

Fairmont State University Faculty

Senate Meeting Minutes

April 13, 2021

Called to order at 3:01

Members Present: Chuck Shields (President), Donna Long (VP, Humanities), Jason Noland (Secretary, Education), Tom Cuchta (Webmaster, Comp Sci & Math), Jim Davis (Ex. Comm, Business), Todd Clark (Ex. Comm, Social Sciences), Paul Reneau (Ex. Comm, HHP), Jim Matthews (ACF), Nathan Myers (Humanities), Steve Roof (AA), Tim Oxley (AA), Molly Barra (Library), Janie Leary (Proxy for Nina Slota – Behavioral Sciences), Rachel Cook (Natural Sciences), Stephen Rice (Natural Sciences), Gina Fantasia (BOG), Denice Kirchoff (Nursing), Jennifer Satterfield (Nursing), Janet Floyd (Business), Troy Snyder (Performing Arts), Robert Niichel (Comp. Sci & Math), Josh Smallridge (Social Sciences), Cassidy Greenwood (Student Government), Zach Taylor (Student Government), Musat Crihalmeanu (Engineering Tech), Tabitha Laffere (Engineering Tech).

Guests: Justin Hastings, Rick Harvey, Rick Stephens, Dr. Mirta Martin, Barb Maclellan, Michael Ransom, Amanda Metcalf, Carol Tannous, Joy Hatch, Deb Hemler, Merri Incitti, Susan Ross, Jan Kiger

I. Reading & Approval of the minutes from the March 16, 2021 meeting

Motion to approve. Reneau/Niichel. Passed

II. President Martin

Appreciate the opportunity to visit with you. Several updates, none of which are a surprise. Efforts will be to provide more information than you have so far. Take a minute to thank our exiting Provost for the service he has provided. Grateful he has been here and the support he has lent us, and work he has done in concert with FS, faculty, deans, and chairs. We have come a long way. Want to personally acknowledge his accomplishments. Once a Falcon, always a Falcon.

Provide Senate with an update on the separation bill between Pierpont and FSU. A week ago Friday we finalized the separation. Under that, Pierpont will move off campus in its entirety on June 30, 2021 except culinary, early childhood, and vet tech. Those 3 will then exit FSU on or before June 30, 2022 as well as the NAEC. So, FSU will retain and control both our campuses in its entirety. Because those 3 programs will remain, at that point it will be FSU, not conjoined as of July 1 this year. Because of those 3 programs until the following year, those who choose to reside in our residence halls will have access to the residence halls, that is the extent of the student population that will be allowed in the residence halls. In return FSU, agreed to turn over the Caperton center to Pierpont, as well as the adjacent land, and the Braxton center. That transfer will take place on or before July 1 of this year. They will occupy those and own them in their entirety at that point.

Commencement: Originally there were 5 taking place starting next Saturday. We have now added a 6th on Friday at 6 that will be a modified commencement – because I found out there were

12 athletes who would be competing during commencement and couldn't participate in any of the other exercises. On Saturday, 9, 12, and 3 Keynote Speaker will be Gayle Manchin. Sunday at 12 and 3, speaker will be Shelly Moore Capito. Very grateful for their participation. As you know, it takes an act of God for just one commencement exercise, let alone 2 or 3. Faculty will be requested they attend the commencement of their college. We will have as much of a regular ceremony as is permitted. The platform party will be extremely small, limited to speaker, chairman, and President, as well as reader and the Dean. We are going to be observing social distancing and masks. Because the weather is the weather, and because we have concerns about crowd control and adhering to 2 guests per students, we are trying to move commencement inside the Feaster Center. Working with the Health Department now, we will make the decision of whether or not to move inside as soon as we get approval. It will be easier to control who comes in, where they sit, etc. But, now that the rate of infection in WV is declining (in this area at least), we feel comfortable talking to the Health Department about if we can have it inside. We will see what happens and let you know within the next 24 hours if not sooner.

Finally, Dr. Phillips has accepted the position of Provost. She will begin next Friday, the 23rd. Which will allow Dr. Stephens and Phillips to have a little over a month of transition, his last day will be May 30.

Q: Will the Pierpont students living in Residence halls have access to Library and other Facilities?

R: 2 years ago, Pierpont chose not to use our facilities (library, FC, etc.) after that point, they have been charging their students the fee we charge our students for use of those facilities. Those students have the ability as anyone in the community to go in the library and study, or buy from Chic Fil A, but that's where their rights stop. In 2019 Pierpont stopped charging students. The librarians remember they let us know within a month that they were cutting support to the library to the tune of half a million dollars. So, there will be no difference in how they operate since 2019.

Much of the Pierpont space is vacant. We will evaluate the condition of the areas, and begin to unify colleges within buildings. We don't know when that may take place because we haven't been in those rooms for 13 years and we don't know what we will find.

III. Provost Stephens

Most of the items I would have comment on are in the agenda, so I will wait until those crop up. I will say I have already been in communication with Dr. Phillips, we are beginning the transition. I have a lot of confidence in Dr. Phillips, and making the transition as smooth as possible for everybody. Our next meeting is Thursday afternoon to articulate the transition.

IV. Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

i. BoG Representative, Gina Fantasia

Regular meeting was Feb 18, special on March 30. Feb 18 most of the business was acting on a lot of the things I reported from committee meetings. The board acted on the program review recommendations from the provost. BA in Education, BS Psychology, BS in Aviation, and Exercised Science. Recommendation was to continue with current resources and re-evaluate in 5 years.

The Communication and Spanish degrees were recommended to come back in a year, to report plans to increase enrollment and implement progress in programs.

Athletics committee heard a revised phases strategic plan, accepted and approved.

Bylaws committee board accepted for public comment a policy on sexual harassment, rules regarding those, and Policy 35, gift acceptance policy and 39 the Drug Policy.

Meeting on the 30th, board authorized Chairman Goldberg to execute the agreement that formalized the full separation that was previously described.

ii. ACF Representative, Jim Matthews

Saturday was the last day of the session. Shared a list of the bills past. Budget bill was passed, substantial cut to WVU and Marshall, FSU was not named. HB 3293 single sex participation in interscholastic athletic evens (sex of birth). SB 657 about free speech on campus, I read it, it's very vague, it's really about making sure we have free speech on campus. It says that they think universities have done a bad job about protecting free speech so they are fixing it.

Do not see the campus carry bill, and didn't get the tax bill passed.

Pretty short list, but some are pretty significant

Q: SB 657 forming open and robust university minds act. Are there any mandates in that?

R: They're vague. It seems most concerned that we are creating free speech areas, so some areas you aren't allowed to have free speech. It reflects a profound misunderstanding of what colleges are actually like. I don't see that there is a mandate.

iii. Executive Committee report regarding BOG & ACF election results

Reported that Gina Fantasia has been reelected to BoG rep, and Bill Harrison has been elected as ACF Rep.

Thanks to both of them, and to Jim for stepping in this year with ACF.

I did send an email to all of you with the election results, if you want to distribute to constituents. An announcement will also be made.

iv. Executive Committee report regarding academic calendar/pay period issues

Chuck sent out the letter Tom wrote to clarify. The question was if there was a practical skip somewhere, HR said there would not be an issue, we would be paid every 2 weeks. We would essentially get a free pay when there is a 27th pay.

Committee on Committees:

has been constituted. Tom Cuchta is chairing again. Others: Paul, Nina Slota, Tabitha Lafferre, Nathan Myers. They sent out the first round of questions. Already heard back from many, another reminder will come.

Bylaws require that at this meeting a nominating committee be appointed for the coming year. Molly Barra, Nathan Myers, Denice, Rachel, and Janet have agreed to serve. They will put together a slate of officers for the coming year and present it at the April 27 meeting.

V. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

COVID Committee

Hope everyone is well, good to see everyone where. Couple questions concerning Dr. Martin's statement:

Q: is it definite we are moving inside for commencement?

R: Indefinite as of 3:30 today. The intent is to move indoors, but they have to get health department sign off.

Q: Intent is to move indoor, how does it look inside? (social distancing)

R: All kinds of mapping of space being done, the concern indoor/outdoor is on one hand weather, and security keeping the numbers appropriate (2 guests). They have been mapping it out trying to make sure the size of the class, faculty, guests can actually fit. That's being worked on.

Q: When will faculty receive an announcement about this?

R: As I shared with the Senate, this is a fluid situation, we have been working on it around the clock to see where to fit everyone – even if it was on the field, how would we process in/out. The thought that it's going to be too hot/rainy, how are we going to control it? We have been in conversation with the health department, we anticipate having something to you within the next 24 hours. We will provide for faculty whether its outdoor or indoor, won't change the fact that we will only allow for 2 guests each. They will be 6' apart. We have someone who is placing chairs on the floor of feaster and on the turf. This isn't an insignificant endeavor when we have to social distance and try to make sure the graduation numbers don't exceed internally. If we can't fit all 6 inside the Feaster Center, we have to go outside, because we don't have the manpower to set it up in 2 separate locations. Working as quickly as we can with the health department. Hoping to make the decision in the next 24 hours.

C: Thank you, I realize this is difficult from a management standpoint. Also, we can't discount the heat/rain, or even snow.

C: If you remember, last year, it was snowing on commencement day it was snowing – of course it was virtual. The year before it was raining. Merri and many of the team are spending literally 24 hours to make sure we can pull this off. These kids have overcome an incredible year, they should be able to come receive their diploma.

Thank you, I can speak for a lot of faculty – we are looking forward to being there physically.

Q: hearing on the news that some universities are going to require students to be vaccinated, has there been any discussion about how we will handle that?

R: there has been plenty of discussion. You will notice that the large universities and what some consider the Elite are the ones requiring such vaccines. To date, no regional university or smaller university that is dependent on Enrollment and tuition is making those assertions. We all wish someone would come forward so we could follow. This is not one where we want to be a leader for fear that enrollment will dissipate. There is not a day that goes by that we don't discuss it. I think as the summer continues, there will be more and more universities that will continue to go down this path. I can anticipate that one day, in the not too distant future, that all universities in higher ed will require this vaccine no different than we currently require from MMR and encephalitis. Today, it's not going to be a requirement, I don't know about tomorrow. We have already started to plan the return to campus in the fall. It may be 4 months away, but for us we are already making plans for another phased return. It won't be a move in day, but a move in

week. At this point, no, we will not require it.

VI. Student Government Report

We will be giving the Senate 2 new reps in the beginning of next year, we don't know who yet. Aside from that, that's all we have.

VII. Unfinished Business

Major Items

i. Faculty Handbook

Tabled at the December meeting. Continues to work, met last Friday and again this Friday. Todd is here and on the committee, as well as Rick. We are working toward getting something to the Senate the goal is to do faculty forums in the fall, goal of approval of the handbook at the end of fall semester. Any decisions about bringing anything to the Senate prior to that?

R: not to my knowledge. We have formed a sub committee to discuss some issues and work some things out.

Suggestion to leave handbook on the table

- ii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-11 (second reading)
- iii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-12 (second reading)
- iv. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-14 (second reading)
- v. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-17 (second reading)
- vi. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-18 (second reading)
- vii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-20 (second reading)
- viii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-21 (second reading)
- ix. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-22 (second reading)
- x. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-23 (second reading)
- xi. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-24 (second reading)
- xii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-25 (second reading)
- xiii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-26 (second reading)

Motion to approve curriculum proposals 20-21-11 through 20-21-26 for second reading. PASSED

Comment: of course as a member of curriculum. I have seen these 3 times now. I am certainly in favor of approving them, my only hesitation comes in part from the healthcare management concentrations – there is a raft of these. The argument for doing this as stated on the proposal is that it allows healthcare management majors to earn credits in a healthcare concentrations vs. 12 credits of free elections. I can understand the impetus. Electives are traditionally meant to broaden student knowledge across disciplines, where this is really siloing them into one. I am voting in favor, but if we are a liberal arts universities that we respect and value the liberal arts and this move to create a concentration for students within the major we are losing the liberal arts component.

Question in chat: faculty who are not on campus that had an ADA or COVID exemption are still not to be on campus for graduation:

R: That is correct. Even if faculty have an emergency, or those are fully remote and ADA

exceptions they are not being required or asked to come to commencement. They may attend, but are not required.

VIII. New Business

Major Items

i. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws (first reading)

EC has been working on this, original desire was to make changes to the bylaws and constitution as a whole, but, because of circumstances decided to do some piecemeal work. These revisions are an effort to redefine the units in alignment with the current Institutional structure.

Motion to accept the amendments Cuchta/Niichel. PASSED.

C: Notice we also removed the Pierpont sections.

C: We can probably get rid of college and school. If you are going to limit the number of senators in the college, why name the academic units? Look at Sci Tech, if we have 60, we get 6 and why does it matter how it's distributed?

Q: Could it not create a situation where some smaller academic units do not get a senator? If all departments are under 10, you could end up with some departments who can't have a senator.

C: It does say 10 or fraction thereof, so if you have 5 you get a senator.

C: The thought behind this was basically a school has 20 faculty, they decide they'll break up into 5 units, instead of having 5 senators, or 1 senator per unit, where another department has 20 but only 2 units and they only get 2 reps. This was just to avoid some units breaking up so they could get more senators and take over senate.

C: I think what we really need to do, is take section 2 and it should simply say each college, then down after and continue with the definition of an academic unit, I think that can be struck and just reference colleges.

C: Library is not a college, we are an academic unit and we are part of senate.

R: I think that is defined in the document

C: That's why I don't want to strike academic unit.

C: Again, this is constitution, not the bylaws. You can't confuse the two.

Q: We can replace schools with colleges, is that an official position now?

R: It is on the BoG agenda.

R: Yes, it is an informational item on BoG – yes we are progressing with all academic entities becoming colleges. (Dr. Martin).

Q: So the question is would it be appropriate for senate to make the change that was suggested to take out schools and just say colleges, or leave it until the fall.

R: I can't tell the Senate how they wish to proceed. The reason we are bringing it to bog is really informational, we are going forward with it. The cutoff date is July 1 since it is a new academic year. It is reasonable since this is effective on July 1 that it be brought into consideration.

Q: so, this will be for first reading. Do we expect to finish it by April 27 anyway, or finish in the fall? That can effect when things need to be edited.

R: the plan is to bring this back April 27 and have bylaws approved for second reading, and constitution, Constitution has to be taken to faculty in fall for a faculty vote.

C: so we can harvest some comments today, and implement them next meeting.

C: the point earlier that was made, I don't think any academic unit would organize in a way to pack senate, because we don't do that in a vacuum it's done with senior leadership, not

on its own through a balance of power.

C: the issue for me is section 2 as written, it is partially or could be self-contradictory. "each academic unit may elect one senator, but the college can't exceed a certain number".

R: Right, a unit can decide if they don't want to get representation.

Have we made changes?

R: No, just suggestions right now. I don't think anyone on Executive Committee is wedded to this language, but we made an effort to address, so the input of Senate is well received.

Q: would it be fair to send recommendations to send suggested edits to you, and EC can discuss it as we make edits for second reading?

R: Yes.

C in chat: "How about this: Each College of the University may elect one senator for each ten full-time faculty members of fractions thereof. The distribution of representation within the college shall be an internal matter to determined at the discretion of the college."

C: that would alleviate some of the issues.

Q: not so much a concern that any one college would break into a bunch of academic units and take over, but because some areas like Aviation are so small, it would put an onus on the faculty member or two to not only have Senate representation, but turn into elected committee representation. It seemed like a solution to make it a college wide number. My question is, are there other reasons that the constitution and/or the bylaws should recognize that there are academic units apart from senate representation? Is there any reason that we should keep units designated?

R: The difference is the Senate and just the Senate can revise, change, update the bylaws at any point. The Constitution, however, requires 2/3 vote of the entire faculty to change. So, you need the constitution to be as stable as possible and put all the variables, like academic units, in the bylaws. That would be my recommendation, primarily because of the way you change them.

R: I think that was our thought process as to why to not define units in the constitution, but refer to them in the bylaws.

Q: Does the senate still desire to have representation from essentially admins in Academic Affairs?

Q: We talked about that in Deans council, we don't really have that anymore. I think that's something that Senate needs to discuss

R: I agree, our goal right now was to essentially define the units as they are electing senators. But, I guess they are part of that.

C: my point was, if we are gathering the faculty to vote on it, we need to make as many changes as we need to.

C: I am in favor of continuing to have representation from AA in the interest of open communication and shared governance.

C: I agree with Donna, I don't know what we call it, or when we make changes, but I think it's important to have representation from whatever we call Academic Affairs. In any kind of deliberative action, you should have input from all angles. Academic Affairs often offers important information.

C: Page 8, Article V, Section 9 Library is not included

ii. Proposed Syllabus Template

C: Reiterate from the last meeting. The reason for this is 1) supports I accreditation, 2) supports faculty and students. A number of syllabus components were outlined. So we are asking the Senate to look at those specific components, and the cover of the syllabus template you will see the BoG policy. Last meeting there were some good comments made. Some understood this importance as accreditors come to campus and look at rigor, etc.

After bringing it to last meeting, one comment that was made about having boxes for putting on Blackboard. This is just to look at these components related to supporting students, faculty, and accreditation and moving forward with that. As far as the delivery, adding boxes, or technology associated with the syllabus I don't have information on that.

C: There was a lot of discussion at the last senate in regard the University policy in relation to syllabus. One recommendation was to take it out. It's important that we do have U policies for students, but it doesn't have to take up 3-5 pages of a syllabus. Joy Hatch has created a start here area on blackboard, where these statements could be included and rolled over from course to course so faculty don't have to think about it in their syllabi.

Otherwise, I didn't receive comments since the last meeting.

Q: I think I asked this last time, just to clarify. What we are doing is creating a template that identifies topics or content, but wouldn't be a mandate that syllabi have to look the same, just have all the information in there and accessible. Faculty still have flexibility in how they create their syllabus and what it looks like?

R: yes, you will have different flavors of syllabi. Some may be more authoritative, some are more democratic. We will have different types. This doesn't define what it means by something, it just describes what that would mean and giving an example. It doesn't mean you have to put what is in the example, but describes the meaning and intent of that component.

Clarification: so, this is intended as presented to be section specific, not course specific?

R: This is intended for courses, so all courses delivered within the University.

Q: he is asking if you have to have all of the sections in your syllabus?

R: Yes, with the detail of this information, are you intending for this to be representative so all sections match? We have 3 instructors who teach the same class, but how they achieve the outcomes differs.

R: I can't answer that question. That is something an accreditor would look at. We are looking at the different components.

C: it looks to me that much of this, is already in our syllabi. I have this information, but I may call it something different. Are you looking specifically that a heading is "Course Structure".

R: Yes, the request was to keep those types of components similar. If we name it something else it may mean something else.

Q: so if Senate passes this, it is agreeing that all syllabi of all courses have to have the headings, or at least the material.

R: Right. You will have all of the components, relevant to your courses.

Q: What, precisely is required of us if we pass this?

C: It is my understanding is that we would all be using the same headings, at least minimally. I have to say from a first year seminar standpoint, we have observed that while keeping academic freedom in mind about what is provided in one syllabi, but not in another. I think it would be helpful to have something consistent so we can teach that from the beginning.

R: Yea, this was a discussion 1.5 years ago in academic affairs, input from a number from that area, Erica Garrett provided ADA input regarding syllabi, Mike Ransom provided some best practice. I have attended a few webinars. It is looking at supporting students and faculty. I didn't want to dig into the depths of it, even with evaluation and grading if there is a grievance, that faculty have evaluation and grading outlined so we can support the faculty. We can't support the faculty if they don't have anything to show us. Course structure is also very helpful for students. I am willing to take feedback on headings and discuss. The goal is to support everyone involved.

R: Merri: Just for everybody. Susan started this long before the HLC conference last week,

but in 2 of the sessions we sat in about what the peer review teams will look for when it comes to syllabi, one is that we have a template we are asking faculty to follow. At bare minimum we need you to agree on what the sections are titled, and everyone needs to use them. What's inside is up to you. There are components they will look at : mapping, outcomes, course alignment also leans to program outcomes. It also outlines types of courses: hybrid, strange hybrid courses, online, etc. The course outcomes for a course must be the same no matter the modality, and the assessments need to be similar – that was outright said multiple times last week. Now it is even more important about what you would like a standard syllabus to look like. I will give them access to Digital Measures where they will see your syllabi, so it needs to be in a format that everyone can agree with.

Q: clarification: I don't have any problem with the major headings, but the subheadings of exams, etc. Those are required, correct?

R: No.

Point of order: If there is no motion on the floor, we should move on to the next item.

Motion to approve for first reading Oxley/Long.

C: it's clear that is what accreditors want, you just want to make sure faculty don't have to have a 15-20 page long syllabus with the syllabus statements and redundancies. The template is a great idea, as long as we have broad headings so we don't have to repeat things in more sections.

R: That's easily solved, if you vote on a broad template. You can refer to other sections under other settings. Part of this is also to cut the amount of copy/paste that has to go into the syllabus. You can put links like "refer to the Start Here page for...."

Q: I would like to see a list of what will be required if we pass this. Not general statements. What, specifically, is going to be required. Some things in there like "course outcomes should be specific" there are unstated responsibilities. I want to see what would be the responsibility of faculty if this is adopted. If that could be provided before the next meeting, that would be great.

C: My intention is to share this with my faculty and get their input. My understanding is that the major categories are expected, but what we put under that category, design, assessments, are up to us. That is my understanding.

R: I just explained that the course outcomes need to match every section of that course. Assessment of those outcomes is up to the instructor as long as someone is gathering the data (Merri).

C: I think it's a great idea for Joy to put the U information in Blackboard. One thing we did with SOAR, we just referenced some of the U policies and put a hyperlink on it. Everyone in SOAR will have an initial experience of clicking all those things as part of the class

Q: I thought the first page before the sample had a list of the sections?

C: I am happy to share a short version that has everything out of it, what you have is the long version with examples.

C in chat: the first section does have headings, but it is not clear those are the required sections. So, just make clear these are the headings you will have to have. I would suspect that most people already have that information in the syllabus.

C: also the specific requirements in that section as opposed to general suggestions.

MOTION PASSED

- iii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-05 (first reading)
- iv. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-06 (first reading)
- v. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-13 (first reading)
- vi. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-27 (first reading)
- vii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-28 (first reading)
- viii. Core Curriculum Proposal Art 1141 (first reading)
- ix. Core Curriculum Proposal English 2240 Revised (first reading)
- x. Core Curriculum Proposal CHEP 1100 (first reading)
- xi. Core Curriculum Proposal CHEP 1110 (first reading)
- xii. Core Curriculum Proposal Nursing 1025 (first reading)

Motion to accept Proposals 05, 06, 13, 27, 28 for first reading Niichel/Long. PASSED

Q: don't know how important this is, CP 05 as revised it specifically states that this is a necessary program for FSU even though a lot of other I have it around the state, and the distinction between other I and FSU is something like it spans the University programs. One question I have, if that is the case, should there be signatures from each of the Deans, currently only Dr. Kast has signed. The other Question is in looking at the revision, none of the course fees were indicated, I didn't know if that needed to be done before passage and hits the registrar's office?

R: I do have the signature, sometimes when they are revised the signatures don't stay. I do have a signature from Dr. Roof. Course fees: we discussed in curriculum regarding the process, they are approved by the BoG at end of term, so that information cannot be there. I don't think that's relevant to this proposal.

C: I remember that now, thank you.

Motion to accept Core Curriculum Proposal Art 1141 (first reading), Core Curriculum Proposal English 2240 Revised (first reading), Core Curriculum Proposal CHEP 1100 (first reading), Core Curriculum Proposal CHEP 1110 (first reading), Core Curriculum Proposal Nursing 1025 (first reading). Niichel/Long. PASSED

C: I don't think it's relevant to what we're doing. I did note that Nursing syllabus still has 1199 as the course number.

R: I will take that back to our Dean.

Minor Items

None

IX. Announcements/Information/Discussion

- i. General Education Faculty Director (on going search)

Susan sent an email yesterday with further information. If you're interested in applying, the committee is still considering applications.

Q: curiosity, since our Gen Ed is now called Core? Why did we change the title of the position? It encompasses more than just the Core. You have Writing Intensive and transfer agreements.

Q: Is it known how many people have applied? Can we know?

R: I don't know.

Q: What happens if nobody applies?

R: There have been, but the committee chair is not on now to give you that information.

ii. Deans & Chairs Evaluations

Those have been sent out.

C: We have 1 more day for the evaluations, then they will be cut off after close of business tomorrow.

Q: next year, if the design of the document would allow us to see all the options along with the description of what we are responding to. I found the description, if I wanted to choose not observed I had to scroll back and forth.

R: Merri I agree, we were using the old document, one of the suggestions was to split up N/A and not observed because they are two different answers. Next year our hope for this body is we can come up with a true evaluation that's not a survey. Provost asked if we could put it in Digital Measures. Yes, but, we didn't have a process to make into a workflow. So, Senate and Provost will need to work on that so we can adopt something different. It deserves something that can give more thought.

R: Provost: Part of my thinking was that this did not happen last year, and the undeveloped status of it as far as Digital Measures. I see this as an experimental model that we could refine something we really want. For example, one of the things that is evident was the questions for deans and chairs was almost exactly the same. Should we separate those out as far as what we are expecting? I would suggest you look at this as a beta model you'll be working with and developing for the next time around. Hopefully with more of a routinization.

iii. Academic Calendar (potential pay period problems)

Addressed previously.

iv. Book Store Issues and book costs

Q: Any additional information, information about Follet contract?

R: Rick Harvey, not much to update. After the conversation at the last meeting, the textbook committee is developing a survey of faculty members. We were making changes but no one asked the faculty. So we intend to go back and ask faculty questions. Not sure if it will get done before the end of the academic year.

v. Commencement

Discussed Previously

vi. Faculty Awards Funding

A couple years ago the then Provost and I met with the Foundation to propose a new award be created for Excellence in Online Teaching because we always have some fully online instructors nominated for the faculty awards, but, they usually don't score nearly as high as face to face instructors due to the nature of the scoring criteria. During this conversation the Foundation expressed they wanted to get out of the business of funding the faculty awards. Through the past several months, I have learned that the Foundation had stopped funding the Foundation Fellow and Foundation Grant awards through a side comment in discussions but that the University had picked up the tab for that. A few weeks ago I was told that there was a lot more funding available this year for the Straight award, and was asked what the committee wanted to do with it. I asked

Caitlyn to do some more digging to find out why there was more than double the normal funding available. She found that the Foundation had the family who created the endowment sign a new agreement in the fall. The original agreement had the funding split between FSU and Pierpont, the new agreement brings it all to FSU and states this is the last year for the award as the endowment will now go to student scholarships. I do not know the current status of funding for the Boram, Abelina Suarez, Advising, or Adjunct awards. The question is, now that the Foundation is not funding awards, does the Administration have plans to continue funding the awards going forward?

R: (Stephens) I don't understand the whole rationale for the foundation not funding. We did manage to fund it this year. The intent certainly is to make sure the funding is secure going forward as we transition. It would send the wrong message to do away with them. My intent before I leave is to make sure the funding, and where it comes from going forward is articulated.

Q: So, my follow up question would be if the Administration intends to continue an award for the same emphasis and criteria of the Straight award, which was the only endowed award?

Q: (Dr. Martin), why do we need to if there is an endowment?

R: The Foundation had the family sign a new agreement that shifts the endowment from the award to scholarships.

R: (Dr. Martin) I did not know that, I wish I had. I would encourage you to work with Dr. Stephens to articulate the funding for each award and we can continue them going forward.

C: I think the issue is that the Foundation Grants were all made out of unrestricted dollars, they didn't come from endowments.

vii. Live Streaming classes
Placeholder

viii. SOARS classes clarification

Carol has been emailing a constituent. Comp Sci/Math want to make a SOAR/FYS class. We just wanted clarification on if it's still possible. I think what we understand now is a 1 hour maybe now, but a more than 1 hour maybe.

R: Carol. It does. Background: we have been talking about soar since 2006, we have run every version 3, 2, 1 credits, etc. When all was said and done and we had a strong push to get it in Core, it narrowed to a one credit extended orientation. We had a business class that already made a course that was grandfathered in. Other than that, all sections are taught as an extended orientation. If you look at the course in the scheduled there are different sections noted with different departments, those courses simply are taught by someone in that umbrella so students have another touchpoint in that department. There is nothing about those courses that is taught differently than any other. We did that out of necessity to start, now recently HLC requirements we aren't complicating it more by creating new versions of SOAR at this point. We recently did approve the Nursing, that was strictly out of an accreditation nightmare to get the one credit course in there. I worked closely with Alexis to get the SOAR infused in there. We are going to

clean up the Honors, Business, and nursing to make it all the same. We do hope in the future to make it 2 credits so we can add more, but, we aren't there yet.

Q: so if I understand correctly, business and nursing get to build into an onboarding class but no one else can?

R: Nursing was an accreditation issue. Nursing had an exemption initially that they weren't even required to take it because of that. As far as Business is concerned, I would like to see that SOAR course separate from the course it's in or be a 2 credit course and 1 credit lab that is the traditional soar. But right now, we are sticking with the traditional setup.

Q: Merri: What is it the program is trying to do? You can't fit much more in a 1 credit class?

R: we aren't proposing a new class, we are proposing editing an existing class to add SOAR components in.

Q: but it's not an accreditation issue?

R: No

C: Merri: business did have theirs in place before SOAR was a thing.

Q in chat: Will there be an online option for SOAR, students who have only online classes have asked so they don't have to come on campus.

R: There is not an online SOAR course right now, most of the SOAR courses right now were taught f2f with the exception of some who were unable to come because of COVID. Other than that, no. Dr. Martin's answer is we are a face to face school, there is not a better time to be meeting with our students than in a SOAR class. I do recognize that at some point in the future that is probably something we will have to look at.

C: I remember a few years ago, we were told we could create our own sections. If that is not the case anymore, faculty should be told.

Letters of Appointment:

Wanted to share some information. There has been a great deal of infusion regarding letters of appointment. Going to share a timeline (on screen). Years without letters, they didn't want to spend the money to generate them. 3 years ago we received them but were told we didn't have to sign them. In 2020 we were told we did have to sign, didn't in 2018 because they were full of banner errors.

In 2020 we were told we have to sign, and I was told when I did not sign because I was uncomfortable was that HR's assumption was that I did not plan to return in the fall. I have no interest in giving up my position, but had concerns about the letter. Since, I have heard from faculty that their signed letter was rejected because they commented on language they rejected. HEPC series 9 does allow for I to assume faculty have abandoned their employment, but also states that faculty objecting to terms do not waive their objections to terms by signing the document. Wanted to share the information because A there is a great deal of confusion, B, a response on the part of the I that is snarky/bullying, and we can sign them and not waive our objection to information in them.

C: what, practically speaking, does it mean to not waive our objections in signing the contract?

R: I'm not a lawyer but I take it to mean I can sign it to indicate I do intend to return to my job, but that I'm not waiving my objection to content in the letter that I might find objectionable like I'm responsible for counseling students when I don't have that kind of degree.

Q: is there anyone who can speak on behalf of the admin

Rick Stephens: I can stir the pot, but not give concrete answers. At this point we are in the neighborhood of 6-10 who have had questions, that doesn't mean faculty don't have questions they just haven't went to the extent of asking. The process is, that it is possible that without signing the letter an abandonment of the position could result. My guess is that would not happen by way of an email. But that people would have to discuss that out. At the same time, there may be terms in there such as counseling that on the one hand have a more substantive understanding of if it's legal, or just an additional adjective, but there's a question someone might reasonably have. Your objecting to that happens after you have signed the letter, you can still deal with HR as well as with general counsel but the process is to turn in the letter to avoid abandoning then deal with the contract details such that there is a standard or criterion you are being asked to perform, that that gets documented in a way that satisfies as many people as possible. There were other similar kinds of things like ADA edits in the letter, ADA accommodations happen after you have indicated you want the job, as opposed to before you want the job. Again, turning it in first, then dealing with HR and would include Deans, Department Chairs, etc. to firm up some condition around a particularly faculty persons performance. That's where we are. It's not a widespread issue in my opinion.

Q: If I understood what you said, I think there are a lot of people who read series 9.12.4 and made the decision they were going to sign. Did I understand you to say, now everyone needs to document what their objections are in order to preserve those?

RL I would say if someone has questions, those questions should be directed to HR. Clarification is the first step, through HR. Sometimes, the communication and clarification can resolve the issue. If, there is something substantive, then there is a more in depth interaction with HR, and if it has an impact on a faculty person's work life, processes, accommodations that need to be made, something else that should e documented around an item that is the process they should go through. I can't imagine there will be scores of these every year, but a handful. One of my experiences is that there are presumptions that people make. Donna has made a reasonable point, what does counseling mean, etc. I think that if someone wants to keep their job, sign it, turn it in, then go to HR to clarify/object and further clarify or accommodate.

Q: A question I have heard from a lot of faculty, the language is a little bit different this year. In the past it was your course load will be 3 or 4 courses, now it says you will teach 12 hours a semester. Does that mean that there is an intent within the admin, while 12 is standard, is it meant to imply that they will raise the standard from 12 hours to 16 hours or 18 hours? Is that why the language is changed?

R: No, the idea of hours is trying to get at a quantity of work. Of course, there are people who don't teach 12 hours, they teach 8 hours and admin for 4. It's a quantity of work that does have ambiguous edges. Were there to be an action on the part of anybody to say now there is exigent circumstances and we have to boost the teaching load to 16 hours or something. That would happen out of a lot of events. As we have gone through the pandemic, and actually have faculty

who are now fully remote and in some instances we were only able to hire faculty mostly at the term level but only at the last minute, those faculty were not going to be on senate, chairs, or other service functions. Question was how do we build a full work load, some of those cases they are teaching 15-16 hours. There will be edges where they will be negotiated. I don't see anything now as far as a general move from a quantity of work from 12 credits. I don't think you want to define it too tightly because you do want people in certain areas to be able to venture into different kinds of legit AA work.

R: Thank you, that was helpful.

X. Open Forum

Constituents ask about student instructor evaluations. How long do they take? They were locked out of Blackboard in the past, is that still happening? Concern was they'd rather students be studying for finals instead of filing thee out.

R: They take maybe 5 minutes, they aren't locked out of Blackboard this semester. Has that hurt our response rate? Definitely. We went from 93% to 43%. Yes, I would rather they study fort finals, but they end before finals start so that's not a concern. I purposely have them scheduled not to coincide. I understand the students' concern, they don't understand how much you and I rely on them.

Is there a book chosen for the fall for the common read?

None known. Molly will reach out to the committee.

Motion to adjourn 5:31

Next Meeting: April 27 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 April 6 2021 for consideration by the Executive Committee.**