

Fairmont State University Faculty

Senate Meeting Minutes

April 27, 2021

3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. Reading & Approval of the minutes from the April 13, 2021 meeting

Motion to approve Long/Cuchta. Passed

Correction: p3. Committee on committees – nominating committee left off last names for Denice Kirchoff, Janet Floyd, Rachel Cook

II. Reading and acceptance of Senate Proclamation Honoring Departing Colleagues

Jim Matthews read the Proclamation [in attachments]. Brought to the EC as an idea, and we thought it was an excellent idea. We truly do appreciate them. Thank you all. We are going to miss you.

Motion to accept the Proclamation for posting on the Senate Webpage. Reneau/Cuchta. Passed

III. President Martin

Unable to attend.

IV. Welcome to Provost Phillips

Welcome to Provost Phillips.

Thank you for the invitation. I want to say thank you to all of you, I got to meet many of you during Commencement this weekend. First of all, when you are starting a new job, starting at Commencement is the ideal time because it is the pinnacle of what we do as a University. This year, it was particularly special. I know the students were appreciative, I got to interact with some of them and their families. I am officially on day 2 of the job, it's very exciting. I have been meeting one on one with Deans and my direct reports. I am happy to be here. Coming to FSU is my dream job, especially as Provost, as a WV native to come back to this state and work with you, to be deeply involved in teaching and learning at this Institution - doing something I care so much about is quite spectacular for me.

Dr. Martin did send me a text and wanted to express her appreciation to you for Commencement, your attendance, the fact that we were a f2f I all year long, meant a lot. Kudos. I hope you all have a safe, relaxing, rejuvenating summer if I don't get to see you face to face to go off to enjoy your summer.

V. Provost Stephens

No more Memoranda from Provost Stephens, we are done with those.

Dr. Phillips and I have already met for several hours, before this week even, as well as even earlier today. The transition is happening. I can't exactly draw a line between all the things that Dr. Phillips may do and I might do, we are just pledged to each other that we will get "it" done. Feel free to send things along to myself, as well as Dr. Phillips, but always CC Caitlyn – she keeps us straight and well informed. We will continue to do the routine business of the

University. Signing off on all kinds of purchase requests, Registrar items, etc. My effort is to shed more and more of that to Dr. Phillips, but she is in the midst of trying to transition. So, that is move from one place to another. It's hard for her to be up to speed on everything. We will do a tag team, and we will get it covered. If for some reason something is dropping through the cracks, send a note to Caitlyn, she will track one of us down and we will fix it up.

It's been a really fulfilling year to spend time with all of you. I'm sorry I didn't get to meet more of you than I have. I saw Robin Payne today in the Provosts office, I said it was the first time I've seen you in 3D. It's been a more recent kind of experience. I would not trade this last 9 months or so. You have something substantial here. This is an I since the Civil War, it has meaning in it because you pour your lives into it. That is evident to me every day. I am appreciative of the fact that you have allowed me to share that with you for a while. I hope I have done no harm, and maybe we have done some good along the way.

VI. Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

i. BoG Representative, Gina Fantasia

The BoG met on April 15. Approved a number of curriculum proposals. Also approved the recommendation to change the schools to colleges effective July 1. The bylaws committee because the 30-day posting period passed approved the new gift acceptance policy, and revised drug policy.

Special meeting on the 19th in which there was discussion in Exec Session but no actions taken.

ii. ACF Representative, Jim Matthews

No report for you today. Since the end of session, things have been quiet.

Thanks to Jim for serving this past year, he stepped in when we needed it. We will be welcoming Bill Harrison as the new rep on July 1.

iii. Committee on Committees

Many emails from faculty, the committee put them together into a list. That list is in the documents you received. I did get a couple more after, I can say, this committee will still accept things over the summer if there are corrections, etc. Email Tom. In fall we will have the final slate for the Senate.

iv. Nominating Committee

Denice chaired. Sent us a report that was provided. We will vote on the slate later in the agenda.

It was a smooth process to get the nominations confirmed. Looking forward to approval of them.

Thank you for your work, and agreeing to chair. Thank you to all the committee who served as well.

VII. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

COVID Committee

Todd: Welcome Dianna. Thank you, Rick, for your service.

Thank the 13 committee members who volunteered to serve on this committee. Ad Hoc committee will go the way of the pumpkin at midnight when the academic year expires, and must be re-instituted at the beginning of each academic year. Hopefully this one does not have to be.

Takeaways this year: looking forward to faculty having greater involvement for planning for fall semester particularly with Covid. There seems to be a rather disturbing idea that this will go away in the fall – it's not going to go away in the fall. Faculty need to be involved to a much greater extent than we have been.

Appreciate all you have done this year keeping us informed, and raising issues.

Q: Given that the ad hoc committee is going to disband. What do you see, Todd, as the possibilities for getting faculty voices into the planning process?

R: That's a good question. I think it's just an issue of dialog. I was going to spend my summer in England as always, but that's off the books now. I have nothing but time to spend talking to Dianna.

VIII. Student Government Report

On behalf of all students, I would like to thank you all, you have persevered through a tough year and helped us all succeed. Cassie and I will no longer be the Reps. Next year it should be Logan Cottrel and Trey Jones. I will try to get them caught up on everything you guys do.

Zach Taylor is the newly elected President of SG. My admin has a lot in the works. This year we focused mainly on service, but we are also going to try to implement some things on campus as well.

If you need anything from us, or have ideas for us on things we can do together, we would be happy to talk with you about that.

IX. Unfinished Business

Major Items

- i. Faculty Handbook (tabled at Faculty Handbook (tabled at December meeting))

Remain tabled as that process unfolds. It has taken some turns we did not anticipate. Not quite ready for discussion and approval.

- ii. Proposed revisions to Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws (second reading)

I realized about 10 minutes ago, what I sent you was what I sent you last time without any of the revisions. Let me assure you that the revisions that were discussed will be part of what ultimately gets presented. Particularly in regard to changing schools to colleges, and the election of senators will be left to the colleges to determine how they are disbursed across the college as opposed to units being responsible.

C: I think I would rather see it recompiled and reedited version before I vote.

Motion to table the matter until the next meeting Niichel/Long. Passed

I agree, I think it's a good idea, and I don't think there will be a delay for putting it off for the August meeting.

iii. Proposed Syllabus Template (second reading)

Sent as attachments revised based on comments.

Susan: These are the common syllabus elements the FS would agree on that would go into Digital Measures as the Master Syllabus. Then, when we have an HLC visit they would be able to pull these syllabi and look at the outcomes, etc.

Q: Are we going to have to upload all of this separately for each course? My understanding is that for every course we teach, we will have to upload this information separately section by section as opposed to being allowed to upload a PDF or Word File.

Susan: That is not my understanding, it would be a PDF.

Q: So maybe just clarify. So, this is a separate upload into Digital Measures, not just having the syllabi being consistent with content as part of what we already do in TS. Because we already load all syllabi into TS for each course and by program. So this would be in addition to that?

Susan: I am going to punt to Merri to clarify.

R: Some are uploading to TS, some aren't. Last year when we adopted Digital Measures, you are supposed to upload syllabi into your teaching section. I believe my predecessor required them in TS. Most faculty have started requiring in Digital Measures unless you are doing it for accreditation reasons.

R: Yes, we do it for accreditation. I am just trying to make sure everywhere things have to be.

Merri: I don't want to mess up your accreditation, if I know College of Business does theirs in TS, I will tell HLC that they can find yours in TS. I believe some of your faculty are doing both. As we move to Tenure and Promotion workflows they will need to be in both for that purpose. Back to Susan's item, they all need to have common elements. You need to agree on what those are. They will look for consistency across sections of a course, no matter the format they are taught. We have to have the same learning outcomes and similar assessments because we are both teaching the same course. That's what they are looking for. We learned 2 weeks ago they are becoming sticklers on common syllabus elements. It doesn't matter where we load them but that we are all adhering to a similar structure, all have learning outcomes, all have a section on grading, etc. We only have 18 months until our visit.

Q: I understand course learning outcomes are the same for each section of a course. The Unit has agreed on those. When you say similar assessment, I want to make sure I understand.

R: I mean more along the lines of rigor. I may do a 10-page paper, Gina may do a 15 page. She may have a specific topic, I may allow the student to pick a topic. But, there needs to be similar rigor in what you're looking for in that assignment to prove that learning outcome. I am not taking your freedom away, but show some stability. I'm picking names because I can see certain faces on the screen. A professor may say Donna learned all of outcome 3, Gina didn't, but our papers were the same in different sections. We want to show consistency but not take away your academic freedom.

Q: In one course where there's a separate section an adjunct teaches. We have common learning outcomes, we have agreed on exams and paper assignment for each outcome, and share rubrics, but for the other things that are outside that she can do

- what she wants, I do discussion boards, but those are not the things pegged as assessment mechanism for learning outcomes.
- R: That is exactly what I would like to see from an evaluator's point of view. Using even the same general rubric would prove you have the same rigor whether yours is a multi-page paper or just a 5-page paper. I don't want to stifle, but I need to prove every faculty member teaching that course and no matter how – every student came out with the same opportunity to show they met the learning outcome.
- Q: Example: world lit. I can envision someone making that very test driven, and someone making it paper driven. Is that okay?
- R: Susan: I can address that. One of the things we are looking for is the rigor. So, in the learning outcomes, one of the factors they look at is the learning outcomes, cognitive level (Blooms). If something is to evaluate literature, or compare/contrast writing, etc., then they look and there's extreme differences – one is using multiple choice and one is doing case studies or writing assignments that better meet the higher learning outcome that is how they look at the rigor of assessments. That could be a difference in assessment – all multiple choice for an examine and evaluate type of outcome.
- R: The hardest part is the faculty member who is using said exam has to show how they have written the Q so it has strong rigor, the answers will be hard for the student to identify the word they are looking for in A. It will take detailing how they feel that is the same as your paper with the rubric. It's harder on the faculty to read papers and grade on a rubric. It would be easier if in 2200 that's where you assess outcome 3, that we each use the same instrument whether it's a paper or exam. If you use multiple choice exams, we need to make sure we are writing those questions appropriately and we are using a similar test so we don't get dinged on one professor being harder than another. It's not an easy yes or no answer.
- R: I think, with all due respect, it does sound like it's encroaching on academic freedom. Whether a student thinks one instructor is harder than another is a student perspective.
- R: The evaluators will look at how you justify it in TaskStream. They will look at 1 and 2 and see how they are assessed in different sections.
- Q: Learning outcomes are not a problem, how they reach those need to be appropriate for the outcomes, instructor, and course.
- R: This is why good conversations are essential, have the conversation as a faculty on how you defend the rigor across. I am concerned because this is what we have been dealing with for 5 years with HLC. We all got dinged by HLC 5 years ago, so heavily that we had to come up with Carnivals to get back on track with assessment and they have taken it one step further. It threw us for a loop that we have to get this detailed. All bodies are moving from regional to national, that is likely why. It will either help or hinder, so we are going to see them all start having similar criteria. I see them all becoming similar, which is a shame because institutions are different. Every geographical region has a different culture, student base, and I see we are losing autonomy in our accrediting body, that means we will lose the ability to say this works on some things. Not our call, we just have to try to adapt. We just want to make sure we can agree on the minimal needs in a syllabus, and you all take it from there. If there are other sections you want to add, add them, but I can say when HLC comes, these xxx items will be in everyone's syllabus. But, in humanities they will have this, and Business has this for their accreditors. I don't want too many topics in there, but a general [format] across the board.
- C: In nursing, we have had a template for a few years and it works well, it is kept on a shared drive, then when we want to change something we change it on the template and everyone has a guide to follow and does their own tailoring to it. But the core

components are still there.

R: That's exactly what we're trying to do. HLC wants us to be able to say we have said template.

C: I feel confident I can defend my rigor.

R: That's the important thing!

Phillips: This is a bit outside of this. Accrediting bodies get accredited as well, they have been under the gun. HLC is one of the regional accrediting agencies, the largest. It spans from WV to Arizona/NM. Those agencies get accredited by the federal government. So, things roll uphill and downhill at the same time. Something to keep in mind in the grand scheme.

C: Just so I understand, Susan, what you are asking us to vote on are the content of this, not where or how to store it.

R: That is correct.

C: We do all put everything in Blackboard, and Digital Measures, so there is at least two places we put them now.

Motion to approve for second reading Reneau/ Cuchta.

- iv. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-05 (second reading)
- v. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-06 (second reading)
- vi. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-13 (second reading)
- vii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-27 (second reading)
- viii. Curriculum Proposal 20-21-28 (second reading)

- ix. Core Curriculum Proposal Art 1141 (second reading)
- x. Core Curriculum Proposal English 2240 Revised (second reading)
- xi. Core Curriculum Proposal CHEP 1100 (second reading)
- xii. Core Curriculum Proposal CHEP 1110 (second reading)
- xiii. Core Curriculum Proposal Nursing 1025 (second reading)

Motion to approve all 10 for second reading. Reneau/Niichel. Passed.

X. New Business

Major Items

- i. Acceptance of Committee on Committees Report (first reading)

Bylaws require a first reading at this meeting, second reading in the fall.

Move to accept for first reading Niichel/Long. Passed.

- ii. Core Curriculum Application Scie 1250 (first reading)

Motion to accept for first reading. Niichel/Cuchta. Passed.

Q: Stephen, just to be sure, this the right version? Also, a request to waive the time period.

Motion to waive the time period. Reneau/Cuchta. Passed

Motion to approve for second reading. Reneau/Niichel. Passed.

Minor Items

- i. Acceptance of year end committee reports
 - Senate Webmaster Report
 - Faculty Development Committee
 - Institutional Review Board

Motion to accept all the reports. Reneau/Fantasia. Passed.

For the webmaster report: I put in there what I found historically of senate archives, there are a lot of gaps in the website. The process I went through in the last 2 years to try to fill those gaps. There is a lot outstanding. If anyone wants to take the list and go through your old email, I will take everything you have.

Update on awards:

Stephens: did some tracking on the Suarez, those funds are available, vary a little from year to year because of earnings, but not radically. So I asked Caitlyn to prepare the award funding as was proposed. We have, in a sense, set aside the Suarez because it will come from a different source than budget. That will show in the final document we put together on this. Here's the awards, here's the amount, brings the budgeted amount to under 10k with Suarez on top. Did include the new online teaching award. I think we are in good shape.

XI. Election of Officers for 21/22 Academic year

i. Nominating Committee Slate

Charles Shields – President
Donna Long – VP
Jason Noland – Secretary
Bob Niichel – Webmaster
Jim Davis – At Large
Stephen Rice- At Large
Todd Clark – At Large

C: As a matter of explanation, I am not up for election. My term is 2 years as set by bylaws. The other members are being voted on.

ii. Nominations from the floor

I think we can accept the slate by acclamation.

So moved Oxley/Reneau.

Thanks to Tom and Paul for your service.

XII. Announcements/Information/Discussion

ii. Handbook Committee Interim Report to the Faculty Senate

C: In regard to PTAR. Post Tenure Achievement Review. Committee determined to send this to Senate for informational purposes at this point. It's not ready for a vote. There is anticipation this will become part of the handbook. It is up for discussion. Rick Stephens is here, he initially presented it to the committee. I would submit the lead with a rationale.

R: In any handbook revision/review there are a variety of interested parties. When I received from the committee an initial draft I took it to the Deans Council. We chatted ahead of time knowing it was coming. Are there things you would like to see in it on any item? We spent some meetings talking about these. Chuck was at some of them. So, we produced an array of suggested items to be either addressed, and in many cases, they are in the revisions, or aren't explicitly but we think could be. Post Tenure review of some sort was one of those. I think a definition of remote faculty is going to be one that needs done. A few other things like that. The concept to me of shared governance is to sit down and talk about them, that's what we did. I took a couple different documents, one of which was a narrative that had all the commentary from deans and others and shared that with the handbook committee to discuss. I will say regarding PTAR that was not our first iteration. I recall the first meeting where we had that on the table, it was an interesting process. A few who didn't want to talk about it, and others who said why don't we look at it, and if there's something we can improve we can work at it that way. I would say to Chuck and Todd, that's pretty much what happened over 3 different meetings with some work behind the scenes between to sharpen it up. My opinion is, whereas post tenure review in a lot of places is seen as a second tenure or something like that and is a bit heavy handed, the product that came out of this is to me a unique document which talks about faculty development rather than faculty critique. But what it does is call our attention to is that once tenure is awarded that there is a continued expectation of work from the faculty member. Promotion is based on work already done, whereas tenure does require previous work but also a relationship between the U and faculty member in the future. So, it's future oriented. In that regard a post tenure academic review makes us think about where we are and provides opportunity for faculty as they become senior faculty to modify or change the nature of their work. What you're doing as a young asst professor or term faculty trying to find your way into tenure, there is a behavior that is different than someone who is 15-20-year service faculty where we expect leadership and mentorship, including what many of you are evidencing right now as service on a critical body. To create continuous pathways or planning for what they want to do to keep the I vibrant and deliver the mission of the I was a general argument I made. After having put a proposal out on the table, after that it was committee work. People might ask me what I think, I'd say it looks good to me but it was handled by members of the committee. I wanted to make sure you were aware this was a point of discussion, that's why it was on the agenda for today.

C: We submit annual reports yearly. It feels like we don't get feedback regularly/often. I think we submitted these in October last semester and a week or so ago I'm starting to hear back. That's a long-time lag. I don't understand how we can expect the structures we have to respond to more assessments when the ones we have aren't responded to in a timely fashion.

C: I laughed when you said that, while we were sitting here talking I received two emails. First one, invitation to respond to annual review materials – they are now available for review. Your response is due by Feb 23, 2021. At the same time, I received a message from Digital Measures saying my response was past due. Tom is right, unless we fix the foundation, it's clearly broken, how is it we can go forward with a post tenure review especially for those facing their first and have not gotten AFR feedback, and without any performance objectives set by the evaluators.

R: I think all of those things are behind or supportive of the broader idea that reviews are important, but they are mostly important if we do them right. And that we have put a stake in the ground and said okay let's take a look at this and make sure that what's happening makes sense. Documentation is important. Doing the reviews is important. One of the bottlenecks this year was myself, where 180 reviews started populating my email back in January, where I simply didn't know the vast majority of those involved. I was being asked to make substantive comment

on that and it didn't work at that time. The fact that something didn't work at some other level isn't reason to not try to make the entire thing better. For example, we have P&T but haven't had progress toward P&T. We do first- and second-year review, then it's a desert unless someone takes them under their wing. I think what we are trying to do is hit the reset button. Here is post tenure review, are there other things around it that need attention? We can hit the reset button on those as well.

Q: Do you have an incentive in mind for a post tenure review? ...move people to tenure jobs.

Q: The question I would have is, we already have the AFR. I'm honestly trying to figure out why we need something beyond that. If the AFR is functional, then on a regular basis both people approaching tenure and those who have earned it will be getting the dialog and feedback out of that. So, to me, I'm puzzled an additional process is necessary. Because it can and should be done as part of what everyone does.

R: I think we're in a moment with AFR's generally, and based on my work with not only the FSU personnel committee, but in other I where the process has a lot of informality to it, a fair amount of that was our precedent in terms of evaluating. So, to take an AFR every 5th year and put more of a spotlight on it and think about where we want to be in the next several years? What does the I need? What does the faculty member need? Takes the routinization out of it. Takes the AFR away from a laundry list of things and more of a discussion of role and what you are trying to achieve. I think people will need to take a look at the document and see what it means. For some of the other questions, some of them are fairly loaded. There was no desire to weaken tenure. I can say there is nothing associated with that.

Q: What will be the effect, then, of this post tenure review? Simply providing the Admin with means to terminate faculty with cause? Where is the accountability? Will admin review pass through the faculty?

R: I am trying to answer that. Because your questions presume a particular kind of answer.

C: I don't assume you had any intent to weaken tenure, I assume the goal was to improve accountability for faculty, but there is no accountability the other direction. It seems the main result will be to weaken tenure.

R: If that is a completely definitive statement that you believe I can't change your mind. I will tell you that having been provost a multiple I there are a wide variety of faculty performances under the guise of tenure where faculty want to and should be able to change their focus. There are times when you can and cannot get faculty to serve on various committees and an I should always be looking to improve itself. The revision of the document focuses on faculty development. The benefit to any one particular faculty member is a more healthy and robust faculty.

C: So it's out there for people to look at and consider, we can have discussion at the start of next year. We can't resolve it today, but it is a good idea to have it out there so people can look at it and consider it and discuss it.

Q: In addition to Todd's comments about needing performance objectives, but also a definition of what constitutes meritorious needs to be in place. Am I meritorious because I serve on senate but

suck in the classroom? How do I decide? Those need to be mapped out, and I suspect there are other I that have this in place. I don't think we need to reinvent the wheel but it needs to be mapped out and understandable for faculty or you're going to have the kinds of concerns we have had already in this discussion.

C: Again, all of those things, and I understand what Rick is saying. I think one of the good things about FSU faculty is we have people that do care about their teaching skills and service. To me, the issue is perhaps appropriate training and more effective utilization of the AFR because we have this process in place. I do get your statement on the routinization, but maybe more effective training on the use of it. That document, outlining what pre-tenure and post-tenure should look like.

C: To point out the obvious, if serving on senate, which I am happy to do, is something that is expected of tenured faculty or senior faculty as part of shared governance and that proves their worth, as we have talked about all year, we have a lot of term faculty serving and doing heavy lifting on senate and senate committees while basically getting no benefit to moving their positions forward as far as we have been able to tell.

Q: Do you have anything to say about the incentivization of the process?

R: I think I addressed that when I said an I needs to be continuously improving. I think you're asking if there is incentivization to a faculty member as far as compensation or some sort. We haven't discussed that.

Q: Todd, I believe you served on a sub-committee that drafted part of this.

R: No, we did not draft. We edited the provisions. One of the things that, looking at the working draft version 6, we changed the name to Post Tenure Achievement Review. One of the edits, acknowledges – precisely addresses the concern of the fact that there is an AFR process in place. We wanted to differentiate this from the outset. I think everybody agrees with that. So we went ahead and did that. Then we spent a lot of time on process as far as who is responsible for the rating under this review? Is it the chair or dean? And, how is this process done in terms of the review itself? Who supplies what? Faculty supplies current CV, etc. The rest of the relevant things should be available in Digital Measures simply from the AFR review. We acknowledge a number of things that need addressing, particularly developmental opportunities like sabbaticals. I can't think of any better opportunity than a sabbatical. I think they have been cancelled for 3 years. It's not just a matter of salary. But we did leave up in the air meritorious recognition, but there may be a separate level of effort because that starts to get into faculty awards stuff, and faculty recognition. That needs to be fleshed out more. We took what we received, tried to remove some of the language [we] felt was punitive, and that is something the AFR is structured for. Then, [recognizing] this is a developmental tool, how can we take it to the next level. I strongly believe there needs to be a discussion between faculty member and chair/dean about what the level looks like and how can we codify that at the outset. Like performance objectives. It made sense in spirit to come out of this, what are the expectations of people post tenure but aren't going up for the next level of rank? It still remains a bit cloudy. I think the version that you have seen is the one we have worked on for the last 2 months.

C: My understanding is that the intent is really a starting point, and Bob and others, be sure your comments will be duly noted and returned to the committee to be discussed. Some have already been discussed there, I will say. I think that is part of what this process is about, to bring this to

Senate at this point, see what the comments and areas for concern were and go back to work on it more. Eventually this will become part of the handbook and we will have the faculty forums in the fall. Who knows what it will end up looking like.

C: Thanks to Rick for bringing this to the committee's attention, I didn't know where to inject this into the FS structure. This one was appropriate as a basis for injection for discussion. I think if we are going forward with this, it needs to be built out and go forward from there. Once this becomes more of an actionable concept, yes, it's got to be injected into the faculty handbook.

Q: Where did the original document that the Faculty Handbook Committee worked on come from?

R: You mean the proposal? Yea, I took a piece of paper to the handbook committee. It was created from me, conversations with Deans and other Admin, knowing something about what is happening in Higher Ed. I am not in a vacuum. As I think about what we are trying to accomplish as an I, I said here's one thing we ought to at least think about.

iii. Core Curriculum Transfer Credit Form

Informational purposes. I did not understand this as something that needed approved. I think it's been approved by the GS committee. Perhaps I am wrong.

Susan: It is just a notification. It is now updated to reflect Core Curriculum instead of General Studies and asks for a little more information we may need from students as they transfer. It was approved by GS committee at the last meeting.

Q: If an advisor submits this form, they aren't saying "And I think it should be approved." I am just a conduit?

R: Correct.

XIII. Open Forum

Executive Committee will meet to determine meetings for the next year.

Motion to adjourn: Cuchta.

Next Meeting: August 10, 2021 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.**