Calendar Implementation Taskforce  
May 14, 2020

This meeting was recorded and can be viewed [here](#).

Jeff Popke sent everyone an update on the Altered Calendar Committee (ACC) through email. Much of it was about addressing the hybrid schedule. He also brought it up with the Interim Chancellor. It looks like this is the model that everyone will go forward with. The faculty subcommittee (made up of Jeff Popke, Chris Buddo, and Mary Farwell) within ACC is concerned with many of the same issues, and that 3-person group has an initial set of recommendations due on Monday. This meeting will help them come up with any remaining recommendations and information to include in that report to the ACC. The ACC had some questions about the model, so he thought CIT should run through those questions so they can be answered in the report. CIT members can also send him questions through email to make sure they make it into the report.

In the email Jeff Popke sent around this morning concerning the feedback from the ACC on the model, he embedded some comments that reflected questions that came up during the ACC meeting. He asked Chris Buddo and Mary Farwell to weigh in if he forgot anything important. First question that came up was what needs to be considered in terms of graduate courses, since Marianne Montgomery’s proposal was mostly about migrating undergraduate courses. For 3-hour graduate courses that meet once a week, could those kinds of courses meet twice a week? Do we need to say they have to be hybrid and offered in their once a week timeslot or should we be more flexible? What do we need to say to address graduate students and graduate courses?

Crystal Chambers said we need to think about the types of graduate programs we have. Her college has a lot of programs that are geared toward adult learners who are online and have kids they are trying to teach at the same time. Most of these programs should be given exemptions. She thinks there should be a distinction between exemptions versus exceptions made on a course-by-course basis. If you are talking about part-time students meeting mostly in the evenings, suddenly increasing that to two times a week is a lot.

Marianne Montgomery said she initially thought like Jeff Popke that those 3-hour graduate courses could just switch to meeting 2 times a week, but she does not think you could do that in an automated way. When creating the model she was mostly concerned with figuring out how to do an automated migration that wouldn’t create conflicts for students. If a student has a Tuesday course and a different Thursday course, then that would create a conflict so she didn’t think she could proceed that way for those graduate courses. She doesn’t think it could be automated but units could split it into two.

Crystal Chambers said even within a graduate program they may be taking classes outside their department. Some kind of standardization would be preferred so those students are not hit with wildly different schedules.

Jean-Luc Scemama said some of these graduate students are also teaching assistants (TAs), so flexibility is necessary. They are going to be teaching and having to meet for courses as well.

Alethia Cook said most of her unit’s students take one class online and one face-to-face and the classes are usually 10-15 students, not larger, and most of them are at night. There is much less traffic on campus at night. They do not teach 5-week graduate courses because they have such a high amount of reading required that it ends up not being done and the learning experience is not the same. They also have a Saturday program where they come for 6 hours from Rocky Mountain and the rest of their contact is online. Do those programs put as much risk on the students and the faculty as an undergraduate course?

Jason Yao said that this block schedule was meant to reduce interaction, but the number of graduate students are much smaller than the number of undergraduates and course sizes are much smaller. Assigning rooms to allow social distancing is going to be much easier. Graduate courses can fit into smaller rooms. He does not see why they want to make unnecessary changes and compress those courses. They will not cause unnecessary traffic and it will cause unnecessary problems to try to make them go to 8-weeks. Students have all sort of family situations. It is already hard
enough for them to take courses to earn these degrees, so maybe for all graduate students unless there are other situations that it makes sense to put in an 8-week schedule, why not just keep them on same 15-week schedule?

Marianne Montgomery said there are a few cases where we won’t want them on 15-week blocks. Most should be getting the exceptions though. Her concern is like Jean-Luc Scemama’s, because they have TAs who will be teaching 8-week classes and then taking their own. Another concern is that in their department, they have cross-listed undergraduate and graduate courses. Those will have to be migrated to 8-week courses. Should it be that graduate courses are going to be exempt from 8-week block scheduling unless you specify that you want them to be included, and all these programs have to request exemptions?

Stacey Altman asked if there should be some sort of statement about the plan for what will happen if those 15-week exempted courses have to go online again. At some point in the semester, which the 8-week seems to be trying to address, would there need to be a plan for that?

Jason Yao said he thinks that statement would apply to all exempted courses. You would just have to move online.

Marianne Montgomery said somewhere in the proposal document there is a statement that Faculty Senate should develop an expanded continuity statement for syllabi.

Jeff Popke reminded the group that the reason for doing the 8-week block schedule is not about social distancing, it is about billing. We want to bill for at least half a semester of face-to-face education. There will be resistance to granting exceptions for all graduate programs, because if we have to move part of the semester online we can’t bring them back and bill them for the other 8-weeks. For graduate programs that are already online it makes sense to keep them that way, but for courses like his where students read 100 pages a week and write 5-page papers each week, as much as he is not in favor of compressing that to an 8-week block schedule, he doubts his program will get an exception.

Crystal Chambers said they haven’t accepted a blanket exemption for all DE programs, so they will make them go through the paperwork. They say it has to be on a course-by-course basis so if you have students who are coming from other programs and taking your courses, they are taken into account as well. Units will know what the programs are, what courses are taken by students outside the department, and what regular exceptions are made when a unit’s coursework isn’t quite as up to date as it should be in the catalog.

Leigh Cellucci said part of what this group is trying to do is give the best education to our students and to charge them fairly. If we have to go to DE in the 2nd 8-week blocks, we may lose students because some programs really need the 15-week timeframe to be successful. She feels comfortable recommending that DE programs receive the exemption. Cohorted programs are similar. In such programs, students are all taking the same courses and there aren’t a lot of students from different majors taking the courses. She would support continuing that recommendation to exempt specialized cohorted programs in the College of Allied Health Sciences, because they are in Health Sciences Division. We have to make certain our faculty have workloads that are reasonable and that we are also doing what is best for the students.

Jeff Popke asked if CIT wants to make those two recommendations: that DE graduate programs be given a blanket exemption, as well as cohorted programs that are not taking courses outside of that program and won’t end up with conflicts between 15-week and 8-week courses?

Mary Farwell asked if Leigh Cellucci was distinguishing between cohorted graduate programs and cohorted undergraduate programs in her recommendation.

Leigh Cellucci said she would actually support exemptions for both. Donna Roberson could speak to Nursing with their cohorted Nursing program, and Allied Health Sciences has some cohort undergraduate programs as well. She would support any program that is cohorted progression receiving an exemption. Their cohorted programs get the students when they are juniors, not their first or second year.
Elizabeth Swaggerty said that with regard to undergraduate cohorts, she thinks it gets fuzzy when that word is used. The College of Education has cohorts that are within multiple programs and even colleges. Maybe add the phrase “self-contained” cohort programs, or something like that. When they start talking about exemptions in her college it requires so many conversations.

Jeff Popke asked if Elizabeth Swaggerty was suggesting that exceptions be kept to a minimum.

Elizabeth Swaggerty said if that statement is made more broadly about undergrads, it has to be clarified.

Marianne Montgomery reminded the group of Crystal’s point that administration does not want a lot of blanket exemptions, so they don’t want to spend their time on things that won’t be approved.

Crystal Chambers said administration is calling all of these “exceptions.” What do we call it when we have a faculty member with a compromised immune system, do we call that an exception? She thinks we need a distinction between courses that are programmatically taken out of the 8-week schedules (exemptions) and others that more based on individual circumstances at the unit or faculty member level.

Marianne Montgomery noted that those individual circumstances don’t have much to do with the 8-week situation, but other factors.

Jeff Popke said what CIT seemed to be leaning toward was recommending that, because we are automating the first run, we want to keep the 3-hour seminar courses the same to avoid conflicts, but at the individual program level if there is the flexibility they can split them up if that fits for everyone. The rest of the conversation has been about the exemptions and/or exceptions. He said maybe CIT has decided largely to leave those in the hands of what has already been set up. He noted that Angela Anderson, Registrar, is sitting in and is probably taking notes about what types of programs this group thinks can remain on the 15-week schedule.

Chris Buddo said the question from yesterday’s ACC meeting has to do with what “undergraduate” means in the first paragraph of Marianne Montgomery’s proposal, and whether to deal with those 3-hour graduate seminar courses as a course type.

Marianne Montgomery said she thinks they can strike the word undergraduate from that sentence. She approached the writing of that document as a tool just for CIT, in which the group could figure out at to do with the vast bulk of classes and bracket off the more unusual ones. The word “undergraduate” is unimportant.

Leigh Cellucci asked if CIT is moving Marianne Montgomery’s document forward with recommendations or is this a tool for this committee that doesn’t leave the committee? Are they sending this on up or are they just using it here, for discussion in these meetings?

Jeff Popke said Mary Farwell, Chris Buddo, and he have to figure out how to formulate the recommendations. He shared this document with the entire ACC and that group discussed it.

Leigh Cellucci said she thinks we need to include the College of Allied Health Sciences in the list of colleges and schools in the first paragraph, even though it is within the Health Sciences division.

Jeff Popke pointed out that they were moving toward a model where Academic Affairs is being required to move to 8-week courses and Health Sciences is not.

Rachel Roper agreed and said many of the programs within the Health Sciences have fewer undergrads.

Crystal Chambers asked if we do have to switch to an online model or put courses in those areas online, are we going to bill them as if it were a block and give them bills for half a semester? How are we going to work out that part? It comes back to the money, and having to refund students for unused services.
Rachel Roper said all of their students are paid off grants. They have a long list of problems that would have been created if they tried to go to the 8-week block schedule. Both tuition and stipends are paid off grants.

Alethia Cook had a question for Angela Anderson. She remembered her mentioning a practice in the past where you could bill the first half of the semester and where a student could pay for a course over two semesters. Sign up for 0 credits in 1st summer and 3 in 2nd so billing could be adjusted accordingly.

Angela Anderson said that was mostly for internship courses and the university moved away from that when the 11-week summer schedule became a formal part of calendar.

Alethia Cook asked if that previous practice is a way that the graduate courses could be handled to allow for a 15-week schedule?

Angela Anderson said the call with the software vendor’s consultants is going on right now, and she could certainly ask. She does know there was a statement made this spring from system that we do not refund tuition and mandatory fees based on going online. We will know whether the system is going to make a mandatory statement about that for fall after the 1st or 2nd week in June.

Crystal Chambers was on a phone call recently with SACS representatives and they are not in favor of billing students for face-to-face when they are actually DE. They do make stark distinctions between DE teaching and face-to-face. That is why we do have additional requirements for training for people to be allowed to teach DE courses here.

Jeff Popke agreed that was an important question—the ability to bill in 2 blocks would facilitate more exceptions for graduate courses to run over a 15-week period. Angela Anderson can keep the group posted on the answer.

Angela Anderson said she can certainly explore it. The part of term for the registration piece is relatively easy, but it is the billing piece that is difficult. That group is having discussions about that right now.

Jeff Popke said another question that came up was about maximum loads for faculty and students. One question was for faculty members not being assigned more than 8 hours in a block. He asked Marianne Montgomery why she had settled on the number 8?

Marianne Montgomery said it was for four-hour courses in the sciences. Most faculty will have 6 hours and they wouldn’t usually have 9, but the 8 was to accommodate faculty teaching the odd 4-hour course.

Jeff Popke said that is how he answered but wanted to clarify. For students CIT settled on no more than 10 hours. So if a student is taking a 15-week course, then does that count as 1.5 hours? What about students with two 15-week courses and one 8-week class? One recommended restriction about going to 8-weeks is that students wouldn’t be taking as many different courses.

Marianne Montgomery said the question is whether it makes sense for a student to take a load that is something like one internship and two other courses, and she thinks it would make sense. Where they are headed with exceptions, she does not think a lot of mixing in course types would happen much. The Dean of Harriot College of Arts and Sciences has made it clear she wants few exception requests, and they need to be clear and well-thought-out.

Chris Buddo noted that one of the questions centered on whether the workload/student course load pieces of the document are hard and fast rules or recommendations.

Marianne Montgomery said it wasn’t clear to her whether faculty workload questions are hard and fast rules. She was basing this on what faculty are allowed to do over summer. Someone couldn’t teach four summer courses in a summer session. If they allowed to be flexible on that she would phrase them as recommendations, but not hard and fast rules. It would depend on when they are encapsulating FTE if units are allowed to be flexible.
Chris Buddo said it might be good to figure a 15-week course in this load. Is it 1.5 or is it 3? Is it 3 across both blocks, or 1.5 in each block? That might be helpful to know so we can make a recommendation in this way.

Mary Farwell said in terms of contact hours it is 1.5 in each block, so it is really half.

Marianne Montgomery said that for students, the 15-weeks course counts as 3 for both blocks, but for faculty it might count for half in each block.

Jean-Luc Scemama said we don’t want students to overload themselves.

Jeff Popke said he thinks you still have to double the 8-week credits. You can call it in 1 block 3 hours, but then he thinks the 8-week courses have to be considered 6 hours. Because there is more intensity and contact hours?

Marianne Montgomery said we can just say it is half the hours for everyone but encourage advisors and faculty to work on appropriate workloads for faculty and students.

Crystal Chambers noted that within that same section of the document, course enrollments will be capped well below seating capacity. We need to put parameters in there. No more than 50%?

Jeff Popke said that in his view that part will be decided by the work of other committees.

Jason Yao said he is on the facility workgroup, and they are talking about the calculated area for maintaining a 6-foot distance within the rooms, so 30 square feet per student. People are looking at room capacities and this question is being considered by others. It isn’t really for CIT’s discussion here.

Marianne Montgomery said she wants to trust that group is following all the health guidance and CIT shouldn’t try to duplicate their work.

Jeff Popke brought the question back to the schedule being built. What happens to DE classes, because they don’t have times? Would that be up to individual depts to figure out which block a DE course goes into?

Marianne Montgomery said units need that flexibility to balance workloads. If those courses are automatically migrated to a block then faculty might end up with too many courses in one block. It makes sense for the blocks to be available in Banner so the units can move the courses as needed.

Jeff Popke asked if there are there programs that are heavily DE where that would cause a significant problem? Should CIT recommend that DE courses don’t get put into the first run and units can move them as needed?

Jason Yao said it is going to be a DE course anyway, why would we want to change them and shorten the blocks when you can still charge them the same way if they run that way the full semester?

Alethia Cook said if a student is enrolled in even one face-to-face course, then they will be billed at an on-campus rate.

Jean-Luc Scemama asked if there will be a first phase where all the classes will be moved, followed by a phase when units can adjust, and then students can be registered?

Jeff Popke said that is how he understands it.

Jean-Luc Scemama said that would be ideal because his unit has courses that offer two large sections and 29 labs with that. They cannot fit all 29 labs in one 8-week block. They will have to be doing a lot to move their labs around.
Jeff Popke asked if the recommendation would be, like DE courses, lab courses would not be incorporated in the automated migration?

Jean-Luc Scemama said that might make problems for Angela Anderson.

Stacey Altman said if they left it as part of the automated migration, it fits into the message of trying to make it work.

Marianne Montgomery said the issue would be how to automate it. We don’t have a logic to do that in this initial proposal.

Angela Anderson said if we are going by the time the class starts, if it is a class that meets one day a week, then we would do that a little differently. But she does have concerns about moving a lab to block one but the course for it to block 2.

Jean-Luc Scemama said the first phase can be letting it run with the labs and then the 2nd phase could be getting input from the unit.

Angela Anderson said as long as she has the information she can have IT build the logic for the move and up until we do that move, units can work with us.

Jeff Popke said there may need to be a side conversation for departments with lots of labs to decide how to handle the first schedule build and then the second phase of migration.

Jeff Popke called attention to another question: the model has different degrees of hybridization possible. At the last meeting, CIT decided the initial build would be based on the highest percentage of DE because it is the closest to the current course length. Is that right?

Chris Buddo said if the default were off the 12% model, then you have blocked off the greatest amount of time, and the student would have that as a default and if the faculty member wanted to have a higher amount of DE, then the student could deal with it. Then the faculty member could do a different amount of hybridization week-to-week if the initial amount of time online was the minimum amount.

Marianne Montgomery pointed out that approach has another advantage: it gives departments a little more time to be more deliberate about the degree of hybridization. It is easier to scale back the in-person time for classes later in the summer, but defaulting to the largest in-person time slots will give them more time to discuss their plans. Students won’t be able to say well I made plans because I wanted to be out of class by 8:55.

Jason Yao agreed that it was much easier to make smaller changes to what you already do and everyone would not be so panicked. They would panic if they were required to change almost half of their courses to online content. The lowest percent (12%) is a reasonable amount to have some online discussion groups or whatever. Much easier for all faculty to implement.

Jeff Popke said this all makes sense to me. He would recommend that they go ahead and change that in the current model and say that the initial schedule build will be based on maximum face-to-face time and there can be adjustments as needed.

Timm Hackett said he ran it by his focus group of two college students who are quarantined in his house. They agreed that if they signed up for a class that is 8:00-8:55, and it gets increased to a much higher amount of time and they did not expect the class to be that long, then that is a problem. They just want to have an accurate idea of when the class will end. If, as the class goes on there are weeks where we can do more online and we let them out of the face-to-face class time early, the instructor looks better in their eyes.
Marianne Montgomery said she thinks departments and faculty can still adjust the scheduled end time. She does not think scheduling a longer time means they would always stay scheduled at a longer time, but she would still envision a lot of classes are going to be changed to the 46% hybrid model.

Jason Yao said since they are talking about the two options being either 12% or 46%, if they use the 12% by default, do faculty have the flexibility to do any combination (30%, etc.)?

Crystal Chambers said as long as they stay below 49%, it seems like they could.

Marianne Montgomery said there would be certain set class times, in terms of scheduling it wouldn’t be as flexible.

Angela Anderson said they would make the class times and faculty just have to make sure they don’t go above the 50%. Students want to know what the course schedule is and they will not be upset if sometimes they get out early. Her concern in building a schedule is to make sure students can get from building to building in 10 minutes time.

Jeni Parker said in the School of Theatre and Dance, they have very few courses that are solely lecture. They have lots of studio, lots of recital. Many of their courses will be in the 15-week schedule. If faculty teaching within the 8-week blocks want to do the 46% because the room schedule is so tight, is it possible for some faculty who want to keep their courses exactly the same time to do that so that courses are kept at the same time except for time between meetings?

Angela Anderson said the only time we are changing course times is now, otherwise schedules are up to the units. As long as the chair or dean is in favor, that is fine. She is not going behind you to see if you make changes.

Jason Yao said his faculty want to make sure there is enough time between the 8-week blocks to finish up (submit grades, prepare the next block, etc.). He also asked if they were still thinking about not scheduling classes on Fridays to allow for deep cleaning?

Leigh Cellucci said there is no system where janitors are cleaning in between classes. The cleaning group she is on was told that would be impossible to implement that across campus. Janitorial staff will do the types of cleaning they were doing when we were made aware of the virus (wiping down light switches, door knobs). The cleaning group has asked to not have the cost of these cleaning supplies be passed on to units, and to have cleaning supplies distributed by janitors to the classrooms so that faculty and students can make use of them to clean their areas.

Jason Yao: And the idea about using Fridays to do deep cleaning?

Jeff Popke said there are classes all day Friday.

Crystal Chambers said that for Academic Affairs, housekeeping staff are not allowed to touch keyboards, so those areas are not cleaned. Will that policy be changed, and will there be cleanings of the podiums, etc.

Leigh Cellucci said their cleaning group had the head of the janitorial staff there to ask questions, and he made it clear that we would have to be accountable and responsible for cleaning our own areas. We have made it clear what kind of wipes and supplies we will need in order to do that. They will not have increased staff to help. They asked for the wipes with disinfectants that works in 30 seconds, not 30 minutes. They have lots of backup to show why they made the recommendations they made, but worked within the constraints as described to them.

Marianne Montgomery said a question that she was not sure CIT had addressed was who determines the particular degree of hybridization for a course. The unit administrator is ultimately responsible for scheduling at a programmatic level. She can envision not being able to leave all English’s composition courses up to the individual faculty member but having to figure out what we will recommend. Then she could have conversations with individual faculty who might want to deviate. It has to be a consultation, but she is not comfortable with saying that every faculty member just gets to decide. She thinks that would be detrimental to programmatic learning outcomes.
Jeff Popke said they can tweak that language a little bit for next week. In regard to Jason Yao’s initial comment, CIT has not focused on the calendar proper (1st class day, last class day, break, etc.). There was a draft put out by Rick McCarty, chair of the regular Calendar Committee, that is in the group files. Mark McCarthy is representing the Calendar Committee and they can work together. Eventually he does think the specific dates should go to the Calendar Committee and then should go to a special called meeting of the Faculty Senate for approval. He hasn’t run that by the Interim Chancellor yet but given that we don’t have the opportunity to have everyone from campus weigh in, he thinks it has to be approved by the proper Senate process. We have to figure out when is the first class day, etc.

Jeff Popke then noted that there seemed to be consensus in CIT about the timeline, and about the desire to give our units as much time as possible to do the adjusting. The Provost noted yesterday that he had given everyone until May 29th to request exceptions or exemption which only gives May 29th-June 5th or so to get everything settled. He told him there has to be time for programs to receive these schedules and the approved exceptions. He is happy to give him a recommendation for how those can be parsed. He is going to move the request deadline up.

Jason Yao said departments and other schools need time, so what can we share with them so they have time to start thinking? Do we have a general idea of things we can share right now so they can begin working on their schedules?

Jeff Popke said he thinks it is ok to share this basic model as long as it is described as the recommendation that is likely to be the working model with some tweaks. He doesn’t know if Chris Buddo would agree, but the ACC is pretty much accepting this as the basic model.

Marianne Montgomery says she thinks the automated migration could happen around May 22nd May 23rd, which would give departments two weeks to make adjustments. That is doable. Once we feel more confident that this is the model or logic, then we could start adjusting faculty workloads and advance. She is hesitant to begin doing that yet.

Jason Yao said realistically they cannot just start a new model, can they really create another model so quickly?

The Block Scheduling memo from Provost Hayes was released while this meeting was still in session.

Jeff Popke noted that Provost Hayes had just sent out a memo, and it looks like there was a new timeline—May 22nd is the deadline for exceptions. May 26-29 will be for department adjustments. June 1-5 is for student schedule updates.

Marianne Montgomery said that seems backwards—what are student schedule updates?

Timm Hackett asked if returning students will get a chance to adjust their schedule before the first-year students start scheduling their classes on the 8th? He has some seniors who put off classes they should have taken their 1st and 2nd year, so are we going to have a bunch of 1st year students flood the courses they should be taking?

Marianne Montgomery said she thinks the Banner updates need to happen before the department adjustments, not the other way around. Departments can do some adjusting ahead of the migration, but there will have to be more adjusting after the migration. She told Jeff Popke that if he is able, he should convey that those two bullets should really just be reversed.

Alethia Cook said it sounded like Angela Anderson would prefer to have departments weigh in before they do the migration.

Marianne Montgomery said she could do her best to set it up so it works correctly, but for departments with 100s of sections, it would be easier to do it after the migration.

Alethia Cook says she thinks Angela Anderson is going to look for the exceptions ahead of time, and the impression she got was that we may be looking at 3 phases: 1. where she consults with departments., 2. where there is the automated schedule run, and 3. adjustments after the run.
Chris Buddo notes that from the memo it looks like students would be able to adjust schedules June 1st-5th?

Jason Yao asked if the dates are in sync now? So May 21st have to have all exemptions approved. May 21-26 is the automatic migration, May 26-29 is for department adjustments, then June 1-5, student schedules are updated?

Chris Buddo said we need to confirm that, and he thinks what Jason Yao said is what that memo is outlining.

Jeff Popke said at least that is what CIT would recommend.

Jason Yao said this gives departments a good idea about how to prepare.

Elizabeth Swaggerty asked about what happens with courses that don’t follow the calendar? They are a service area and they have a lot of made-up times already on the schedule. How will that come out the other side of the automated migration? Is that an Angela Anderson question?

Marianne Montgomery said her guess is that would not be able to be automated at all.

Elizabeth Swaggerty asked at what point should her unit address that in the timeline?

Jeff Popke suggested she reach out to Angela Anderson on that and see what she suggests. When does the group want to meet again? The ACC faculty subgroup has some recommendations due Monday, and the entire ACC will meet again on Thursday. So maybe either Thursday or Friday?

Jason Yao said the memo is asking departments to submit these exception requests before they really know what is going on, with regard to the hybrid schedule.

Crystal Chambers said her chair did ask for them to go ahead and submit the exceptions.

Alethia Cook said she thinks it is a good idea to see what that form will look like so they will know what sort of info will be requested.

The group verified that the forms were linked in the memo from the Provost and looked at them.

Leigh Cellucci said she never received confirmation about whether it would be Mark Stacy approving her college’s exceptions or Mark Stacy.

Jeff Popke noted that her college’s form was posted, so wherever it goes must be the approval process that was agreed upon by Provost Hayes and Vice Chancellor Stacy. He said Rachel Baker would send a meeting invitation later for Thursday or Friday of next week.