

Fairmont State University Faculty Senate
Meeting Agenda
August 10, 2021
3:00-5:00 p.m.

- I. Reading & Approval of the minutes from the April 27, 2021 meeting
 - Meeting called to order at 1500
 - Move to approve minutes Cuchta/Niichel
 - Motion passes – minutes are approved as presented.

- II. President Martin
 - Not available due to BOG finance committee meeting
 - Dr. Martin jointed at 1613 at this point and was announced by Chuck Shields
 - Floor ceded.
 - Thank you very much, appreciates the flexibility of Faculty Senate.
 - Visit today is to bring greetings for the beginning of the academic year and express gratitude for everything that was done last year and this year. Has been very impressed and grateful to address the needs of the university and where we need to improve. Asks for continued engagement with the community in dealing with each other and in helping to retain students. As of Friday last week we were 6% down from last year – other institutions are 20% down. Still has hope that we are going to break even – we have not brought in dual enrollment or winter term classes which will count towards that. Campus is alive again – exceptional job last week interacting with students and socializing with students. Reiterating thanks, greetings, and gratitude and request to continue to engage each other, ourselves, and our students.
 - No comments or questions

- III. Provost Phillips
 - Dr. Martin extends regrets. Once that meeting has concluded she will join the meeting.
 - Matt Swain is not able to meet with us today – Will talk about what she knows in that topic on the agenda.
 - Expressed thanks for a wonderful start of an academic year. It is very much appreciated. It's exciting to be here with the students. She has spent the last couple of months moving between MD and WV, but is now boots on the ground in WV. Approaching duties with a 'light touch' which is deliberate due to what we have gone through over the past 18 months.
 - Worked organically over the summer and on specific items, such as the faculty handbook. Excited to be here. Has been meeting with Faculty members one on one and looking forward to doing more of that this Fall. Introduction to 'Senior leadership team' includes Susan Ross, Robyn Payne, Sharon Mazure, Deans, and Department Chairs. Called it an academic social and will meet on a regular basis (tomorrow 9-11) to discuss what's happening with covid and invited Matt Swain. Once agreement is met within the entire group –purpose for meeting, goals, makeup of the group will be shared with the entire faculty.
 - Another thing not included in email is the educational technology center – introduced in PD last week "Falcon Format". There is a new center that reports to Joy Hatch. 4 members with 2 instructional designers (with Master's degrees) and trained in instructional design with best practice in Quality Matters. Kicked off

lunch and learn with new faculty last week. Educational designers are a resource to help with building out instructional support and design in Blackboard.

- Attended many sessions and recommends reviewing 2 recordings: EAB keynote address which included information and data at a national scale (Post pandemic world) which included trends that were interesting at a national level and Final Session of student and faculty panelists and what was most fascinating is that the trends the researcher noted the first day and what we heard in the panel discussion aligned. Found fascinating and disturbing at the same time. Invited Chuck Shields to join weekly meeting.
- Questions or comments are always welcome.
 - No questions asked.

IV. Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees

- BoG Representative, Gina Fantasia
 - We have 2 new board members – Jason Henderson and Jennifer Kinty were appointed to the board. John Schirripa and Dixie Yann rotated off the Board.
 - Scheduled board meetings were sent out through the end of the calendar year. Aug 19 at 0900 is next scheduled meeting in person and online – Agendas are on Fairmont State’s page and the secretary of state’s page. Open to the public since we are a public institution. Public and faculty are always welcome unless there’s an executive session.
 - No questions asked at this time.
- ACF Representative, Dr. Bill Harrison
 - Michael Farrell is stepping down as HEPC Chairman to be replaced by Andrew Payne
 - Chairman Farrell read a resolution honoring Dr. Corley Dennison, who is retiring as the HEPC’s Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
 - Dr. Christopher Treadway reported on recent college going patterns of high school graduates in the state – confirmed expectation that high income families are going to college in greater rates than lower income families.
 - Dr. Martin praised institutions and faculty for persevering during the last year.
 - Multimillion dollar high speed internet are in the final stages of completion.
 - Dr. Powel WVNET has turned 45 this year.
 - Bluefield State University was denied a branch campus in Wheeling.
 - No comments or questions.
- Rick Harvey, Bookstore Committee
 - Brief report – minimal activity since end of last school year.
 - Follett has 2 new software applications:
 - ADOPT changes how textbook adoptions take place (no choice, it’s how they’re moving). Once ADOPT is in place, ACCESS is designed to increase student access to all course materials. ADOPT has to come first. IT has been working to integrate but is not yet done. Must be functional before ACCESS is implemented. This was supposed to be done over the summer but should now be place in the Fall for spring adoptions.
 - Expect training for faculty if ADOPT is in place for spring adoptions. Current plan is to run a pilot of ACCESS with only one

unit (College of Business and Aviation) in the spring if ADOPT is up.

- At the request and suggestion of senate members – committee started to develop a faculty survey and has been through a couple of iterations before the school year. Will bring the survey back out and get feedback from a couple of people with a goal to send out in September. Survey to assess faculty knowledge of various components (costs, BOG policy 54).
- Donna Long question – do we know when the contract with Follett is up? Concerned if they are putting in place adoption requirements that change when the contract is up:
 - A: The Follett (bookstore) contract ends May 31, 2021, followed with a series of three one-year renewals. ACCESS has a cost associated with it and a different contract to negotiate. Rick quoted the contract date from an email from the CFO sent in April 2021.

V. Student Government Report

- SGA not present, may not have gotten email announcing the meeting. Chuck Shields will apologize and move on.

VI. Janet Floyd, Report on Student Athlete GPA and football progress reports

- Requested to be on agenda to update on student athlete GPA.
- Update on student athlete performance from last year:
 - Cumulative GPA was 3.4 including all 17 programs.
 - 121 student athletes received the Division 2 Academic Achievement award to student athletes that maintained a cumulative GPA of 3.5 over 4 semesters. All 17 athletic programs – every sport- was represented on that list. At least one on every team with 3.5 or higher.
 - Football progress reports for faculty feedback on student progress and attendance. Met with Coach Goodwin was open to feedback and was open to one of those between midterm and finals. Hopeful we can get a digital method to make this work. Don't want to be blindsided that athletes won't make 2.0 grades, so this will be after 4 week and midterms are in.
- Comments:
 - Donna Long – comment that students have to come to class to get signatures.
 - Bill Harrison - some athletes contacted to request information be sent directly to coach
 - Gina Fantasia – comments semester to semester and across campus with issue about some teams/athletes practice takes priority over attending class. You're talking to teams and athletes about going to class on time. Expressed sentiment of Students first, Athletes 2nd. Spend as much time working on academics as practicing sports. Expressed thanks – concurred by BH/Chuck Shields.
 - Chuck Shields – comment on academic versus athletic success and importance of academic success.
 - Provost Phillips – Agrees students first and athletes second. Meeting with Greg later this week. Really wants to talk about how our student athletes are doing and how do we work together to ensure their academic success since their future success will depend on their academic success. How do we work together to do that is the focus of meeting with Greg.

VII. Matt Swain, Badge/ID concerns

- Provost Phillips addressed concerns as Matt Swain was not present.
 - Matt Swain was just reporting on, not keeper of all things ID cards. Questions that were sent in are being answered right now by ELT and will be shared with the entire campus community. The idea of junction controls, for the last 8 years, has been used to access buildings as safety and security measures. Experienced active shooter and bomb threat scenarios and can speak to benefits of having security in our buildings. Questions will be answered and disseminated.
- Chuck Shields asked about the disposition of questions asked by faculty during the professional development session:
 - Provost Phillips – they were good questions and need to be shared broadly due to move towards single point access. Believes it will take a little while to get there since it has been worked on for 2-3 years and is not as far along as anticipated. Swipe systems are not up – except for SciTech. Bottom line is more to come/questions answered.

VIII. Unfinished Business

Major Items

- Faculty Handbook (tabled at Faculty Handbook (tabled at December meeting)
 - Chuck Shields – don't think it is ready for the vote, suggests that it should remain tabled since we don't have the new version. Not being considered as a body.
 - Robert Baker not present due to class, but may join later if senate still in session. Chuck Shields reports that he was preparing to report and that he has been working with Dr. Phillips on issues in the handbook process.
- Acceptance of Committee on Committees Report (second reading)
 - First reading was in April at end of year – bylaws provide for second reading at this meeting. This is probably going to change due to change in units and inclusion of people on committees.
 - Tom Cuchta – there has been a couple of changes since the last iteration, but mostly the same. One thing he didn't do was email chairs for people that are gone. May include individuals who have departed the University. If that is found alert Tom Cuchta or Executive Committee.
 - Chuck Shields – Reminds chairs to convene committee at beginning of this academic year to elect a new chair.
 - Donna Long – motion and second (Robert Niichel), no further discussion
 - Polled – motion passes.
- Core Curriculum Application Scie 1250 (second reading)
 - We waived that on the last meeting – in the minutes.
- Discussion on unfinished business
 - Constitution and bylaws from last meeting – no major discussion occurred

IX. New Business

Major Items

Minor Items

XII. Announcements/Information/Discussion

- Handbook Committee Report to the Faculty Senate (Dr. Baker)

- Dr. Baker jointed at 1627
- Chuck Shields – we looked at series IX for the handbook for definitions and the like. If we had exemption we be exempt from those as well.
 - President Martin – best practices are best practices. We should look to establish and adopt what makes the most sense for us and our needs (students/faculties/staff). When policies are being crafted multiple sources are evaluated to bring in best practices. HEPC has done a lot of work and policies are solid/strong. If we were fully exempt we could look at and modify them. We can use the resources at our disposal to chart a path for the University that makes more sense and is based on best practices and our stated goals.
- Robert Baker
 - Apologies to colleagues on handbook committee. No good reason, just the reason of summer vacation. Provost Phillips had several frank and constructive discussions over the summer. Committee finished draft of the handbook and was handed off to Dr. Stephens who was going to share it with Provost Phillips and General Counsel. Provost Phillips assured that she would work with Robert Baker to move it forward. Current plan is for Provost Phillips and counsel to respond in early to mid September, committee to submit to stakeholders at end of September. Still needs to do a final list of recommendations discussed last year. Fairly confident that we can produce a handbook for 21-22 with Provost Phillips consent and President Martin.
- Provost Phillips – has read the former handbook, current iteration, and other handbooks. General Counsel and Provost Phillips meeting on Thursday and have been apprised of conversations with Robert Baker. Robert Baker and Provost Phillips developed a timeline to get this iteration through the faculty senate and signed off on. Agrees with what was said.
- Donna Long – In follow up to discussion from last year at last senate meeting. Post-Tenure Academic Review, is it in the draft/what's going on with that?
- Robert Baker – it is in the draft
- Robert Niichel- can you provide greater detail – who will be reviewing and deciding if they are acceptable.
- Robert Baker – off the top of head the dean will look at post tenure review. Looked for Rick/Chuck for confirmation. Chuck Shields – several discussions and unsure of where it was left, but believes it was the Dean that would look at it and make decisions.
- Robert Niichel – what decision need to be made?
- Chuck Shields – Unsure
- Provost Phillips – what she remembers is that Robert Baker shared that there are sections even a draft that was incomplete. The PTAR was one of those sections and has not been resolved. More discussion is expected in the future.
- Gina Fantasia – concern is that we already have an AFR in place and concern that it is a nullification of tenure. Even under HEPC exemptions, we are not exempt from state law – state code is state code.
- Robert Niichel – Greater perspective on why post tenure review since we

do AFRs?

- Robert Baker – happy to share draft with anyone that likes it. Reads as DEAN will convene academic committee for submission with Chair, internal/external colleagues to make meritorious recognition.
- Robert Niichel – What does meritorious recognition matter?
- Robert Baker – was told that it needed be included. James Vassal(?) insisted that the committee needed to include a recommendation.
- Robert Niichel – Seems like an additional labor on part of faculty without benefit beyond that to the University.
- Robert Baker – What’s lacking is what the reward/compensation is for meritorious service.
- Robert Niichel – currently nothing in place?
- Robert Baker – no, when we submit recommendation, there are multiple parts of the handbook that are incomplete.
- Robert Niichel – what are the consequences of not doing? Accused of insubordination/forfeit of tenure?
- Robert Baker – question for provost. Assures senate that the first draft raised concerns about what that would do to tenure. Revised multiple times to move from disciplinary document to one of recognition.
- Robert Niichel – what are the consequences (directed to Provost Phillips)?
- Provost Phillips – this is one of those situations of listen and learn. I started off saying that Robert Baker said it is incomplete draft and was treated as a rough draft. Understanding that it is recognition and attached to meritorious compensation of some sort. Hasn’t had conversations with other than Robert Baker. It is currently planned as voluntary – this is not required. Understanding that Faculty Handbook is not punitive but creating a document that we can all live with together. This is a joint document that sets parameters with how you function as a faculty in conjunction with the Provost’s office. The concept of PTAR is a rough draft in the handbook and has been left as that. There will come a point in time when there will be a serious discussion about this but it has not happened yet.
- Robert Niichel – Hypothetically, a mandatory PTAR is possible at this time?
- Provost Phillips – Yes. I am unwilling to take it off of the table at this time, but we will be engaged in conversation. Nothing is being taken off of the table, and when the time comes have a robust conversation about it based on research/best practices.
- Robert Baker – Sharon Smith raised issue in committee meetings throughout the spring and sent an email with recommendations for this part of the handbook including the standards for evaluations. Many of the things that are said in the AFR deal with dispositions versus standards of performance. It would be ‘fool hardy’ to establish a 5 year review without having some sorts of standards.
- Provost Phillips – wants to add one other thing for faculty consideration. Goal as provost is always to encourage and recognize excellence in teaching. That is always the goal and how she wants to approach conversation of PTAR – to support excellence in teaching.
- Tom Cuchta – please send draft to Chuck Shields to forward to faculty
- Robert Baker – Thinks is better to get everything else back and share at a later time.

- Chuck Shields – what is the timeline recap?
- Robert Baker – Provost Phillips is working with Counsel to return around end of September. Committee will respond and finish recommendations and will submit to Provost Phillips and senate and once adopted will be sent to BoG as an information copy.
- Goal is by Sept 30 to have handbook finished
- One of the recommendations is for a standing handbook committee to be reviewed every year. Would need to be convened soon.
- Donna Long – there was a plan to have a couple of faculty forums, still in the works?
- Robert Baker – I don't think so.
- Robert Niichel – Why the change?
- Robert Baker – To speak frankly, delay on part of the administration. Plan was to hold in the spring term – Dr Stephens did not get back to committee until end of March/beginning of April and there was no time to do the forum. It does seem good at this point to get the handbook done.
- Gina Fantasia – I understand there was delay from the administration that prevented forums in the spring. How can we do this in true shared governance without faculty input before it is finalized?
- Donna Long - The administration's delay doesn't seem like a reason not to have full faculty input.
- Faculty Senate is the representative body of the faculty, and that will bring into play the aspect of shared governance.
- Gina Fantasia – is the idea that Faculty Senate will convene forums, is that the process?
- Robert Niichel – What is the role of the Faculty Senate in this process, given understanding that Faculty Senate has little to no authority in this process?
- Robert Baker objects strenuously to what was said. Committee is a hybrid committee constituted by the senate and works under the provost office.
- Handbook draft was shared last year with Faculty Senate. Committee incorporated feedback from Faculty Senate.
- Gina Fantasia – understanding that at the time the committee was put together was put together by the faculty senate and was charged to work with the provost to revise the handbook and is an arm of the Faculty Senate to work in tandem with the provost as a shared governance activity with faculty forums.
- Robert Baker – that is correct. In working with 3 provosts we have operated as an administrative committee as well.
- Robert Niichel – what purpose is there in bringing the handbook to the Faculty senate? Is that a legitimate authority?
- Robert Baker has discussed with Provost Phillips authority of handbook. The Handbook has been revised and edited with members of the faculty and shared with the faculty last November. There has been faculty input but comes out of the Provost's office and needs the consent of the President.
- Robert Niichel – does it need to be approved by the Faculty Senate?
- Robert Baker – I hope it will be. If we are going to have shared governance, it does need to be.
- Provost Phillips – I think I would agree with Robert Baker that if we are to have genuine shared governance that would be my hope. I had three

questions – one of which, where does it get its authority. That is why they are asking legal counsel due to the legal consequences of what's in the handbook beyond the academic or administrative role. I don't know the answer to your question right now.

- Robert Niichel – if there was a section that the Faculty Senate was opposed to, could Faculty Senate processes be used to instruct handbook committee to remove that section.
- Provost Phillips – I don't believe so.
- Robert Niichel – In my view of shared governance, each party has the ability to say no. Without that, it doesn't seem like shared governance.
- Tom Cuchta - Recall by BOG policy "insubordination in any form" can be responded to by termination:
<https://www.fairmontstate.edu/aboutfsu/sites/default/files/bog-policies/fsu-policy-64.pdf>
- Provost Phillips – Objects to concept that it doesn't matter what Faculty think, it does matter.
- Robert Niichel – so if Faculty Senate does not agree with the draft of PTAR, could strenuous objection by the Faculty Senate remove it from the handbook.
- Provost Phillips – I don't believe so.
- Robert Niichel- why have we devoted time if it doesn't require approval of faculty senate, and questions revolve around understanding authority of document?
- Robert Baker – historical presentation that faculty had little input into the handbook; it was revised by administration. We have had more faculty input and effort in revision and edits than recent.
- Gina Fantasia – can't speak to how handbook came about – but it was a collection of policies from administration and faculty senate and were collected into a single file. Some of these policies have been passed and approved by the faculty senate – has not had the understanding nor gotten the understanding that the handbook was created in someone's office then hoisted on the faculty. It derives from decisions that Faculty Senate voted on and was done by Faculty Senate with the administration in shared governance.
- Chuck Shields – Appreciate all of the discussion; Gina Fantasia and Robert Baker seem to have different understanding of the historical perspective. Having not been involved in the 94,95-,96,98 does not know how the handbook came into play. This is probably the most input the senate and faculty have had in reference to the handbook. The characterization that it doesn't matter what we say or do and the handbook will be what the administration decides is not accurate. We have influence through discussion and the ability to be a part of the process which is positive. We do have a handbook which is outdated and poorly written – I think the faculty would like the opportunity for at least 1 forum if not more into the whole process. I appreciate all that Robert Baker has done. What is the possibility of extending deadline to October 30 or something of that nature in order to include faculty forum? Is that a possibility?
- Robert Baker – Certainly but Provost Phillips would need to weigh in as well
- Provost Phillips – I like your idea of persuasiveness. I think it is also possible. Notice I keep using the phrase this iteration of the handbook.

Handbooks are always a work in progress. I have received things from 2 predecessors and am trying to dive in and understand things from your perspective and previous provost perspectives. Board is interested in having a conclusion. One of the things we may consider is that this is not one and done – it is only for this year. Amenable to having a conversation about meeting the Board's request for this to come to a conclusion and then move forward. How do we make this valuable for this year, complete it for Board involvement, and pick it back up to move forward?

- Gina Fantasia – my understanding of the board is that the BoG had encouraged the process to move along. The BoG understood the timeline to be the work of the committee in collaboration with provost with forums with review this summer for legal standing/correctness and the same thing for HR and that would be delivered to Faculty Senate then the board would get a report of that. Current understanding that the board required a specific timeline, but encourage/pressed it because the board received a report that nothing was finalized or put forward for faculty review. Encouragement to move along is not something to foist on the faculty but as an exercise in shared governance.
- Tom Cuchta – faculty are not going to feel like we have input if the forums we were promised aren't held. The narrative is not good to take back to constituents.
- Donna Long - Can we approve the handbook for 21-22 if something like PTAR is in it but not defined? What we have now is an outdated version of the Handbook; but we *have* a Handbook. Why not take the time for faculty to respond to this iteration--and avoid faculty feeling left out of the process? We should still be able to have the Handbook "done" by the end of fall.
- Robert Baker – The committee tried to move process along, but the above is not a true characterization.
- Tom Cuchta- Agreed, concern is that this will be the interpretation for the faculty at large, not that this was the characterization of the committee.
- Robert Baker – recommends speaking to Provost Phillips to discuss faculty forums with Faculty Senate encouraging faculty attendance. Previous attendance was poor.
- Donna Long - Perhaps what Bob is suggesting is that if PTAR is not defined and doesn't have a clear process and purpose, that the Handbook be produced for this year WITHOUT that part, with the understanding that the Senate committee for the Handbook (that Robert suggested needed to become a standing committee) would take up that portion for the next iteration of the Handbook.
- Todd Clark would strongly support that as both a committee member and faculty senator. Faculty need to participate
- Gina Fantasia – think about how you're planning the forum so that senators can have discussion with the appropriate academic units to bring comments back to senate, committee, and provost. If you allow senators to arrange presentation within already planned meetings there can be more meaningful dialogue and feedback.
- Chuck Shields – Supports Gina Fantasia's idea of flexibility to gain more faculty input.
- General agreement that Robert Baker and Provost Phillips meet to discuss.
- Broadcasting/Recording classes

- Discussion on concerns for intellectual property, student privacy, student success due to just watching recordings.
- Gina Fantasia – some of the discussion in the Faculty of Business/Aero – those decisions vary from class to class and program to program. That’s where the choice should be made. Whether it is effective to record a seminar class when not required to teach to a monitor and effective pedagogy/decision in particular classes and programs should have input from the faculty teaching those classes/running those programs. Decisions of the academics that are teaching the programs. Part of what she is hearing is that the technology isn’t designed to do that effectively. Webex has been having glitches (e.g. password difficulties, recording difficulties).
- Jenn – Nursing is still recording their lectures but are not required to allow this to count for attendance.
- Rick Harvey – no single approach works for all.
- Bill Harrison – As a poli sci professor concern is that students will be afraid to share their views on controversial topics if they are being recorded.
- Gina Fantasia – we want them to exchange ideas with vibrant discussions as an essence of higher education.
- Tom Cuchta brought up that it was shared that it is okay to not share recordings with all students at all times.
- Chuck Shields this seems like there is not universal policy across campus
- Tom Cuchta added that they don’t have as many controversial discussions but cameras don’t capture white board and has taken to pointing the white board.
- Donna Long does a lot of in class workshopping in writing classes and there is nothing to record. It isn’t appropriate to record since there is not discussion or lecture.
- Gina Fantasia – Also has concerns and have heard concerns that the message that you can watch it later resulted in decision in students to vacation due to not being important. It’s important to reinforce that we are face-to-face to strengthen community bonds.
- Bill Harrison – It’s a real issue
- URM official directive read as guidance which included face-to-face synchronous and recording. Interpretation that we have to record.
- Provost Phillips – Learning how to navigate in this space and will listen and learn. Tomorrow morning 9-11 will meet with Deans and Dept Chairs in Sr leadership team which will include discussion of classroom protocols in response to Covid. Nothing to share in edicts, but trying to learn what the issues are around managing covid map and procedures in the classrooms. Important to help understand the year we’ve experienced with Covid. What are the positive lessons that we can learn and move forward with and put best practices/anticipate needs for this year should we need to pivot?
- Tom Cuchta – feels like a forever encroachment on streaming/recording.
- Chuck Shields – Part of the concern is that the classrooms are not appropriately equipped to handle these concerns and are not conducive to translating the face-to-face experience.
- Donna Long – Points out that fully online learning is not as effective as Face-2-Face learning. We shouldn’t be trying to be both things.

- Gina Fantasia – Expresses concerns of faculty that we are doing both things and in so doing creating a disservice to both audiences and not serving the students well.
- Bill Harrison – Found this portion difficult
- Todd Clark – Who owns the course recordings questions was never answered
- Chuck Shields – avoided giving an opinion because it is not known and has not been answered.
- Chuck Shields – it would be great to receive information about these concerns/progress on these concerns.
- Provost Phillips – Understands concerns and hopes to share information on what she can before the next meeting – this is a good learning experience for her.
- Joshua Smallridge – important to let students know the viability of these recordings for certain classes this first week while we are still in the add/drop period. If we have classes that we think there is a definite issue with students should be aware so they can make informed decisions.
- Donna Long – Expecting/communicating face-to-face format
- Jenn – Communicates that students may miss things if they are not in face-to-face classes
- Stephen Rice – syllabus comment about not re-recording lectures
- Donna Long – notes at other institutions that students may not want to be recorded and could in essence veto the recording. Faculty were only required to meet with students that missed class to compromise between.
- Jenn – all nursing students sign video consent
- Tom Cuchta – we had a discussion a year or two ago having their photos taken and being used for advertisements. Remembers hearing about student release paperwork for use of likeness – does this apply to in class recordings?
- Rick Harvey – Tom is right. When that came up, understanding that application was modified to include the release for video/photo – he doesn't know if that covers classroom recorded and release would need to be reviewed.
-
- Nina Slota – is there a FERPA issue of being in a class versus being in the Falcon center.
- Donna Long – brings up a potential problem in recordings resurfacing where students may be damaged by in class discussion that became public through recordings.
- Discussion about Webex recordings being deleted permanently or whether they are held. Potential issues with students recording meetings which could potentially be used against classmates in the future in the case of problematic stances, capturing students on camera who may not be aware that they are on camera, issues with recordings minors.
- Julie Reneau believes there may be policy around recording minors.
- HEPC waiver—What does it mean for faculty?
 - Some faculty have been concerned about the announcement about the HEPC waiver granted to the University and what that means for faculty?
 - Dr. Martin – Exciting news – administrative exception is journey to full exception. 3rd largest institution. In many ways restricted by the needs of the smaller institutions in their HEPC support. We do not use any HEPC

services – goal is for full exception. Administrative exemption is huge that affords us latitude (similar to WVU, WVSOM) – ability to buy/sell/lease real estate in excess of 1M, previously needed approval. Not currently anticipated to do or impact. Impacts meetings/minors/concentrations – nothing has changed internally, faculty retain control. Once board approves it goes straight to HLC and bypasses HEPC procedure (saves 90-100 days). Without exception, programs could be developed and approved faster for larger institutions and can now compete in the ‘first to market’ category for programs.

- Tom Cuchta – Going through HEPC is what required the rush on the police academy processes last year due to HEPC process.
- President Martin – Correct, makes us more competitive and supports/protects work by preventing being undercut due to timing constraints. Wanted full exception like WVU/Marshall/WVSOM
- Donna Long – Point of clarification: You said there are three areas of exception. What was the third?
- President Martin – Purchase of real estate, lease of real estate, administrative.
- Gina Fantasia – can share with executive committee/Faculty the HEPC resolution if interested (: <https://www.wvhepc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/HEPC-Special-Meeting-Agenda-7-19-2021.pdf>)
- President Martin – Deeper and specific than what’s presented. Most significant and most important is that curricular proposals don’t need to go through HEPC any longer.
- Chuck Shields – what would a complete exemption mean?
- President Martin – University would not have to abide by any rules or regulations established by the HEPC. Institution could purchase property, create pathways for students, regulate our classes (with the faculty), keep us from having to ask permission to spend funds or to provide them with yearly procedures. Makes us more nimble than what we are right now. It’s the gold standard. For me the biggest area that I wanted exempt was the curricular exemption. But there are other benefits of becoming exempt in not having to follow HEPC guidelines and rules in order to turn on a dime. That is the best way in a nutshell that I can put what a fully exempt institution does. Right now we have to use current platform because of what the state does; if we were fully exempt we could use other platforms that would be more effective and efficient. Goal is to be able to be free from the HEPC and be able to grow as an institution without HEPC oversight and requirement of certain platforms – exception for programming is the most significant one.
- Pay raises?
 - Robert Niichel – WSJ reported inflation was ~5.3% this year and producer inflation at 7.4% with expectation that inflation will increase. This raises a question about pay and cost of living adjustments. Constituency that has received only 1-2 allowances over the past decade or so. This pattern results in about a 10% decrease in true earnings. Faculty may need to consider other opportunities to make ends meet and a 5%-7% increase in inflation will be here to stay. Cost of living allowances are important, especially with a major university in the region that can offer higher salaries and the move of faculty to WVU recently.
 - President Martin not present for discussion

- Chuck Shields – How best to proceed? We can't convene our bargaining unit as we don't have a collective bargaining unit. How to proceed as a senate?
- Robert Niichel – Pass resolution regarding cost of living pay increases?
- Chuck Shields – Resolution would probably require waiting until September meeting to be on the agenda.
- Parking Permits
 - Todd Clark – concern that the wording at the bottom of email that permits are available. Discussed rates that are paid for parking are based on classification and to contact HR to determine rate. That is unsatisfactory; we should be invoiced for the expense and not have to go to HR to get that information and be informed beforehand.
 - Tom Cuchta – clarity is a problem about when charges occur
 - Donna Long – concern of mandated payroll deduction versus paying by another method such as check.
 - Tom Cuchta – Recalls last year's problems with faculty that had never had a permit being charged for one.
 - Todd Clark– Question directed to Chuck Shields – how do we convey our concerns and to whom do we convey them? There needs to be a change in process. One thing we could do is reach out to Staff Council and work on request for change in process. Could reach out to see what staff is experiencing and report back at next meeting.
 - Chuck Shields – suppose we can contact HR and talk to Matt, but unsure who makes these decisions.

XIII. Open Forum

Meeting adjourned at 1732

Next Meeting: September 14, 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 September 7, 2021 for consideration by the Executive Committee.