

Fairmont State University Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

November 12, 2019

3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

303 ED

Members Present: Donna Long (Acting President, L&L), Jason Noland (Secretary, SoE), Rachel Cook (Proxy for Mark Flood Natural Sciences), Stephen Rice (Natural Sciences), Jim Davis (Ex. Committee, Business), Janet Floyd (Business), Dan Eichenbaum (Performing Arts), Steven Roof (Academic Affairs), Molly Barra (Library), Nina Slota (CoLA/Psych/Beh. Sciences), Tom Cuchta (CS/Math), Tim Oxley (Academic Affairs), Tyler Keller (SGA), Annalisa Hall (SGA), Musat Crihalmeanu (Sci-Tech), Julie Reneau (Proxy for Paul Reneau, HHP), Todd Clark (Ex. Committee, Social Sciences), Diana Noone (Social Sciences), G.H. Budd Sapp (BoG), Harry Baxter (Ex. Committee, HCF), Denice Kirchoff (Nursing), Jennifer Satterfield (Nursing)

Visitors Present: Gina Fantasia (Business), Leisa Muto (Business), Deb Hemler (Natural Sciences), Sharon Smith (SoE), Dillon Bradley (SGA), Zac Fancher, Jacqui Sikora, Richard Harvey, Jon Dodds (IT/BoG), Macgorine Cassell (Business), Phil Mallow, Kandi Nuzum, Brenda Nickolich, Greg Noone (Soc. Sci.), Chuck Shields (Soc. Sci), Chris Kast (CoLA), Carol Tannous (SoEHHP), Michael Ransom (Beh. Sci)

I. Minutes

Reading and Approval of Minutes of October 8, 2019 meeting

- Motion to approve minutes by Todd Clark, Seconded by Jim Davis. Passed.

II. Announcements/Information/Discussion

President Martin

- Not in attendance

Provost Harvey

- The President offers her apologies. She is away attending a board meeting.
- Deadline has passed for sabbatical one-pagers to be submitted. We received 5, which is not as many as we thought we would have. There was also 1 other outstanding that was pre-approved but was not allowed to go forward, so there a total of 6 on my desk. No decision has been made on these at this point.
- Initial meeting of bookstore/textbook committee has taken place. We started trying to establish baseline of what the policy actually is. Looked at info the bookstore provided, as well as BoG policy 54 to see how the bookstore statement aligns with the BoG policies, which it does primarily. Identified a few areas in the BoG policies that may need adjusted, and that we are not abiding by at all. Trying to establish a baseline, then potentially go back to the BoG for amendments on their current policy. We are still waiting on student reps for that committee.

- Opening week in Jan. Tuesday morning will be the traditional opening session. Followed by Faculty Welfare doing a training for faculty on the Academic Integrity policy that was passed a year ago. Wednesday Jan 8, the whole day will be assessment and development similar to what happens in August. Thursday afternoon is orientation that may not impact everyone. Other times around that are available to academic units.
- Question: Sabbatical proposals where do they go next? I'm not sure I know yet. What has been received are not formal applications, if sabbaticals go forward then formal applications will be requested for review.
- Question: Jan 9 orientation is that for new students? Yes, it is for new students starting in January. It is a smaller orientation, but, still important.

BOG representative, Prof. Sapp

- BOG meets Thursday, Dec 5. We received an e-mail notification resignation, Mark Hart who lives in Colorado. Not sure if that has been officially accepted or a timeline for a replacement.
- BOG has been invited to a training that Serena has sent out that will take place in Greenbrier County. It is open to members whose schedule allow them to attend, BOG members have to have a certain number of hours of training.
- I will forward the agenda as I receive it. As always, I am happy to take/answer questions when it comes out.

ACF representative, Prof. Baxter

- Legislative forum December 4 (last week of classes) from 3-5 in 305 ET. We have invited all delegates and senators in Marion County, Harrison, Mon, as well as Summers from Taylor county, Pethel from Wetzel, Senators Prezioso, Beech, and Clements. Have had a few respond they will come, but have had responses before that they would come but did not end up coming. Will send a list of attendees closer to the event. Encourages faculty to try to get students to attend, even if you have to give extra credit in classes. We had more students last year than before. I will start sending information soon.
- Great Teachers Seminar: There has been some interest among some faculty. It has been at least 4-5 years since anyone from FSU has attended (maybe longer). Two people can attend per institution. If other institutions send less, there can also be alternates. Send Harry an e-mail if you are interested in attending. hbaxter@fairmontstate.edu
- Legislative ACF Agenda. Faculty Senates at 14 of the 21 schools have approved.
- PEIA finance board public hearings: this is going to be November 13 at the Erickson Alumni Center in Morgantown. You should arrive between 5-6, if you want to speak you have to be there by 6. Hearing is scheduled from 6-8.
- Question: Great Teachers Seminar, is that the teaching professor conference in Atlanta? No, it's at North Bend State Park. Request to speak to what they do: There is a lot of workshops about teaching, and group work with others in the state. Especially if you are

new it's a good idea. Everyone that comes brings a strategy that they use in class and shares them. It's a really good PD opportunity.

- What are the dates? June 15-18, 2020

Student Government

- Just finished Maroon Madness, it ended well. We are getting ready for the Christmas Tree setup.
- Almost have senior campaign funding nailed down. We are working with Student Activities and the Foundation on this effort.
- Feb 26 is Fairmont State Day in Charleston. We have 35 slots in the Capitol to fill. Information forthcoming.
- Student Government has received a lot of complaints about the availability of Health Services. They are checking into that and talking to VP McNeely. Looking to see if we aren't having full-time practitioners on campus, what are some other alternatives?
- Question: The Nest you had mentioned a few meetings ago that it was being used a lot: I was expecting a call for donations. **Response**: We are in talks with Robin Yeager, we are looking to see usage over the holidays. We worked with the Fairmont Credit Union and received \$2000 from them which will go to providing funds and canned goods to the Nest. Currently working with Dr. Yeager and Evan Fossen about disbursement of those funds.
- Question to Provost Harvey: A few meetings ago you gave us an update on Health Services, do you have anything to add? Response: I am not the person to ask. Jacqui Sikora also defers to Tim McNeely.
- VP Long noted that this is a concern that students are having.

Parking decal letter

- Several faculty members who do not drive to campus received letters saying "you better pay for your parking or else" which seemed heavy handed. Wanted to bring this up as a concern that perhaps there is a way to ask people why they haven't paid for parking before they are threatened of being turned over to HR as there are faculty that live so close to campus that they do not drive.
- Comment: Budd received one as well, also didn't know that Maintenance parking was moved to the other side.
- Question: Are you aware of the circumstances these letters are received? Did people receive letters that never got a ticket? Response: The understanding is that people that never got a ticket have received a letter.
- Comment: I called security and talked to the GA who said I would be removed from the list, but the student never took my name. Sent an e-mail later to ensure I would be removed, but never received a reply.
- Comment: Spouses have also received letters even though they carpool.
- Comment: In my 35 years, I have never parked on campus, I haven't paid for parking. I never received a letter.
- Comment: I don't know that there is action to be taken on this, it may be a point of action for the Provost who is present.

- Comment: I believe it was a few years ago that all students are charged for parking even though they don't park on campus. I have a feeling that it is across the board, so keep that in mind if we are looking into this.

III. Unfinished Business

Ad hoc committee on bylaws and constitution, Prof. Davis

- The committee met and compiled a list of questions that need to be answered for the changes to be made. Those have been forwarded to the handbook committee, who can hopefully direct us. Hoping to wrap it up by March/April for voting by faculty.

Presidential survey

- Chuck Shields: The committee has finished its work, forwarded the report to the Executive Committee, which is all we can say at this time.
- The Executive Committee discussed the procedure and are following precedent on the handling of the results which has been to provide. Based on vote by senate the full report with comments will be sent to the President and the BoG, and provide only the report to faculty without comments.
- Question: The first time we did this when Dan Bradley was president, I know that the survey results came to all faculty, comments did not. Did the BoG get the comments? I think they didn't. Response: I don't know, I can't remember. I don't have any historical artifact that I could find to answer that question.
- Comment: I know over the years the process has evolved. If you recall the first time we did that survey, we spent an entire afternoon compiling the results by hand. So, I can't answer that question as to what point in time the results were sent to the BoG. I do know that when Krepel was president that those results got sent to the BoG. That would be my first recollection (around 2010).
- Question: So the comments did go? Response: I believe everything went to the BoG, but I don't have historical artifacts to support that.
- Comment: I feel that the comments should not go to the BoG, because the comments were directed toward the president and they were personal. I think that it would be a bad idea to send it to the BoG. I would like to make a **motion** along those lines, that the BoG would get only the survey results, but that the President would get the results and the comments.
- Comment from BoG Representative: I think the BoG is under the expectation to receive the results and the comments. I also disagree because we get all kinds of positive comments about the President, so if there are other constructive criticisms for improvement, they should be sent so a collaborative effort can be made so she can be recognized for her strengths, and suggestions for improvement can be given.
- Question (Point of Information): Who has this been provided to already? Response: Faculty Senate Executive Committee only.
- Question: I'm wondering why the faculty have not received the results? Are you sending a summary or the results? Response: When we are talking about results, we are talking about the compilation of the results in the form of results that show various points of data, means, median on a likert scale. What we did was we took the raw data, put it together in a report and sent it to the Executive Committee. So that is the report we are talking about. The Presidential Perception Survey Committee sends the report to only the

Executive Committee, then the full Senate makes decisions on what to do with it. This is the point where we are now.

- Comment: wondering why something of this magnitude has not been shown to the entire faculty before going to the BoG.
- What has happened in the past is that the PPSC has sent the report and comments to Executive Committee, who then brings to senate the question of how to disseminate and what to disseminate to whom so that is where we are. What has happened in the past is that comments only go to BoG and the President but not entire faculty. Only data collected in report has been disseminated to the entire faculty so that is what we are recommending happen again.
- Comment: But we don't know about the precedent.
- Question: Budd have you reviewed comments in the past? Response: Well, as has been explained in detail, Dr. Rose was here, then Steve Jones, so we didn't do it because Dr. Rose was retiring, then we only had a president for 6 months.
- Clarifying question: So in your tenure in BoG we have not had a Presidential Survey? Response: correct.
- Question: What was participation like? Is that going to be reflected in the report? Response: It is the 3rd iteration, it was 49.8% participation.
- Question: That number is reflected in the report? What was that number compared to the other iterations? Response: Those were not pursued.
- Question: So we don't have numbers on that? Response: That is my understanding. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has that data.
- Comment: My recollection, I have served a few years, We didn't do Dr. Rose in her last year, but did do prior. It is my recollection that what was given to faculty was what is being suggested, likert scale with median, mean, mode. BoG and President received data and comments.
- Comment: I think it would be a good idea to make sure of that.
- Point of Order. We have a formal report from a subcommittee. Does there need to be a vote to accept said report. Response: If someone made a motion to do so.
- Comment: Someone should make a motion to accept the report then what to do with it.
- Question: We do this every year with the subcommittee reports, do we need to do that with this report?
- Comment: If we haven't seen this report, how can we vote on it?
- Comment: The reason the report has not been sent to the full senate or faculty is because everything distributed prior to and during this meeting is public information. If it had been distributed it would have to be posted to the webpage in public view at that time.
- Comment: We do have a motion on the floor. Seconded. Question: Clarification of motion. The motion is that the survey and comments will go to the president only, and the survey will go to the BoG.
- Question: I guess I am baffled because we are a state institution, if the BoG says they want to see it, why would we hold information from them especially since it has precedent?
- Question: Why take comments if they are not used?
- Motion is made to hold a ballot vote given the sensitive nature of this topic. Seconded.
- Question: There were two types of data quantitative, comments are qualitative which are very important to the process. Who sees them, what is in the bylaws? What does it say

in the Presidential Perception Survey? Response: I think it just says that they will move through the survey and it will be sent to the Executive Committee.

- Comment: If we give our students evaluations, I can't fathom that my chair or deans cannot see the comments. I don't think any dean or chair would find that acceptable.
- Question: Mr. Sapp said that positive comments have been received by BoG, have you all seen the comments before taking the PPS. We did see these comments from the community? Response: I have seen things sent directly to us, but not everything sent to BoG
- Comment VP Long: As I understand the motion, it is whether or not the BOG will be able to see those comments not whether faculty will see them. Which is contrary to the previous comment.
- Comment: I think we are having two or three different conversations, question of what BoG is receiving, also what the faculty get to see, I'd like to bring in the IRB paperwork question as far as anonymity and confidentiality and what we told our participants about where it was going. That could be an issue. Was it a private survey?
- Comment: I believe participants expectation would be on past precedent which was the committee's understanding that the Pres & BoG would get likert scale and comments, and the likert scale would be released to faculty as a whole. I believe that is what participants expected because that is the precedent.
- Comment: In the bylaws, to me it sounds like an inter-senate process. There is nothing stated about communication to BoG and Senate. From what it sounds like, this is the first survey in 4 years. If you look through the bylaws all it says that it will be used by the faculty to report survey findings to the Faculty Senate. If someone wasn't sure, if they read the bylaws the it seems to stay in senate.
- Comment: HEPC says we [BoG] receive data and comments from staff, community, and students for moving forward.
- Comment: One thing the Executive Committee considered was that in real world Boards of Directors is a direct supervisor of the CEO. Comments would not be distributed to faculty/staff, but, it would be given to direct supervisors.
- Comment: I don't remember if this happened in the last senate or two meetings ago. Shields gave a report, I said the last survey for the president was 2013, Shields found something from 2014. Most likely the last survey was 5 years ago. Now, the other thing that concerns me I know Dan Bradley as here when we did the first one. I know the comments did not go to BoG. We need to look at what has been done since the first one and if it went to BoG, it may not be precedent. It may well be that the BoG has not received the comments. We need to find out before we go ahead and do something.
- Comment: Unless it something prohibited by bylaws, precedent does not matter. It is up to the senate to make decisions.
- Comment: But, based on previous comments, if we go by IRB, that is a federal guideline. My perception is that filling out the instrument that it would only go to the President and Faculty Senate. My participation was not intended for BoG.
- Comment: The BoG did not receive that information [comments] for a reason, because it is personal. Response: You don't know that. Please don't speak out of turn.
- Comment: We need to look, research.
- Comment: I think precedent is important.
- Comment: I don't think you can do what you choose without violating Federal guidelines.

- Comment: I think precedent is important as well, because our understanding is the BoG has received comments in the past. Calling into question: You're right I don't know, I didn't hand them the comments.
- Comment: I know the first one wasn't. After that, I don't know.
- Question: As I indicated, if you decide to send that in, would you be going against IRB.
- Comment: IRB has no oversight into institutional research like this.
- Comment: Correct, it is a federal guideline that does not impact this, but it does call the question the perception of the takers as a matter of courtesy.
- Motion to ballot. Seconded. Passed.
- Motion to postpone the survey until the next meeting. So we can take time to investigate and have a more informed discussion. Seconded. Division. Raised hands vote. Motion Failed.
- Ballots distributed for voting. Motion restated: Motion is to send only the survey to Bog without comments, and survey with comments to the President. 18 No, 2 Yes. Motion failed
- Motion to distribute the full report with comments to the President, full report with Comments to the BoG, and distribute the results as Gina described them to the faculty. Seconded.
- Question: is the release of this report classified as a major or minor piece of legislation? Minor.
- Question: What is so pressing to hold this? Response: I think it is important to hold precedent and follow constitution/bylaws. It is a pretty important survey.
- Comment: It is so we should disseminate it.
- Call the Question
- Division, show of hands. Motion carries. Survey results will be distributed with comments to the BoG and the President, only results without comments to the faculty.

Campus Climate Committee Charge

- Suggesting that Matt had more specific ideas about moving forward, I am not sure if we are prepared to create this charge. Motion to table this until the next meeting. Seconded. Passed.

IV. New Business

Curriculum Proposal 19-20-02 (second reading)

- Motion to approve. Seconded.
- Question: So, it came to our attention in Curriculum Committee that there was some concern about who would be teaching this course if it turned out to be more students than you can handle (Amanda), or if you decide to leave FSU. Can you give a sense of how this will move forward if it gets too large? Response: As of right now, enrollment is maintaining, it would need a good drastic enrollment in SoB for that to happen. If that happens, Hopefully Dr. Oxley can address some of that. Response: We want to move ahead with that proposal regardless of what happens with the SOAR initiative, so it can be part of our assessment piece and also have an outboarding class. We also have other means to teach it on faculty load as there is more to this class than just the SOAR component. You have this question with any proposal, you may currently have resources

that you don't have in the future. It is an important question, but not relevant to just this course.

- **Comment:** Well, I think it is. One of the concerns is this course will be part of General Studies. **Response:** it may not be. It may be just part of our Common Core. We don't have an approved General Studies yet.
- **Comment:** The other concern was that an informal survey of Curriculum Committee members who would volunteer to teach a SOAR for the money proposed, nobody volunteered. Adjuncts are not supposed to teach the courses because they are built around people who know the institution. I wanted to raise that as a potential issue.
- **Clarify:** this is a Business OnBoarding class that will satisfy the SOAR requirement. I don't see it as a SOAR course if it is approved. If SOAR does not continue, the SoB will make the motion to move it to the Common Core in Business.
- **Comment:** We have gotten a lot of positive comments on this course from instructors and students. If Amanda would leave I could see where faculty would rotate, bring in big session and smaller sessions that rotate.
- **Motion to approve Second reading, seconded. Passed**

Curriculum Proposal 19-20-01 (first reading)

- Motion to Approve first reading. Seconded.
- **Comment:** Still don't have final course numbers. **Response:** We e-mailed those to Cheri. They are in progress.
- **Comment:** My only concern with this as was discussed in Curriculum Committee, from feedback that SoB received on students' writing ability, main concern was that they needed practice in writing, adding 1 writing course will not fix that problem. The description of the writing that would happen did not fulfil the previous definition of Writing Intensive Course criteria. Susan Ross said the definition is under the microscope, and urged us to pass it without worrying about that component. Writing every day in every course is what will make them better at writing.
- **Motion Passed.**
- **Motion** to waive the time period. Seconded. Discussion. Motion Withdrawn because there is no rush to get this through quickly.

Additional comments provided by Susan Ross during the December 10 Meeting:

I was not at the meeting but wanted to provide clarification. Under "Susan Ross" it says the definition [of Writing Intensive Courses] is under the microscope...I felt uncomfortable with that and how it was communicated. We did all agree as a committee [Curriculum] to pass the [Accounting Program] proposal. I think the intent of that is that we have a group together [Writing Intensive Committee] we are looking at the criteria to establish a Writing Intensive Course. That criteria has not been confirmed yet, it is just generic. Now that we are in the process, we have a Curriculum Committee proposal coming through that has a WIC requirement. If we look at CC minutes the course was equivalent to a WIC course, ACCT 4410 was being replaced by a new course. The reason why it was accepted was because it was a research course that was already a WIC equivalent. The second part [of the comment] "writing every day in every course..." I don't recall saying anything like that. That was me [Donna]. I don't agree that writing every day will make someone better, it is about feedback, etc. There are a lot of components to it. We will be having another proposal coming through with Community Health soon with this same situation.

Curriculum Proposal 19-20-03 (first reading) withdrawn.

- Motion to bring to table for first reading:
- Comment: Math Course is referred to 1107, that is the old number. It I now 1407 and 1507
- Comment: Appendix D mentions SOAR 1101, which is a different course number than the one at the front.
- Question: We heard already that faculty were uninterested in teaching it at the prescribed pay. There is a larger discussion about faculty pay, load, and where it is housed. Is there anyone else that still has those questions? Response: Yes.
- Motion to table this for the next meeting with these details fixed. Seconded.
- Comment: Can we be clear on an avenue to take. Response: I think the appropriate action is for senate to send back to Curriculum Committee to come up with a policy.
- Comment from Provost Harvey: I'll interject because Academic Affairs took it up between Curriculum Committee and now. I would concur with Molly the specific concerns. I'm not sure we will have the answers before the next meeting.
- Question: Would it be appropriate for senate to send it back to Curriculum Committee? Response: Curriculum doesn't have the answers. I guess you can ask Curriculum Committee to identify the questions.
- Response: Part of our charge [Curriculum Committee] is to produce policy regarding Curriculum.
- Comment from Carol Tannous: I'm not sure it goes back to Curriculum Committee either. The questions have been asked, but not answered. I have talked to Rick, and Academic Affairs about who is in charge? Who is going to teach? What's the pay going to be?
- Motion passed. Sent back to Curriculum Committee.

Curriculum Proposal 19-20-04 (first reading)

- Motion to approve for first reading. Seconded. Passed.

Curriculum Proposal 19-20-05 (first reading)

- Motion to approve for first reading. Seconded. Passed.

Faculty Representative for Committee on Residency Appeals

- Executive Committee received an email from the Registrar. This committee has functioned for some time. Recently, HEPC or HLC mandated that a faculty member serve on the committee. We are asking for a volunteer. Lori says they meet approximately once a month and that it is not a lot of work. They hear appeals on in-state residency for tuition purposes. Would love for someone to volunteer, barring a volunteer if you would take it back to departments for a volunteer. E-mail possible nominees to Matt. Does not need to be a Faculty Senate member.

Promotion and tenure guidelines unique to NSI

Motion to approve first reading. Seconded.

- Everyone received the proposal in email. NSI is a different animal in that there is not currently a PHD in NSI. So, we needed to provide different avenues that are not currently provided in the Faculty Handbook.
- Question: in Fine Arts Visual Arts Masters is a terminal degree. Previously we have left this to the Units, why does the Faculty Senate need to be in this discussion?

- Comment: The Senate did act and recognize the MFA and the MA as terminal degrees. Same with SoB.
- Question: Is there any rush? Response: Not particularly
- Clarification: Did you say MBA was a terminal degree? It is not.
- Motion carries

V. Open Forum

- Library is hosting trivia night November 21 from 6-8. First was last spring and was a huge success. Students' Only recommendation was to get a faculty team involved. There will be pizza, goodie bags, etc. We can also get childcare if you let them know in advance
- I'd like to commend Steve and company on the Lego Competition. It was fantastic, you did a wonderful job and I heard a lot of terrific complements.
- Question: Is there a registration fee for the Library trivia? Response: No. There will be prizes for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place teams, though. It was a blast last time.
- Question: A few faculty in our division asked about Monday/Tuesday after graduation. Is there an expectation to be on Campus? I was told to ask. Response. The expectation is that you will complete your grading and course space assessments before you leave. Other expectations are up to the Units.
- Edwin Drood opens in Wallman Hall this weekend, as well as "Bridging the Gap" playing on November 21.
- WV Business Competition Deadline is Friday at Noon. It is not just business students. There is a STEM and Innovation Category. I know we have students who could win this if they enter. IT is very simple, maybe 30 minutes of time. Semifinals will be on campus January 31.

Next Meeting*: December 10, 2019 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. 303 ED

*If you have items for the agenda please send your request to the Faculty Senate President by Tuesday morning December 3, 2019 for consideration by the Executive Committee.