we do – the study is meant for the adult casual rider – some different areas of campus we might want to reach, some areas that give us concern, like do we want to go through a quad; there's not the conflict of time and space after 5:00 pm – we ask that you forward your comments to Jimmy; I'm the point of contact for campus; I do not filter the comments, leave it up to the consultant to weed through those suggestions – we haven't agreed to or signed anything yet, no obligation; it's a planning document; we can add, subtract, do it in multiple phases over several years – I'll stick around after the meeting, put it up on the board and discuss it with anybody who wants to

BRUNS: I think it's important to do at least a little bit of that now

ROBERTSON: Maybe we can talk about a plan of action for the workgroup review committee very quickly and then spend some looking and talking, because we might run out of time, but I would like some time to look as a group at those plans

Discussion of Senate Response to the Recommendations of the Vitalization Workgroups 8 & 9 Review Committee

ROBERTSON: My proposal is to form a small subcommittee to generate some language for a formal recommendation

HUNG: Since Sen. Bruns and I were on the review committee, we shouldn't be appointed in order to avoid conflict

BRUNS: I don't know how we can have a committee working on a response when you haven't had an opportunity to ask us questions

Discussion of Proposed Bike Path (continued)

BRUNS: My understanding is that the bike paths are being funded by the city

PAMPERIN: We'll have to figure out city funds going to a state property, we haven't worked out those details yet; we can probably do some signage and striping, but the bigger stuff we'll have to work out with grant money – we're collaborating with the city of Mattoon so students from the Chicago area can get on the Amtrak, get off at Mattoon, and ride their bikes to campus

HUNG: Could you send us the image files of the proposals that we can circulate to the faculty for additional feedback?

PAMPERIN: We can make the second draft of our planning document available – you can also make comments outside of campus – most campus towns are designated as “bike friendly communities,” we want to be that too

BRUNS: We'd like to see a map

STOWELL: How do we make this more accessible to students – bike sharing in the future?

PAMPERIN: We've talked about bike sharing, maintenance stations along the trail – not just the trail but doing some natural things: we're partnering with native groups; we had a conversation with a biology professor about butterfly gardens

HUNG: That's something we can talk about with CUPB or Master Planning, Panther Card-operated bike sharing would make a huge difference on bike usage

OLIVER: Have we involved the private sector—for example, Bike & Hike?

PAMPERIN: Brendan Lynch is on our committee

OLIVER: At other universities, students can ride the train right into the heart of their campus – is it realistic to expect students to be able to ride their bikes with all their stuff from Amtrak, or do we provide any type of shuttle service; what percentage of students have cars, how many might use this?

L. YOUNG: Dial-a-Ride covers transportation to and from the Amtrak station; the bike path would be more helpful in getting around campus and around town, avoiding pedestrians and cars; campus isn't bike friendly now, it deters students

HUNG: From Greek Court, either you walk or you drive; if the bike path were connected, people would have another access method

L. YOUNG: People keep saying “I wish I could use bikes more” – there are some remote areas on and off campus that students would use if we were a little more bike-friendly

OLIVER: Dial-a-Ride, Panther Shuttle, the bike path—combine them all together, this is another complementary piece that could be used in marketing

PAMPERIN: The bike path would be more realistic for short weekends without a lot of luggage

CULP: Another group to consider is visiting parents

L. YOUNG: This will also get runner traffic ...

BRUNS: This isn't a question of “should we,” it's just a question of where – I think we need to look at the maps

[Zimmer hangs a map and explains the color coding – comments from the ensuing conversation include a mention of positive reactions toward the pink path from some members of the Master Planning Committee, coordinating all-way red traffic signals, widening of sidewalks along Lincoln Ave. between 6th and 7th Sts. and also down 18th St., more support for the pink path with some tweaking, possibility of closing the alley on the east side of Doudna to allow routing past sculptures, etc.]

Session adjourned at 3:52 p.m.