

Fairmont State University Faculty Senate
February 9, 2021
Minutes

Members Present: Chuck Shields (President), Donna Long (VP-Humanities), Jason Noland (Secretary, Education), Tom Cuchta (Webmaster, Comp. Sci & Math), Todd Clark (Ex. Comm., Social Sciences), Paul Reneau (Ex. Comm., HHP), Jim Davis (Ex. Comm., Business), Janet Floyd (Business), Josh Smallridge (Soc. Scie), Molly Barra (Library), Musat Crihalmeanu (Engineering Tech.), Nathan Myers (Humanities), Nina Slota (Behavioral Sciences), Robert Niichel (Comp Sci. & Math), Steven Roof (Academic Affairs), Tabitha Lafferre (Engineering Tech), Troy Snyder (Performing Arts), Tim Oxley (Academic Affairs), Zachary Taylor (Student Government), Rachel Cook (Natural Sciences), Stephen Rice (Natural Sciences), Jennifer Satterfield (Nursing), Denice Kirchoff (Nursing), Gina Fantasia (BoG),

Guests: Dr. Richard Stephens, Amanda Metcalf, Merri Incitti, Joe Kremer, Jacki Sherman.

Meeting called to order at 3:00

I. Reading & Approval of the minutes from the January 12, 2021 and January 26, 2021 meetings.

Motion to approve Niichel/Cuchta. Passed.

II. President Martin

Unable to attend.

III. Provost Stephens

President Martin sends her regrets. She had a significant family matter to attend to. Everyone is fine, but she remains in Virginia for now.

Few items:

Working on the letters of appointment, reappointment, etc. Need to be done by the end of the month. New pattern was begun last year, they will still come over with the Provost's signature. Working to make sure we are addressing all items that need addressed including changes in status (P&T), but, on target for getting those out by the end of the month per state regulations.

Question: Referring to the ones being resent, or next academic year?

Response: Next year. I do believe we will be asking everyone to sign and return this time to close the loop. If there are any issues/errors we will tend to those as they crop up. I think we've got those well in hand with Deans and HR to make our lists as accurate as possible.

AFR's. I am a bottleneck in AFRs as all of them come to me. Have tried to diplomatically object to that a little bit, partly because there are those of you I don't know yet and don't feel comfortable making comments relevant to AFRs. Trying to widdle that down in the coming weeks. If you or others are anxious about those, they are in a queue. To get to everyone, I am a few lightyears behind with other things that are going on. Otherwise, there is no issue with those at this time.

Have had one presentation to the Provost council, some of you may be part of that, will have

another to the Deans. We are taking a run at trying to get better organized around the potential for digital and/or open-source /OER for classroom purposes. We are working now with Follett, they are still our provider. We are still to work with and through them. They are providing new adoption software to us, it will take a little while to get that fully sorted. Among other things, it will provide information to faculty as to various ways academic content is available. Only in a book, for rent, or used. Whether it can be acquired digitally, as well as if it might be available for free. "Free" is a bit of a shady concept because there is a little bit of handling associated with that, but is minimal. We do know, particularly with synchronous delivery, that more and more is showing up on Blackboard and other platforms. Imagine us out 2-3 years, more of what we had as traditional book is probably being converted over to various digital formats. The ability for a variety of our disciplines to be able to make a quick change in the middle of an academic year to account for a pandemic (business, nursing, social science, etc.). Our ability to be able to be current is enhanced with access to digital formats. There is no edict that everyone must do A, B, or C. We are trying to be thorough and clear as far as options that it makes gravitating that direction easy if that makes sense for various courses.

Taking another look, along with the business office at the potential for students to opt in/out for a one fee book access/academic content access. A student would get access to everything that way. Looking at how we might manage that going forward. Every study shows that students who have access to material do the best. Library has also done gymnastics with desk copies to try to make material available.

Question: You said you had had a presentation, from whom?

Response: Actually two to the Provosts council, one from Cengage as an orientation for the SoB with things they were doing. It was interesting that people from other disciplines saw things available they were unaware of. Follett is our contracted provider of materials, so we have asked them to make this presentation as well. They have made one very similar to the one that Cengage did, but have been asked to do another, particularly on financing, to Deans. We are not trying to reduce or eliminate choice, but to get more material in the hands of students.

Comment: I would request that if the Institution is leaning in a certain direction, that there be ample opportunity for faculty forum. From experience, with Cengage, they met with our department and they said they aren't interested in doing literature – it's not their area. A few years ago, there was the idea that we all would go to Cengage, and that doesn't work.

Response: That is why I am mentioning it now, you are all representative of the faculty. I Wanted to let you know that as word got out, there is not 5th column of book people that will cause us to have to bow down in the same direction. But, what they said 2 years ago seems different from what they are saying now. Follett is also creating a new adoption software which will make it a lot easier for you to know what the real cost is of different formats that Follett has access to. We will keep working on this. You as faculty need to be comfortable with the materials you are using in the classroom, and if we can reduce costs to students, we try to meet in the middle as much as possible.

Chuck sent a draft calendar that takes us pretty much through summer 2022. If we go back to last fall, I mentioned something about developing a calendar that takes us through next fall and winter term because we needed to schedule that. I was advised that bringing calendars to Faculty Senate was a good thing to do, I am doing that now as we have worked on the draft we have. Here's what I will ask from you, that is, this is not a calendar to be voted on up or down. There are more considerations across the I than only those we have represented by you all. But, I am interested if

you have questions, comments, concerns, or advice, and we will take that into consideration. The more detailed you can be, that would be appreciated. We need to publish relatively soon. If you take some time to discuss it and digest it, get those comments back to us by early next week then we can consider those and I will make sure that if there is a point around which a consideration that we can't do, I will be back in touch with Chuck so he can communicate back to Senate. If it makes sense, we will make an adaptation to it. But, it's a pretty thoroughly developed draft.

Question: Do you want people to email directly with questions?

Response: That might be the best thing so we have it detailed out.

Question: Do we have Dean evaluations moving forward?

Response: The short answer is yes. Yes, we will do them. In terms of having accomplished steps? No, not yet, but we will be doing them.

Question: will we be doing them for this academic year?

Response: Yes.

Question: I'm not sure you can comment on this, or if we need to leave for further discussion. One of the issues that arose last senate meeting. There is apparently some potential pay period problems with the calendar as it is structured.

F/U: This might be HR, as the early start date of the semester moves back, eventually it will have to hop forward so we don't start in mid-July. What happens when the hop forward screws up the pay period schedule? Will we get an extra short pay? How is that handled? I was originally going to ask HR, but, we haven't gotten around to making up the questions.

Response: that is a good question, there is probably some detail we can't work out here. I will reach out to HR and payroll so we are clear on the answers.

If I could mention one other things: Because of the fact that we are already a month into the semester things are flying by really quickly. We are looking at how we build next Fall's schedule. How we built next winter's offerings, in fact also currently building summer session. I would like to suggest a couple things. Summer/Winter please be considering courses to be offered and reporting that back to constituents. We ended up having a very successful 1st winter term from the points of view of finances. We spent out a little over \$100k in salary, over 280 students enrolled with minimal marketing, almost no visiting students from other Institutions (maybe 4-5) with a lot of potential for that. We need to start thinking about that, and what makes the most sense for us. We need gateway and introductory courses during summer/winter terms. They populate well and generate interest, and help them move on through their degree programs. Next fall, given what we think we know now, and this is pandemic talk, about vaccinations and when those might be sufficient to create downward pressure on pandemic. We might be in the neighborhood of 70% vaccination by Sept/Oct. Many of those not yet vaccinated would be children, and not necessarily who we would be doing business with. We are planning for next fall, not only trying to look at enrollment overall, but continuing to make use of our synchronous capacity we have developed. But, intention is to have a normal fall semester. Obviously, any of that can change. The British version of the virus could take off and we might not have good experience with vaccines, but, we have to plan now in order to be in shape for next fall. August is now 7 months away. I am giving you a heads up. I think it's not just hope, I think it's our plan to plan for a normal fall. Obviously using our capacity with synchronous delivery in case that's what we have to do.

Question: Winter Term. When we first instituted Winter Term, you mentioned that faculty could choose to teach 3 courses in fall, one Winter Term. Is that something that is in the works?

Response: we have begun our debrief already. Already had a few meetings, with Deans and larger group of folks. Everyone operational/behind the scenes for good feedback. What I have said to the Deans is that, at their discretion, depending on the trend of enrollment associated with a division/department and the needs. If there is a particularly low enrollment class Institutionally, if I have a faculty member who teaches 3 4 credit classes, and one is very small it ends up being our most expensive credit. Think about how we schedule that and think about moving that into winter term where there is some revenue to mitigate the cost. And, if there isn't anything else to be done to allow that to be part of a faculty member's load. I don't think we will be rushing into that for next year, but I have told the Deans it can be considered. Summer term we aren't ready for that, but Winter term.

F/U: If a course is a low enrollment course, but a major requirement, and we are asking students to pay more money than they would to take it in a regular semester. I find that problematic.

Response: Yea, I find that problematic, but I find other things problematic, too and sometimes you have to make hard choices. I am asking us to look at everything, and if there is a way to move things around to promote institutional positives then sometimes you have to make that kind of choice. We do it already in the way that we sometimes cycle courses every 3-4 semesters so students don't always have access to a course. But, by putting it in the Winter term students may choose to take it then, while we may end up offering it in the normal semester as well. I have said to the Deans, you have authority to do this on a case by case basis.

Question in chat: Does that mean that certain classes may only be offered in winter term?

Response: I would say that as Winter Term matures at FSU, you will find that some classes only fit well during winter term. I used to take students literally to Russia during Winter Term, it didn't fit anywhere else, but always had 12-15 students I took. Some of the programs we have, modern foreign languages, etc. travel opportunities really fit at that time. Courses we aren't sure will generate enrollment but we think might be good and over time could generate enrollment could be experimented with during winter term. The balance we need to achieve is enough front end gateway courses (for volume of students), but I would never say to a faculty member that you have to teach gateway courses during every winter term, but maybe every other as a way toward their degree program.

Comment: My concern is, I have 9 students in a Shakespeare class. From what I understand, if you don't have at least 12 it's not really paying for itself. If it's a situation where Shakespeare is low enrollment so we are moving it to winter, we are asking students to pay an extra \$1k in tuition, where we are also talking about trying to save book costs.

Response: All those can be true. We have tiny enrollment classes now, but we haven't had an alternative. I think we will be experimenting with this going forward. I can imagine going forward there may be times we say we can't keep affording to offer a 3rd or 4th of a faculty member's time to 4-6 students unless its rotated every several semesters. What I am asking is to be thoughtful about how we schedule these things. Sometimes you have to make a choice, sometimes winter term may be the best option. There is no one size fits all, and there is room for people to make their cases about it. I see it as mostly opportunity as opposed to road blocks.

Question in Chat: Calendar. It begins with Summer 21, listed as 12-week term with 2, 5-week sessions. What does that mean?

Response: Well, there are 3 terms there. A long 12-week term then 2, 5-week terms. It's not 2,

5-week as part of a 12 week. I can imagine that there will be some course or other in which a faculty member will say that I need all that time, so we have created that. But with the 5-week we have replicated the winter term so we have 3 terms that operate exactly the same.

Question: For example, if you were doing an experimental class in winter, because it is set up as a 5 week, you can continue that experimentation during one of the 5 week terms during the summer?

Response: Sure. I have been asked that since Winter Term was remote, does summer have to be that way? My answer is, if you want to have an in-person course, during the summer you will likely have enrollment issues. So, I think it's right for online digital delivery during summer.

IV. Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

BoG Representative, Gina Fantasia

BoG hasn't met as a whole, but committees have been meeting. Bylaws considered and moved to the board 2 policies, a drug policy update with revisions meant to ensure we are in compliance with federal requirements, and is working on a revision to the gift acceptance policy because it hasn't been revised since 2005. It still refers to a VP for advancement which we haven't had for many years. The next scheduled meeting is Feb 18. Academic Affairs committee has begun program evaluations. The Provost and Deans presented the program review for 6 programs. BA in Education, BS in EX Sci, BA in Psych, Spanish, Communications, and BS in Aviation. There was a lot in there. The committee was not asked to make a recommendation but the Feb 18 BoG meeting the reviews will be reviewed by the board for consideration.

Sat in on athletic affairs, they have mostly been working on their strategic planning and aligning with the foundation for fundraising.

Sat in on finance, and that information will be shared at the next BoG

I welcome questions you would like answers to, I can't guarantee I will get them, but will give it my best shot.

Board meetings and dates for committees are posted on FSU webpage, and have been sent. It's where a lot of the work of the BoG occurs and are open to the public.

Question: BoG is still meeting virtually?

Response: Yes, I think at least on the website the March meeting is scheduled for in-person. There had been discussion in Executive Committee on moving to face to face in the fall, but, with COVID they elected to keep them remote. I think, right now, maybe March will be face to face.

Question: Do you know what their process is for looking at program reviews? Like in Senate there is two readings?

Response: I don't know that. I don't think there is something in the board operating procedures addressing this. I will see what I can find out and communicate it. I don't think there is a formal process outlined. There had been some discussion early in the semester with the Provost to create a more formalized process to get more faculty or faculty senate input into the process. That hasn't moved, probably because of COVID and a million other things. I will also ask Chairman Goldberg.

Question: My understanding would be, if anyone wanted to speak to the program reviews, we are

going to have to do it by making written comments ahead of time. Of course, folks can attend virtually, but, they wouldn't be recognized to speak, correct?

Response: I believe that is correct. At this point if you have any comments they have to be in advance submitted in writing. One thing, I am operating on the assumption that there would probably be in the board meeting, the same sort of presentation that was made in Academic Affairs where the Provost had some comments, but the Deans over the programs that actually presented the review. So, for those of you who want input, you might address through your Deans. I, candidly, think there should be a process that creates a more formal, in advance, input from faculty senate into that- like we do with curriculum, where it be faculty senate committees or grad council but that isn't in place yet.

ACF Representative, Jim Matthews

Been a lot of media coverage, the legislative session begins tomorrow. Lots of ideas, not a lot of specifics. What I have seen:

Phasing out state personal income tax. Republican priority. Some models I have seen include complete defunding WVU/Marshall. FSU is not mentioned in anything I have seen.

There are 21 education reform bills on the docket, don't know how many are Higher Ed.

Biggest republican priority for Ed is to expand state funded charter schools, even though there are none even after the 2017 legislation that allowed that.

Expanding broadband.

Reunite FSU and Pierpont, not sure how official that is.

Campus carry, have heard almost no talk. Not sure if that's because of supermajority and is understood.

Because of COVID they are planning a fairly aggressive early agenda. Sort of making game day decisions every day.

Legislative rules require in person votes. Voting system has been upgraded to allow voting from the gallery.

Sessions closed for lobbyists and public except by appointment.

Only chamber and government organization room will be useable because of social distancing, expecting a smaller number of bills because of this.

V. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

COVID Committee

Had some questions about the reporting categories on COVID that were changed. Matt Swain has been helpful in resolving those. Right now, we are tracking at 3.22 overall infection rate. It is the highest that FSU has reported, but has been gradual and holding. Not alarming when tracked against the county (4.14) Mon (4.13, WVU 1.54). That's not raising alarms. I am wanting concerns about PPE, classroom environment to make sure they are protected. I say that with regard to the UK strain. Which is depending on who you listen to 30-45-75% more transmissible. I want to make sure you are all protected. Last semester I felt the University had done a good job, I felt like a hockey player in a penalty box behind the plexy glass. Want to

make sure we are keeping up with that, and things may depend on the environment. I want to make sure we are registering everyone's concerns.

VI. Student Government Report

There are some concerns about changing in the library and moving things around there, possibly rearranging the tutoring center and it was discussed in our general meeting. Are there any updates?

Response: I think the response I can give you is the report that came from the library committee along with the agenda is what we know at this point, and is an action item for the senate later on.

Comment: The committee report sums of what is being proposed. It asks that exploratory advising and career development relocate to the second floor of library. They will eliminate some student space (4000sq ft) at least one study room, 3 semiprivate study rooms, and flexibly study space with 25 tables and chairs that can be moved around. It also could eliminate up to 16 computers. We were asked to give a tour after fall semester, which included Krista, Merri, and DeVault. The library has some very big concerns with this because of the impact it will have on student space. Past library committee reports we have actually asked for more room for private study rooms – those are our highest demand items other than reserve books. We have put out some statistics in the report. Those study rooms are checked out once, but usually to 3-6 students at a time, about 2700 in the 2019 year, multiply by 3-6 to show the impact of students. We use the semiprivate rooms as a backup to the study rooms. The problem we see is not only in student access to resources, but also the longevity of the plan. This plan would put the library, IT, and LEAD center which we have a great relationship with. Also include advising and career development. We see that if we have all of those within our building it doesn't leave any room for growth for any of us. It presents a problem that we all want to grow, all our departments to get larger, retention/recruitment/ student success. It would limit our goals as an institution, not just our current students who visit the library.

Comment: SG has generally found the same. This move could impact a lot of students negatively, lose a lot of space they use regularly.

Comment:: that's our main focus, as librarians, we are advocates of our library space and resources. We have that space and resources for one reason – for our students. They use our space and resources to meet your course requirements, your accreditation, and by cutting this down or infringing on high need space would be a huge negative. I would like to move that we accept and move to accept the recommendations of the library committee.

Question: Tom was kind enough to post the link to the report in the chat. To what degree were you or the staff consulted on the decision?

Response: I think there was some informal communication in October. Formally we were not included until late November. We didn't have a meeting with the interested parties until there was a tour that happened after students left in the fall. So, there was a lack of transparency.

Question: Do you have any idea what the space in Turley where they currently are, what is happening with that space?

Response: I have no clue. We have only been in contact with the deciding parties during the tour, and some informal conversations on campus. No insight has been given in regard to the current placement of them. We are also concerned this decision has been made during a pandemic. A lot

of these resources have been closed during social distancing and sanitizing efforts. Many are now open and we are seeing a surge in use again.

Response: my understanding from the document from the committee, one of the concerns or reasons for proposing this move is they are not getting enough foot traffic in Turley. It seems to me that shouldn't necessitate a move, but more PR for career services. Why spend the money for that move instead of lets have a PR push first instead of spending the money to move?

Comment: We are more than happy to help to find new ways to help promote the Career Development Center

Comment: I wonder when the numbers were pulled about foot traffic? We are in the middle of a pandemic which has severely impacted numbers on campus. There are new people in charge of each of those areas within the last year, so the data they are using is likely skewed.

Question: You mentioned that you had this walk through after the fall semester. Have you heard any other communications since then from admin?

Response: No, Stephanie Degroot was also a member, she was there to talk about building walls, how to make this be most effective. We did see Stephanie come through one time over winter break to take some measurements, but other than that we have not heard anything else.

Question: any discussion or input from Deans Council or Provosts council?

Response: No, we actually followed out chain of command and reached out to Dr. Stephens and asked his opinion. He was uninformed of the decision process and didn't have any more guidance. He said he would talk to Dr. Incitti and we have not heard back.

Question: is Student Government acting on the matter?

Response: we have talked in general counsel, and had an Executive Board meeting and try to tell the students what we can. At general board they did show their disapproval. We will bring back the information from today for the next meeting.

Question: Is there administration here that can speak to this?

Merri: I just logged in. I have not totally digested the committee report. I am not sure where they got their square footage. There was a walkthrough to combine the LEAD with the rest of the division. It has nothing to do with foot traffic. We wanted to walk through to see available. There is a space beside LEAD that used to be Pierpont. Dr. DeVault also had conversations about the study rooms, but they are not on the table because it is evident they are used. It is just a discussion about trying to put a division together that is now separated. There is more to what was done. Krista was with us and wanted to know what spaces were used for because there are upgrades that need done in the library.

Question: Is there a plan to use library space for other administrative purposes?

Response: No, it is a conversation.

Question: I am asking about the logical implications. Is the conversation possibly going to have an impact on library services?

Response: No

Question: But it will for student services?

Response: There is a plan to see if we can put all three services in the library, if it is feasible. There is no active plan.

Question: When were faculty going to be brought in to the discussion?

Response: When there was something to truly discuss. We don't know what can or can't be done. All we are doing is having a conversation and see what the space was used for.

Comment: Former Pierpont space is now being used as flexible study space and 3 semiprivate study areas because tutoring moved from that side of the floor to the opposite side to be near Tablab for testing. So, this is not unused space that used to be for Pierpont, it is relocated because tutoring switched sides.

Question: The Provost told the librarians that he was unaware of any plans to reallocate any library space, has he been included?

Response: Not at that time, no.

Question: Why would you not, the library is under his purview?

Response: No one was trying to circumvent anyone, it was a conversation. There is also a need for commuter space, students need digital media access.

Question: Why wasn't he involved, then?

Response: He can go around and have all kinds of conversations, when nothing has been planned. You can't have a plan without having conversations to get some ideas. The person who can draw this up is Stephanie, but I haven't seen any of it. There have not been further conversations since we walked through.

Comment: Institutional history. We had a wonderful colleague who ran the center for teaching and learning when we had that. She learned she was losing her job when someone did a walk through of her office. So, I don't think that suggesting a walk through doesn't mean anything, conversations don't mean anything, I think they mean a great deal. As someone who worked in academic advising for 18 years, that office has moved at least 8 times since I have been here. It has never helped their outreach to students to move, but it also didn't hurt it because they have a very efficient way of getting undeclared students in to get advised. That is not an office that is not functioning at a high level. So, I think it's a little short-sighted to say that conversations and walkthroughs and Stephanie doing measurements doesn't mean anything.

Student: I have used both of those, and the fact they are in Turley didn't dissuade at all.

Merri: The conversation was to combine the 3 areas that combine the areas that are in one department.

Comment: I know that some librarians have received dismissives, I don't know specifics, but the

librarians testified about having heard or seen something about this foot traffic issue.

Response: That was not part of the conversation I was a part of in November. I think there is some hearsay that has taken place by people not involved in the conversation. Two librarians were involved in the conversation in November. They pointed out that the study rooms because someone in the group mentioned they had walls and doors. We want to keep it by the LEAD center if it would come to fruition. We weren't there to get rid of the library, librarians, or get rid of someone. That isn't it. We also were having the conversation when we had a different VP of student success who wanted to make some changes. He isn't here, so, we still just had a conversation. But the President is also being asked for a commuter space, and electronic information where students study. I have not seen anything from Stephanie or Krista about what can or can't be done.

Question: When you say an ask for commuter space, isn't the library where they go?

Response: We assume a lot when it comes to students. They need space where they can get on the internet. We assumed they were using the Falcon Center, or by Starbucks in the Library, but, they have asked for a space where they can go where it's quiet. But, I am not an architect who can make these decisions. The computer area out front wasn't part of the conversation because the LEAD center uses part of it for the TEAS test because it's too big of a group to fit in the TabLab. It was a conversation about how spaces are used, and what can we do to help our students.

Comment: Commuter students have used the library spaces.

Response: I can't talk against that, I am just talking about what the ask was.

Comment: I think it's good we are having this conversation. I appreciate the Library committee bringing this to us, and Merri your willingness to be here to respond.

Question in chat: What is keeping the commuters from using the library as is?

Response: Nothing. We encourage all students to use the library.

VII. Unfinished Business

Major Items

Faculty Handbook (tabled at December meeting)

Should remain tabled until we hear from the committee

Curriculum Proposal 20-21-01 (second reading)

Received a request to table for the February meeting because it's not ready to go. It's being vetted by General Studies

Motion to table Cuchta/Gina. Passed.

Curriculum Proposal 20-21-02 (second reading)

Motion to approve. Long/Cuchta. Passed

VIII. New Business

Major Items

Curriculum Proposal 20-21-03 (first reading)

Curriculum Proposal 20-21-04 (first reading)

Motion to consider as a package: Long/Reneau. Passed.
Motion to approve for first reading: Long/Reneau. Passed

Minor Items

Library Committee Proposal (See Library Committee Report)

Sent in the packet. In addition to information, there are two proposals from the committee.

Point of Information: Recommendations from the library committee, are they active motions or need to be moved?

Given what Merri said, I will take her at her word and assume that is true, but I think we should pass this.

Motion to pass the second recommendation (read from the document). The President of the Faculty Senate will submit a request in writing to President Martin, the Provost, and the Executive Leadership Team that any future plans to reallocate library space be prepared in consultation with the Provost, the librarians, and the Library Committee, and that such plans be discussed openly with the faculty and student bodies. Niichel/Cuchta.

Comment: I agree with Bob. It looks like some moves are already being made as far as construction, maybe that's just coincidental. But, is there something we can confirm that no such moves are actually moving forward. Not to say that Merri isn't correct, I don't know how many actors are involved and if everyone is on the same page. Not everyone may be communicating with everyone else. Assuming all is as Merri suggests, moving with the second motion is the least we could do.

Comment: Could I suggest a friendly amendment? I think if you just take out future, and say "any plans". It could be that the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing.

Motion amended to to remove future.

Comment: Before things get voted on: As a POI, the foot traffic issue. Merri may not have overhead this in the walk through, that is one of the main reasons that Dr. DeVault shared with Sharon and I, that Career Services only had 1 student in the fall and they hoped the library foot traffic would help increase traffic to the center. I don't want anyone to think the library committee pulled that out of thin air. We love to identify our sources, that was the primary source.

Motion carries.

Approval of Recommendations from Faculty Handbook Committee

Any insight into any of these that should not be passed?

Comment: #3 has a recommendation that the Academic Integrity policy be passed by Senate to BoG. We have done that, but there has been no action at the next level. Second was to develop a process, we did give that charge to the welfare committee already.

Question: Are there any we should not take action on immediately?

Comment: Not to my mind.

Comment: I am a little leery of the recommendation that each unit or division create its own handbook. It's been my experience, the more of those there are the more confusion there is. I toss that out as a comment.

Question: Are you referring to item 7?

Response: No, #4.

Comment: I will say, I agree with Chuck, you have a faculty handbook. You may have some procedures/policies per unit that are peculiar, but I don't think you can have a different handbook per unit. It raises questions of practicality. I don't know how you really could ask or expect admin to agree to different handbooks across units.

Move to accept items 1, 2, and 5-9 on the recommendations. Niichel/Long. Passed.

Comment: I would like, if anyone from the handbook committee is here and would like to speak to what they had in mind

Comment: I can't recall what was meant by #4, but, I would encourage the passing of the others.

Motion to consider item 4 as a separate item. Niichel/Clark. Passed.

Comment: I would suggest tabling until we can get some feedback from the committee.

Response: I am still in favor of the motion, it seems that scholarship in the P&T process may warrant separate.

Comment: I will say I think the handbook as a whole covers that, as it speaks to these items in regard to specific programs like NSI.

Question: So, each school may submit their own?

Response: Yes, the NSI procedures were done in consultation with the Dean and Provost, it was not a separate thing. It was a University thing.

Response: Rick has commented that Jason is referring to appendix A as it refers to P& T and suggests tabling until the committee can discuss.

Motion to table Reneau/Cuchta. Passed.

IX. Announcements/Information/Discussion

Provost Search

What I am about to say is not personal. I hope no one takes it personally, it is in the spirit of professional discussion among colleagues. For some time we have known this search would take place. As Senate, we have asked a number of time for representation. We have been told for several meetings that no information was available. Last week, we got the email that committee had been selected and it was moving forward. Particularly that the committee was in place and presumably reviewing applicants. To say we were disappointed is an understatement. There was no consultation with faculty leadership about the committee makeup or qualifications of applicants. I learned that the committee membership had been determined by the chair of the committee. I had asked for more representation from faculty chosen by faculty. [Portions of an

email to the chair was read referring to no representation by a faculty member whose sole duty is to teach].

For several months, there has been discussion about the concept of shared governance. It was renewed discussion at meetings, senate, and was hopeful/optimistic that we had turned a corner. You'll note the use of past tense. This is not shared governance. This is the same thing we have seen 100x before. We have been told what's happening, we are now expected to accept it. My fear is that if we question, we run the risk of being viewed as whiners or disloyal to the progress of the Institution, which isn't fair to the faculty. Faculty don't want to run the Institution. I don't see a single person who wants President Martin's job. We just want a say in the vital decisions that impact our jobs.

Comment: One way to skin this cat might be to at least pass a resolution among the faculty by the Faculty Senate that says something like "we expect some degree of more meaningful representation in the search for a Provost, who is in many ways our representative, or represents our interests. Our concerns to the administration". The response I have seen to you, is "okay, there will be these forums for a for faculty to give their input." But, short of a resolution I can't come up with anything.

Comment: I'm not here to defend the composition of the committee, I am on the committee and was asked to serve by the chair. At the time, I am not told who else is on the committee, how many, etc. I was asked to serve, and I appreciate your commendation on serving. I do want to try to allay your concerns that it's not like I've gone to the dark side and am just an admin. I am teaching 12 hours every semester. I think one semester I had a 9-hour load. I certainly haven't forgotten what it's like to be faculty. Whether you wish to put more on the committee as faculty, is another question. I at least bring a faculty perspective, and I realize I am only one. At this point, concerns you have as faculty, please funnel them to me. As long as the structure is what it is, I will do my best to represent you. I understand where you are coming from, but, just know it's not everyone who hasn't stepped foot in a classroom in a long while. I do appreciate any input you send to me.

Question: Can the Faculty Senate call a general faculty assembly?

Response: I don't know that that particular authority is in the Senate bylaws. I think that has to be done by the President. This is an issue that has arisen a few times in the past but has not been truly resolved.

Comment: My recollection is the Faculty Senate President can call a general faculty meeting at the request of the senate. I have a lot of memories of the Senate President calling a meeting (elections, etc.).

Comment: When I have done that in that past, I have done that in conjunction with the FSU President.

Comment: I am looking at the updated bylaws from November 30. Item 4 "General faculty meet together....President shall convene a meeting when...."or when 20 faculty who are not on senate ask the FS President to call..."

Question: Re: timeline. The search committee has reportedly been formed. Who is the chair?

Response: Merri

Question: Other members?

Response: Joe Kremer, Amanda Metcalf, Joy Hatch.

Question: None are full time faculty without admin duties?

Response: Correct. Essentially all admins of some nature. I understand the special relationship with Joe in terms of straddling the ditch.

Question: Would it not be prudent to have a faculty member, full time, not beholden to the admin world?

Question: What is the timing? Committee has been formed? How does the timing work as far as search committee, interviews, etc.

Response: Committee has been meeting and looking at resumes. There are WebEx interviews scheduled now. First ones start on Friday, then Monday, Tuesday, and some after that. So, a short timeline to the first interview.

Question: So, you have initial interviews remotely?

Response: Correct, all remote.

Question: When you launch a Provost search, what sort of rough order magnitude of applications you have to deal with?

Response: We had 30 applicants.

Question: Widdled down to?

Response: There are 10 scheduled.

Question: From there what?

Response: 3-4 will come down and do an extensive series of forums with faculty and other constituents. There would be a number of open forums where any faculty member will attend, others for Senate. I don't know the structure of the units right now but it is planned.

Question: I would ask one question, how does this process compare with faculty involvement in the past from beginning to end? Granted, COVID.

Question: In this search process as envisioned, you said there would be various forums and interviews with constituencies. Is there a plan for Provost candidates to have interview time with Executive Committee of Senate?

Response: That is kind of what I'm referring to. I'm quite sure Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be part of it.

Comment: That might help to pair that down, not that it mitigates other things. If there is a plan of not just a big faculty forum, but a plan for FS EC to be able to meet with and talk with, provide feedback.

Comment: Yes, it was not just large open forums. There would be several so every faculty member would have an opportunity, but smaller groups as well so Executive Committee and Deans also have the opportunity. Prior searches, some has been put into the chat. The prior search was the failed search where Rick was chosen as Provost. That one had representation from each unit. Beyond that, the earlier ones I don't know – it was before my time. (this was started during President Jones' time)

Comment: Point was, there was significant faculty representation. Prior to that, it was all over the place. Some have been appointed, some searches. So looking at the past may be helpful, but, I'd rather look forward.

Question: Do you have proposed action?

Response: I don't.

Question: Thoughts on what we could do?

Comment: As Todd suggested, we could pass a resolution. Someone mentioned a general faculty meeting.

Comment: I'm not averse to that, but not sure what purpose that would serve.

Comment: My only thought was that the voice of the General faculty might carry more weight than the FS.

Comment: Such a meeting would have to happen in 2 days since interviews start Friday.

Comment: I think getting this out in the open and having a discussion is an important step. I was hoping with all of these folks here with PhDs someone would have a good idea.

Comment: There may be ideas, but stepping out and acting on them is different.

Comment: I like Gina's idea, of requesting at least, that Faculty Senate Executive Committee have an opportunity to have a meeting with the Candidates. I'll just say that when we were doing a search for the VP of Student Services the time that was set up for faculty to attend the forum was in prime time teaching period. At the time I wrote Merri and said it would make a lot more sense to have the 12:30-1:30 hour set aside for faculty because most of us teach at the other time. She said she would take it into consideration for future situations like this. I would ask Joe to take that back and request the faculty forums be in times they are available to attend, and follow up with Gina's suggestion that there is a separate forum for Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Comment: I will definitely take those back to the committee. I am very much in agreement with

both.

Comment: Shared governance is not something that most people do naturally. If we want to see more shared governance, we may actually have to do something about it. I'm not sure I want to propose this yet, but possibly request that the President call the general faculty so they can discuss, perhaps, the final candidates for provost. I think requesting another member on the committee at this point would be ignored. I think we need to try and have some sort of tangible action, or we have the appearance of sitting by the wayside watching things go by.

Comment: I would make the suggestion that, if the group, keeping with what was said maybe have a resolution that additional faculty representation be put on the committee, and in the process that there be planned time for the candidates to meet with FS EC. I don't know why, necessarily, you want a general forum for faculty to discuss specific candidates. But, if you want some discussion where the faculty can express their perspective on having input into the provost choice since it is the chief academic officer. That can be done with a special senate meeting by recognizing people in open forum who wanted to speak but are not senators. I don't think, HR wise, a general forum is not a good idea.

Deans Evaluation

Discussed above

Term Contracts

I have been asked to share some thoughts regarding this issue, shared governance. This speaks to the Provosts recent email announcing that Deans/Associate Deans that were interim were going to be no longer interim, noting in the email the decision was made due to the substantive work the admins have done and how they support the fundamental processes engaged by faculty and students. We don't disagree, but, we also believe that Term faculty complete substantive work on behalf of the Institution, and support the fundamental educational processes engaged by faculty and students. This becomes an issue of equity and justice. We need a policy in place where either everyone is subject to a national search, or there is a pathway for tenure, or going from interim to full Dean positions. In this case, the interims were moved into their positions with no input from faculty, no national search, but term faculty have been told to be considered for tenure track they would have to go through a national search, even though they were hired as a result of a national search. The idea that these all over the place ways of hiring and promoting become problematic because, it makes faculty a little skeptical, of if you are a term faculty member is there a path for you or should you be on the job market, or do faculty have a role in choosing their leadership – chair or dean.

Question: Ideas in terms of action?

Comment: I would love to know what kind of action to take, to tell you the truth. We have seen again and again whether its term faculty being overlooked, faculty who have been here in some cases years and still not being considered for conversion even though they have earned it and their departments are hiring tenure track positions, or now a Provost search underway without real faculty representation. Many VPs that we had no say in in terms of their hiring. So, it's an ongoing problem that speaks to the lack of shared governance and I don't know how to make a substantive change.

Comment in the chat: There is proposed language about conversion. I do remember working on that some and talking about that in handbook committee. Again, this is another issue we have as

faculty and senate. I don't know what actions to take which is unsatisfying, but, I don't know.

Comment: Looking at the comments. I don't know what they are considering, but, it seems it might be objectionable. I think perhaps Senate should move forward with a resolution because, once the language is there it's harder to get it undone.

Comment: I agree with that. I don't think you'll like it. It essentially removes the convertibility ability. I was always pro conversion. In the past we have done that, and counted the time served if they have been doing everything they could as if they were tenure track.

Comment: I will say, if as FSU's strategic plan says we are looking for the best faculty we can get, offering someone a one-year contract with no semblance of a possibility it's going to be converted, means the quality of our applicants is going to decline.

Question: This is not a solution, but I want to clarify in my own mind. I don't know what has happened in other units, but my recollection going back a number of years, we looked at the code and found the section that allowed us to hire term, but renewable for 3 one-year terms, but allow for the possibility for conversion. Isn't that how we hired some people with that understanding?

Comment: And it was written into the appointment as "may be" converted. If it's not in code it's in HEPC policy.

Comment: If there is language coming that is potentially making it harder, or impossible to convert. I think all of our current term faculty need to be grandfathered in.

Comment: That's not a bad idea. Let me try to clarify it more. It's not that they would be prevented from converting. They could apply for the position along with everyone else, going into the pool of applicants along with everyone else.

Question But, starting from scratch in terms of years?

Comment: I don't want to speak to that, I don't know.

Comment: It sounds to me like a lever to kill tenure, maybe not in the next decade, but in the future.

Comment: There has already been legislation that would give BoGs control over whether an Institution allows tenure or not, so it's already under discussion.

Comment: I don't know whether it's in part discussion with the handbook committee, but it may be something for Senate to consider for whatever good it does some resolution that deals with that. Addressing a resolution that goes to the board. Honestly, it's to me a fairness issue, and equity. I know there were positions that that was what the intent was. We were doing a search for someone with tenure qualifications, but we weren't allowed to offer a tenure position, but specifically found that part of the code to give them a multi-year offer that allowed the possibility for conversion. It does seem that that idea to grandfather people in, is worth discussing.

Comment: To Donna's point, we conducted a search within the last 5-6 years, one of the candidates we asked specifically rejected the offer because it was a temporary position. It's not

something that will impact just the new faculty, but the long-term health of the University. It would be nice if the Admin had to prove that they could not financially offer a tenure track position. Term became something that was “we only hire term now” at what point is the onus on them, here is why we must do it, instead of it’s what we do. We did, in our department, hire two people. One tenure track, and one term. I am happy to see that most job announcements recently have been tenure track, I am heartened by that. It still leaves too many faculty that were hired under term when it was the only option that it shouldn’t just become the fallback.

Comment: Sounds like what we need to do is wait to see what comes out of handbook committee, but keep it on our radar. I think it’s important, all points that have been made.

Comment: I would like someone from the handbook committee to come back and speak to us about item #4 and share anything they know about the term faculty language in the handbook. I think we need to know as soon as we can so that we can have a response.

Comment: I will do that. I had a talk with Robert before this meeting. I will get with him after and relay the Senate’s concerns. One thing I ask, if you would succinctly put what you stated in an email. We are currently in this synched-up phase where administration is making comments, and we have no idea thus far as far as formal input. If you send that to me, I will send it to Robert and CC Chuck, and get you a response in time for next month.

Academic Calendar (potential pay period problems)

Discussed Above

Book Store Issues and book costs

Rick: Chair of textbook/bookstore committee. In that position I have become aware of a number of issue with adoptions/failure to adopt even though they were notified. That was a part of the presentation by the bookstore to Deans where they fell on the sword and admitted their communication plan failed. One reason we are going to be implementing the adoption software, should improve that process and eliminate the glitches. Please let Rick know if there are further concerns that have not been communicated so far.

Question: Who is on the committee? Rick H (chair), 10-12 others. I can send you the names after.

Comment: I didn’t realize the committee was active.

Response: We are, as active as you can be during COVID. What we are really trying to do is try to update the BoG policy on the bookstore.

Sabbaticals

Not discussed due to time

Recording Classes

Not discussed due to time

Restored Access to All Faculty List Serve

Has been restored. Any violations of the policy will be addressed on an issue by issue basis.

X. Open Forum

Meeting adjourned 5:45

Next Meeting: March 9, 3-5pm

***If you have items for the agenda please send your request to the Faculty Senate President (Charles.Shields@fairmontstate.edu) by Tuesday morning March 9, 2021 for consideration by the Executive Committee.**