

Fairmont State University Faculty Senate
Amended Meeting
Minutes
August 18, 2020
3:00-5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Chuck Shields (Social Sciences, President), Tom Cuchta (Comp. Sci & Math, Webmaster), Paul Reneau (HHP, Executive Committee), Jason Noland (SoE, Secretary), Donna Long (L&L, Vice President), Jim Davis (Business, Executive Committee), Gina Fantasia (BoG), Tim Oxley (Academic Affairs), Annalisa Hall (Student Government), Bob Niichel (Comp. Sci. & Math), Dan Eichenbaum (Performing Arts), Denice Kirchoff (Nursing), Jim Matthews (ACF), Janet Floyd (Business), Josh Smallridge (Social Sciences), Molly Barra (Library), Musat Crihalmeanu (Engineering Tech.), Nathan Myers (L&L), Nina Slota (Behavioral Sciences), Rachel Cook (Natural Sciences), Stephen Rice (Natural Sciences), Steven Roof (Academic Affairs), Tabitha Lafferre (Engineering Tech.), Zac Fancher (Student Government).

Guest Present: Amanda Metcalf, Cindy Curry, Deb Hemler, Frankie Delapas, Pam Pittman, Carol Tannous, Rick Harvey, Rick Stevens, Justin Hastings, Kayla Lantz.

Meeting called to order at 3:02pm

I. Minutes

- a. Reading & Approval of the minutes from the May 5, 2020 meeting

Motion to approve Reneau/Cuchta. Passed

II. Announcements/Information/Discussion

Senate meeting dates for Fall Semester

Available on the Faculty Senate Webpage

Introduction of new Senators

Welcome to new senators! Ask those who are new to introduce themselves briefly:
Rachel Cook (bio), Tabitha Lafferre, Josh Smallridge.

President Martin

E-mailed, regretfully cannot join today.

Interim Provost Stevens

Greetings, I wish I could recognize everyone. Thanks for inviting to the FS. Look forward to working with you on any number of things. Chuck and I have talked several times to bring me up to speed on topics we might be discussing, etc. Dr. Martin sends her regrets, she

is still on the front lines. I will probably be the most regular senior admin at the meetings. So, greetings from her!

I wanted to mention I have, as the new guy, been needing to get up to speed quickly. As I have gone about trying to construct routine meetings I have included Chuck in Deans Council meetings knowing he was coming in as FS President. I know communication is a paramount variable on any college campus, you can't communicate too much. There is always something left out or miscommunicated. In the age of a pandemic there are lots of them. One example was around 100% online students, we are now trying to fix that in regard to testing. That happens when we have fluid situations like we are in now. Having Chuck as a member of Deans council, we are hoping to solicit as much of that communication through him and back to faculty so we don't have a 2-3 step process where communication can get more garbled. One of my efforts is to try to compensate for important business of the Institution and have people in the middle when and wherever possible. It's not an end run on Faculty Senate, actually more of an invitation into the heart of things at least during my time as Interim Provost.

Speaking to my time, the President and I have talked about it. I agreed to come for 1 year. There was some discussion about the length of my term. I work at the pleasure of the President, so if I am not doing something right I can be shown the door this afternoon, in that regard I am more of a consultant. My question was when will we start doing a new Provost search? The President's preference was not right now in the middle of everything else. The search is going to be put off until the start of next year, I will be here at least until next December in that case. So, probably 18 months, maybe a bit longer depending on the productivity of a search.

One other item, more of a front burner item for me. I spoke to the Deans about it today. I gave them a bit of a heads up, and Chuck, in a previous week. But things were moving quickly and less firmed up. We are going to have a Winter term this year. Some of you have experienced this at previous institutions. These are not new, but it is new at Fairmont. It is a real opportunity for a few things. Briefly, increase the academic success of students. Winter terms have demonstrated to be helpful to students by helping them maintain Satisfactory Academic Progress (ability to pick up 3-4 credits when not crowded with other schedule items). First semester fall athletes, particularly, can pinch their academic progress. Students who struggle with gateway courses (Calculus, languages, etc.). Do-overs have also been really productive. First time in college or specific courses is sometimes a teachable moment and now they know they need to focus. Business wise, we can tolerate different class sizes than we can in the regular semesters. Can also be an opportunity for special topics, and even unique courses that may eventually be moved to the regular semester once we have more experience. I want to make sure we don't twist arms to try to get courses offered.

In order for this to be successful, we have to compensate reasonably for this. I am not ready to provide all the spreadsheets, as I have just gotten them back but they will be distributed through the Deans and Chuck. Would like to do our best to get this launched as quickly as possible. Basic model: class enrolments of 10-20, where an average of 10 is the target. What

is important to me is not that every individual course have 10 students. If A has 5, B has 15 that's an average of 10 and that's fine. At 20 we are considered full. In both cases 5/15 faculty will be compensated for full rate. Right now we are looking at \$1k per credit hour for teaching of the course (plus the benefit package). If you have one more student who wants in but you are at 20 we will build in a prorated amount so the faculty get compensated for the extra student above full. Extra is about \$100 per credit per student above 20. We do have to come to some understanding of what a maximum load would be, looking for Faculty Senate advice on that. Found it is strongly attractive to faculty inside and outside the Institution as you look for people to do teaching. Departments already receive a multiplier on revenues for e-courses that come back for departmental purposes. The model you will see, if you can generate enough courses during Winter term, we can begin generating fairly substantial revenue after expenses. Net revenues of easily \$250-300k. Preliminary agreement at exec level is that we will find an accommodating division of that (50/50, 60/40, 70/30), with part going to bottom line (salary benefits, etc.) with the other part(s) going into a fund for things we already lack (Faculty development, additional instructional tech folks, special projects/research, etc.), and potentially funds for academic innovation and program development. First model we ran was if we had 10 sections that run this winter with only 5 students in each section still come out with \$11k net revenue. We are not losing money on this. I believe we should be able to reach 30 sections, hopefully with an average of 10 students. Excited and anxious to meet with you in more detail so you can develop some confidence about it. Talking to URM about trying to name this something exciting and interesting that students would gravitate toward. I hope this gives us a bit of encouragement.

Question: One thing that came up in the last year about summer session was the argument that 5-week courses were not viable because they were not academically rigorous. This led to going to a 12-week summer session instead of 2, 5-week sessions. If winter term can work as 5 weeks, can we go back to a 5-week summer term or is that off the table?

Answer: on the table

Question: If winter term becomes a regular offering, does that mean the Fall semester will always look more like it does this semester?

Answer: on the table, up for discussion. Most of the time that I do these, when Fall semester ends typically close to mid-December we start winter term the day after things were done with fall semester - around the 12-14. We didn't pick up spring until almost MLK. Did not instruct the faculty or students how to manage the holidays. Said you have to manage the course. Found no real issues of substance of how to work around the holidays. May cause us to think about when we start spring semester. Timing now is a function of the pandemic, trying to get them away from campus as early in flu season as possible. Your question is a good question and should be part of long-term planning for winter term.

Question: Will students need a separate FAFSA for winter term?

Answer: working with financial aid/ business office. Would not need a separate FAFSA. Intent is to make it a regular session of the university and schools all across the US do

variations of this. Some include as part of fall for financial aid package, others treat it like a summer session. We are going to have to smooth that out so it isn't complicated. Financial aid can be available during winter term.

Comment: I am sharing this as cautionary tale. A number of years ago during summer we went to a compensation package like you are talking about where xx over cap meant additional money and there was at least 1 professor who seriously misused that and enrolled a bunch of students that had no intent to stay in the course.

Response: This is why I said we will have to take recommendations from you, as well as my considerations about what we think is a reasonable amount of student load during winter term. If someone who has only taught 15 students say they can do 45-50, probably not. We will have to put some limits on it so it's not hairy. Usually people argue about how money will be distributed. My hope is that we will get something institutionalized so it doesn't have to wiggle much going forward.

Question: wondering if it is the intent to move the winter pay scale into the summer term as well?

Answer: That would be the model. If you can regularize this such that faculty and students can count on it happening, then having winter and summer look as much alike as possible is the better way to go. If they are exaggerated from each other it makes it more complicated for everybody. One thing we did when we had student 21 or 22, operationally I have said as long as we have 5 or more students in a class because we knew where the average was for compensation, when we got to 4 and below we offered the prorated compensation as if it was the student overload. We cancelled less than 1% of classes. Using the same model consistently also lets faculty market to students, as well as the university.

Question: Would this be outside the normal yearly 24 credit hour load for faculty?

Answer: Absolutely. Now venture into another wrinkle, I did mention it to the Deans. If you have some discipline where you are struggling with some courses in enrollment. Frankly, that is the most expensive cost part to the university, to pay you for that portion of your full time employment when there are only a handful of students in the class. That's the real tug of war. I have offered to Deans and faculty to say we are moving a low enrollment class into the winter term, not compensated, but with reduced fall or spring load with that course being offered at a different time. Some faculty have chosen to do this over time. I want this to be flexible, not command.

Question: If a faculty member chose to take a regular load course as part of the winter term, does that place restrictions on class size?

Answer: Usually what we are talking about is low enrollment courses. What eases it is an additional revenue source. It eases the pressure. It is an extra cost to students, but FSU is reasonably priced.

Question: One big concern about online classes is the academic rigor of such courses. What systems did you have in place, or have you heard of, that could be used to maintain an appropriate level of academic integrity?

Answer: FSU is part of NCSARA an interstate compact for online education. The purpose is to allow students in a number of states that take a course from any other state that meets the criteria of NCSARA. We need to brush up to make sure we are doing all we should. Might be one expenditure of our net revenue going forward, making sure everyone that is teaching is hitting the quality markers. One thing I would like to say when you have 184 full-time faculty and 300 part time faculty there are already people now who are not the best at doing any kind of teaching. We know that. Educational quality is our concern and is a concern of the faculty in any circumstance where we are doing our teaching. With your assistance, we can get some guard rails up for load size, but also how people qualify to be able to teach during concentrated time, how we do assessments, etc. to ensure what students are signing up for is actually being delivered.

I will tell you, what I have seen already in the faculty development sessions, we don't have to go to California to find anyone, we already have talented online instructors.

Question: I am wondering what kind of input you will have, and what kind of faculty input you will have beyond me in Deans council? Will we make a committee? How do you see that?

Answer: Part of my purpose in bringing this up in my first opportunity is so you can think about how we can do some constructing on the input side. My real concern prior to meeting with you was convincing the business side, getting them on board with this workable fiscal model. We will have to build this while we are flying it. I would expect that my experience with already doing this may carry extra weight at the time. But, when you would like, Chuck, to convene a group of 3-4 who are interested in this and can help speak for the rest of the senate we can help legitimate some of the questions and concerns that may lead to the lengths of summer terms and that type of thing. You getting your hands on this right now is imperative.

Chuck: Great. Sounds like an issue of EC to bring to the full senate.

BoG Representative, Gina Fantasia

I haven't been to my first meeting yet, so I don't have a full report. I welcome the opportunity to say that I am honored to succeed Budd Sapp. I hope to follow his example. I appreciate the trust placed in me to be sure to bring the faculty perspective to BoG considerations.

In keeping with that, I welcome your input and perspectives. You have my contact info. Let me hear from you. My role in BoG matters is considering faculty perspective. I think that is critical to effective operation of the university. A strong, effective collaboration is important to FSU's success going forward. In order to do that, I need to hear from you.

First meeting is on Thursday.

ACF Representative, Jim Matthews

We met over the summer several times. No legislative report, between COVID and election the next session is a lot of questions.

Several USDE rule changes:

Most press: revisions to Title IX. Issued a 3,000 page document detailing the changes. Check with Alicia Kalka about them.

Academic: weakening of accreditation. No longer a recognition of national and regional accreditation. Strong impacts on transfer. Summarize because of WV legal statute in combo with the guidelines, all institutions must accept transfer credits from all postsecondary schools including jr colleges. Satellite campuses across the nation can now receive accreditation based on the physical location of their main campus.

D is now a passing grade and must be accepted as transfer

All academic programs w/ licensure must post about licensure requirements in all 50 states on their webpages.

Dual credit courses can be taught by H.S. teachers with no college credit in the discipline.

2-year institution gainful employment requirements are now gone.

Other pretty extensive changes. Not sure how accreditors will respond to this.

Comment: Title IX I am an investigator. As far as everyone here, our responsibility as responsible employees does not change. What the change is in the investigation but mostly adjudication process which is also up for debate. Although USDE came up with a statement, they admitted it is awaiting further codification on how we investigate or adjudicate complaints. It is your responsibility to report to Jessica Kropog when Title IX issues come to you. She will take it from there. Don't be thrown asunder by what is going on with Title IX. You are the front line. When a student comes to you to complain or register a concern, your job is to report that does not change.

Question: Changes to things like the D being a passing grade that must be transferred. How does the university internalize those changes? If I am an advisor and I see these D's, what do I do with that?

Answer: (Dr. Stephens) I think we still have questions to ask, have to involve Merri and the folks in the Registrars office because there is a lot of things that happen automatically at most institutions. Typically, some level of institutional prerogative. Some will accept nothing below a C, others will accept a certain number. Others will accept an overall GPA. We will have to dig into this. HEPC has released a transfer and course agreement policy that has been put out for this year. I don't think this is going to move as quickly as Betsy DeVos would like for the long term. It's going to be a moving target.

Jim: all conversations I have been in said we won't see these changes until next fall.

Student Government

Elections will start tomorrow through the 21st. Currently have at least 2 people running for Senate, hopefully at least two will be elected. Also wanted to say we are excited to be back on campus. If there is anything we can do to help monitor students and get them to stay on campus we are willing to anything we can to help.

Question: Someone in my department asked about status of the Nest and if students have access.

Answer: I haven't heard anything, I know when I was applying for jobs the Nest was a position available. I will check with Robin to see if the positions have been filled.

Question: at one time there was a request for donations to the Nest, is that still a need?

Answer: I know Robin is always taking donations, asks that it be monetary so she can buy things that are needed and will be used.

Question: so if we wanted to make a donation, we should contact Robin.

Answer: Yes.

Term Faculty

There is some concern across campus about Term faculty, what that means, who is term, and inconsistency of information that faculty are getting about term faculty.

Comment: Those on senate last year remember that we had a brief discussion toward the end of the year, a lot of concern about inconsistencies for term faculty being eligible for moving into a tenure track position. Term faculty who were hired on 3-year contract who were shifted to one-year contracts. These are faculty who are carrying heavy loads, chairing senate committees, etc. Some concern that at least one has been told that there is not a path toward a tenure track position. In my department, that is not the case as some have migrated to tenure track lines. I think we need consistency, as it is not fair not to have it. In my mind, anyone good enough to be hired on tenure track should be considered for the next tenure track line. It seems to be fundamentally unfair. If someone who is temporary is not going to be tenured, they should be promotable. These are some of the issues.

Comment: I would agree with that statement. I have at least one faculty member hired at a time that we could not replace with a tenured position because that wasn't on the table. That person has not been moved to a tenure track. That is unfair and unreasonable given the amount of work that person is doing.

Provost: Chuck mentioned this to me in one of our earlier conversations. I know one of the things that is ongoing is Faculty Handbook revision. That is a place to try to address this. I have opinions about it. Those opinions should not be taken for gospel. It is something we should be talking about. One bit of a lean I have that comes from 23 years as faculty and 23

years as admin. Tenure track means something different and special than any other kind of hire. As much as we become really good colleagues and friendly with people who are on term contracts when we consider asking a tenure track hire, most often what we do is at least in part open that up to “is this person the best candidate for a tenure track hire”. Which means some level of search because there may be someone better fit in all kinds of ways. They have some advantage of being known, etc. and in many instances may become that. But, to move someone over without a quality test against those in the discipline who may want to come to Fairmont. That is my opinion, and should be negotiated with the Faculty Handbook revisions.

Comment: We had a tenured faculty retire, at the time when we did the full search we were told tenure track was not on the table. One person would not consider it further once they were told that. One person did come to fill that position and did not get moved to tenure track. In your opinion, someone in that situation with a full search, should that position be moved to tenure track?

Provost: that is too much of a hypothetical. In general, there should be at least some steps that look like a search where they have to stand in the context of others in the field interested in that position. There is some wiggle room on the sides. Tenure is one of the few tools left for smaller institutions, where salary may not be. For that reason, I am careful for how that gets assigned. If you look at full time faculty postings, the trend is away from tenure track. I don't think every position should be considered tenure track to give financial flexibility.

Question: You are saying if someone is on term contract and a tenure line comes up are they the best person, we still need a search, etc.? Would that term person be eligible/need to apply.

Answer: yes, they would need to show they are the best person for the job, and then do what is expected of a tenure track faculty. We may even offer them credit toward tenure if chosen.

Question: So, if a person applied for a nationwide search and was given a term contract, now have to go through another nationwide search to get hired again?

Answer: Yes, but I didn't say it had to be a nationwide search. There needs to be steps that look somewhat like a search.

Comment: I want to throw in over some period of years, we had discussions we needed flexibility. The code allows term to be converted to tenure. There are positions that have been filled where the search was done with an understanding that for the time we were in we were only hiring on term, but were convertible to tenure track. I completely get what you are saying that tenure is not an automatic thing. There are, I believe, people who were hired as part of a national search into term positions some with the expectation that that position was convertible to tenure.

Answer: I have no doubt that that is the case. I have inherited a lot of hiring understandings. I will tell you as I have talked with Cindy that one of my pet peeves is the ambiguity of the conditions of hire. I have written templates with the dozen bullet points of things I think should be there: when someone can apply for tenure, when that would take effect, etc. There

is an informality at many institutions about this. One way to address it, that I don't disagree with. Most of the time that I have had trouble with that was in the inheriting of a vague appointment. That ought to be something that should be at least part of the handbook discussion that says normally a letter of appointment should include... I wouldn't want a rule. That way when push comes to shove we have a document so when someone leaves we have a document that outlines it.

Question: are you saying you won't honor those?

Answer: Nope, I am saying that informal is open to interpretation. Right now, I am saying what do we need to do going forward is to make sure we don't run into these particular circumstances. It doesn't block off anything that is right there that is churning. When you inherit churn, you have to make a judgement. I had a faculty before that did everything right, but there is a "however" in every policy particularly in regard to enrollment. I managed to get this person moved over into another school on campus into a tenured appointment.

Chuck: Sounds like this is an ongoing discussion we need to have, and maybe specific cases that are on people's minds that we don't know the specifics on. As a senate and Executive Committee this may be something we need to follow up on

Stephens: I am happy to be a part of those conversations so positions don't get set, and negotiations can happen.

Faculty Senate Input on BoG Policies

Donna: A few years ago we had our faculty welfare committee undertake a year long (more than a year) process of putting together a policy on academic honesty. When the final product was brought to senate for approval and was approved, shortly after Provost Harvey said because it was called a policy it was subject to BoG approval; if it was a procedure it would not have been. It is still in BoG. It has been at least half a semester, maybe longer with no action from BoG.

Gina: Right, I have not been to a meeting. I know that code does require that faculty policies have input by BoG and approval. From conversations I have had, it seems the chair and Executive Committee of BoG want to have open dialog. They seem to be reasonable, collaborative people. We need to see what we do and I completely agree that communication is a key thing. We need better, more regular communication and collaboration to sort these things out.

Comments: Sounds to me like what we need to do here is collect more information.

Degree Termination Decision Process

This is something everyone has concerns about. That we, as a full faculty, may not have any or much input about. Of course, on everyone's mind is Theater and Music. How that came about has been contentious. We all know there is legal action involved with this now involving faculty and community members. I think a lot of us felt left out of the whole

process. It was a surprise to a lot of people. How can we as faculty have more input into a process like that?

Provost: Everyone is looking at budgets, program viability, etc. always agonizing. The questions are 1) the current set of programs and what might be done relative to those because of specific points of view/feelings about colleagues and students. I don't know enough about that to have any specific comment on it. 2) How do we work through these things? One thing I have asked the Registrar to do so I can share with you, is to give a historical approach to programs at FSU over a significant period of time (50 years) in 5 year chunks, listing of majors/minors and any trendline data we may have. I have not seen it yet. That's a big job. I already know that it will demonstrate that programs have come and gone over that period of time. FSU has not always been as it is now. There are some things we need to look at to understand our present and how to go forward. It comes down to getting that in shape and making sure that we talk about both academic quality and success as well as fiscal viability. I'll just tell you, my dad was a small college president of a denominationally related institution. He used to say "if it's not in the Bible, it's in the budget". You don't just take one piece or the other in how you look at program viability. I think having gone through this in an agonizing way is an opportunity for us to sit down and think about it more rationally, like those fuzzy letters of appointment. What should our procedure be for program evaluation? We know this will happen again, we will do ourselves a favor and those that come behind us if we work through that.

Comment: There was a suit filed to try to stop the process of shutting down the programs this summer. If you will indulge me I would like to reading something...[reads from transcript of comments made by Judge Janes, copied below].

"Now, let me editorialize a little bit. That's -- I hesitate to do this, and I rarely, rarely do it, but I'm going to do it under this circumstance. This is a admonition to Mr. Lilly and Ms. Sikora's client. If the notice requirements are satisfied, and if the case is re-filed, this Court will liberally interpret and apply the requirements of West Virginia Code §6-9-1 of the Open Governmental Proceeding Act. I can't tell the Board how to spend its money, but I can tell it how to decide to spend its money. Decisions of this nature should be fully transparent and made in full view of the public scrutiny. I suggest that the Board consult with Mr. Lilly and Ms. Sikora to thoroughly and candidly examine your process and your compliance or lack [of] compliance with the open meetings requirement. If in counsel's opinion the Board has fallen short of those requirements, the Board can fix that problem itself by vacating its decision and restarting the process in a transparent fashion, one that complies with the requirements of the Open Governmental Proceeding Act. That may satisfy the plaintiffs thereafter and avoid further litigation. If not, they, as is their right and may be their choice to provide pre-suit notice and then re-file your complaint and I'll revisit the issue. But I'm giving you all fair warning that I'm going to liberally apply the requirements of the statute. So you examine it thoroughly. If you think you've done well and right, that's fine, we'll address the issue at a later time. And if Mr. Lilly and Ms. Sikora believe that they could have done better, now's the time to fix it."

Comment: I had no intention to speak up or say anything. In my previous institution they did have a model and there was a process, A Program Review Council. We are coming up with a

number of program reviews in the fall. What is the model we will be using to review our programs? Will it go directly from the Provost to BoG or will there be some sort of intermediary group that will have a recommendation before it goes forward? I would be happy to assist if that is the direction the I would go.

Question: Did the Council include faculty?

Answer: Many times it included Deans, but also faculty. Usually had a primary reviewer and secondary. Primary reviewer is the one that spoke. Once a year, all programs would come to the Provosts office, the committee came out of Academic Affairs. It would then be assigned to 2 individuals. You cannot review a self-study of someone in your department or college. The group convened at a specific date and gave a recommendation. Through the process, you could contact faculty and departments for clarification and more information that may be needed. Then, the committee convenes one time and the primary reviewer made the recommendations for the programs they reviewed. Faculty could attend the meeting, not to sway decisions, but to present factual information about the program. The group doesn't necessarily make a decision on the program, but there are 3-4 levels of recommendation.

Comment: let me be sure I understand are you suggesting we implement this?

Answer: No, I am suggesting we look at different models, and giving examples of one model I was a part of. My recommendation is if there is concerns of transparency, there is concerns of the process. So, we should look at the model we are currently using to review these programs.

Comment: in the chat, it sounds like that is a good starting point as we move forward to try to avoid situations that happened like music and theater where we read about them in the newspaper or social media instead of having prior knowledge.

Comment: I'd like to add one more fact, there are 0 program reviews for Music going back 10 years, it is WV state code that the BoG is responsible for overseeing and requiring the program review process on campus. We contacted the HEPC, there are no program reviews on file down there.

Question: What is your suggestion in terms of action the senate can take at this point in time? I realize you have this ongoing legal battle, some things may get resolved some may not. The particular issue is the open meetings law. That the belief the decision was made prior to the public meeting with incorrect information. What is the suggestion for action that senate can take?

Response: What I'll say is, I like the resolution but frankly there were people who attended the BoG meetings where they voted and re-voted to end the programs, the public was admonished by members of the BoG saying things like "I love the arts". They love the arts but they are going to cancel the programs and how dare anyone challenge them for their love of the arts. It is hard to come up with a methodology of changing or bringing about any sort of faculty voice to the BoG when they will openly say things like that and vote again in public to cancel the programs without listening to the hundreds of letters, calls, emails, and

the community members who have lost their source of artistic enrichment in the community. That's not a specific action for Faculty Senate. What I will say is if we don't come up with something, some way to approach the BoG, Music and theater will not be the only ones to go away as a result, and a result anyone tenured into those programs will be left out of the University. The board did not recognize any of the service component of the music and theater programs. When looking at a program, they did not look at appreciation courses, performances, number of people brought to campus for any performance, purely at the number of majors. If the University only values financially the number of people leaving with a degree and not a holistic viewpoint of a particular program all of us are destined to failure because we will be left as a technical college.

Question: What action is available to us? Do you have any thoughts?

Response: No, not specifically. I think our intent in putting this on the agenda was to open the discussion and start some dialog. I appreciate Susan's examples of ways to move forward. As far as actions for Music and Theater, there is a resolution as a matter of business if we get there that we can talk about. But, as far as anything else, I'm not sure there is much else we can do at this point. I think it's important we continue to have this dialog and open discussion. I appreciate Susan's comments and the Provost's comments as a good starting point.

Comment: I see there needs to be accountability, no question. With respect to program reviews, decision about productive/non-productive programs. If Senate is directly involved in curriculum creation, there is a role for Senate in the program termination process. There should be a way to ask questions before the proposal gets to BoG. Have input from faculty who have had an opportunity to vet the information and make a rational decision. Since we are the sole source of proposing curriculum to BoG we should also have a role in decommissioning curriculum before it gets to BoG.

Comment: Thank you

If Senate agrees, EC can follow up with the Provost and Susan, to get an idea of a process.

Motion that EC propose or try to get a meeting with the BoG to discuss the concerns and see if any resolution or discussion can take place. Eichenbaum/Bob Niichel. Passed.

Comment: Whatever we do in this, we need to be careful that we aren't following a process we shouldn't be. That BoG rep is included in that. I think we have to include BoG rep in this discussion.

Comment: Support the motion, because we have to figure out how to open a door with the BoG moving forward if not for music and theater, for future program reviews. I agree completely that there is too much at stake at every level for the BoG to act on programs in the way they acted on theater and music. I think at least trying to begin a discussion with them is worthwhile.

Faculty e-mail Concerns

This goes back to last semester when at some point most of the faculty were denied access to the global email list for other faculty. At least as far as I still understand, only a few still have access to that. Chuck and the BoG rep. That was concerning to faculty in that there was that limitation of being able to use that email list to communicate with each other. Some faculty created their own global list.

Question: Rick S. Do you have any historical knowledge of this?

Comment: I think he left

Comment: It came down to us in Senate as a done deal, no discussion, no indication of why the choice was made. When there was pushback in senate, it seemed to go away because Budd at least had access to the list. I don't actually know who has access and who doesn't at this point. As we talked last time, there are reasons why the full faculty need to be able to be part of a full faculty discussion. Email is the official communication for FSU. So that it was done without discussion with faculty came down as a fait accompli with no indication of the purpose. That is why it is still on the agenda.

Comment: It seems we keep it on the agenda. It is something the EC can pursue with the provost and others who have control over that.

Comment: Another piece of this item was that the Provost is on all program email lists as a member, we weren't sure if that was the case before.

Comment: What do we say about that?

Comment: I think it has less to do with if the Provost should be on the department listserv, instead "when did that happen?" To my knowledge, that was not the case prior to 2 weeks ago. It seems at least appropriate that departments are aware of these kinds of changes.

Comment: This seems like a conversation that needs to happen with the Provost here.

Question for Rick Harvey: Were you involved in such list servs to your knowledge?

Response: Not by request from me, apparently, I was added to them

Question: Who added you?

Response: I don't know.

Rick Stephens: I did not ask to be listed, it just was there. It didn't seem abnormal to me with my past experiences. The only opinion I have about it is that probably the #1 thing is that it doesn't matter how much you communicate, you can't communicate enough. The more community conversation that are discrete, the less they move around and the more things trail off. So, I don't spend time mining the mails for things typically. Sometimes you can head things off that you don't need to spend a lot of time on. I am fine with whatever you want to do with this.

Comment: Yes, but we do. This is being noted for the record.

Comment: I think a continuing dialog particularly about global email list is something we need to have.

Rick H. Since I was drawn back into this, remember the timing of this was created by the departure of the person who was in charge of the global email list. Until Donna brought it up, I wasn't aware I was on the department list. The concern was the ability for one faculty member to be able to email the entire faculty for whatever reason, maybe not academically related, was of a concern

Comment: I would say that not being able to do that is a concern.

Comment: Perhaps, but, it took a lot of time to get the Pierpont emails to stop. Solicitations, fundraising, etc. were the concern. I agree faculty should be able to reach each other, but, how do we limit that? That was an attempt to do so.

Comment: Again, this sounds like it should be a continued discussion with others who might have some control over this. I do understand what you are talking about, Dr. Harvey, in terms of solicitations. I get that. I don't have an answer. Almost said education is the answer. Teaching what is appropriate and not appropriate.

Faculty Participation During Upcoming Provost Search

Dr. Stephens has shed some light on this. We can delay this discussion for a bit.

Name Change of Constitution of Faculty of Fairmont State College

Name of the Constitution lists " Faculty of Fairmont State College", instead of University. I guess we need to change that name. I want to quickly see, is this something we should just do or should it be an agenda item for vote, or something for the bylaws committee?

Motion to send it to the bylaws committee (Niichel/Cuchta). Passed

III. Unfinished Business

Committee on Committees (second reading)

Website has the most recent version. Received 3-4 changes in the last two weeks.

Motion to accept Reneau/Long. Passed

IV. New Business

Major Items

a. Senate Resolution in Support of Colleagues in Music & Theater Degree Programs

Motion to approve Niichel/Long.

Comment: I have a concern about the last paragraph. It seems to be addressing two issues, one is a general support for the program but then the last sentence is seeking a process of collaboration. It would be stronger as two separate resolutions.

Comment: That is why it was a major item of business, so edits can be made between readings.

Amend the Motion on the floor. Motion to approve resolution with changes (Niichel/Long).Passed.

b. Senate Resolution on Senate Input on Program Reviews

This was left out of the sent out items

Motion to table Long/Cuchta. Passed.

Comment: this resolution will have more fruitful discussion when the EC and BoG have met.

Minor Items

c. Reorganization of the ad hoc Committee on Bylaws (minor)

This committee was appointed a year ago. Various reasons didn't get off the ground.

Executive Committee thought we should reconstitute the committee and move forward from that point.

Comment: I was chair of that committee. Donna and I worked several times and were the only ones to attend. Thought with a new year it was time to reconvene with a new committee with fresh faces. Donna has agreed to be on the committee, but not chair. I highly recommend she be on the committee based on her tenure at the University, and her editing skills.

Comment: With the restructure, the handbook under revision there were so many questions that couldn't be answered. The committee has been together for two years, it's now time for a fresh set of eyes. We were at a standstill because of so many questions that were out there.

Question: Any volunteers to serve on the committee?

Chuck: I am willing to do this with Jim and Donna. But I would like at least one more person.

Comment: That person doesn't have to be on Senate.

Comment: True. We can solicit someone from outside.

Motion to reorganize the ad hoc committee Long/Cuchta. Passed.

d. Ad-hoc committee on COVID-19 response

Comment: This came out of discussion with Executive Committee as well over the past week. In terms of discussions among the faculty. We have had lots of info coming from administration. Executive Committee thought it would be a good idea to have an ad hoc

committee of senate that might be able to work and have ideas about this and communicate with and recommend to administration from a faculty perspective.

Comment: The thinking behind this was the Faculty Senate reserves the right to have ad hoc committees. This is really not an ad hoc committee dealing with academics. What we are talking about is large public safety issues. Having worked with COOP with DoD is what concerns me. What we need is a committee that deals with faculty concerns of their safety. I can't tell you how many faculty have expressed concern over their safety. It is designed to field concerns and communicate them to admin in a more efficient way. If you put yourself in the shoes of the admin, you are getting slammed from all sides about concerns. If we can perform a more efficient function as far as a clearinghouse for "these are the main issues". faculty can forward concerns to the committee which will group those into "bins". Those are not necessarily about academic planning, course structure, etc. but more in terms of "first day in the field". It was concerning, even though there was no one in the classroom. At least the FS could set up a committee to be the point of contact for faculty concerns about teaching: are we getting the information we need, what do we need to communicate to admin, act as POC from administration. Until now, Chuck has been the POC for all the COVID stuff. He is just one person. He has overwhelming responsibilities. It is not to impede the admin ability to do anything, but to help facilitate. I ask Faculty Senate approve of a concept of this ad hoc committee.

Motion to form this ad hoc committee as outlined, nominate Todd to chair. Long/Cuchta.

Would like representation from all areas as all needs are different.

Comment: I would hope this committee would be a clearinghouse for classroom tech/blackboard issues. Some bubbles up through the Deans but they are very busy with other things right now. For instance, I learned one of the Bb links is not working, the one to Ensemble. It would take one thing off the desk of the deans.

Comment: Also can't forget that we have a Technology committee.

Comment: Agreed. The Bb stuff, clunky interaction between Bb and WebEx to put mildly. Fact that Firefox doesn't play well with things.

Call the Question. Motion to form this ad hoc committee as outlined, nominate Todd to Chair. Long/Cuchta. Passed

V. Open Forum

Motion to create a committee to serve with the Provost to help in creation of the winter term to ensure the academic quality. Niichel/Long. Passed.

Question: would this be better in Faculty Development?

Comment: Curriculum Committee?

Comment: My only concern is this is a fairly major undertaking. It will take a lot of work.

Provost: Will need lead time to generate the scale that we want out of this. We are starting this next week/early in September. The big pieces are not hard to figure out. It's about making sure the courses are quality.

Comment: can you email faculty to solicit members? Contemplating how to diplomatically limit to 3-4 people.

Comment: It is the prerogative as chair to appoint people to the committees.

Provost: Want enough participation, but don't want to slow things down. The people I want are people with immediate interest and who will make themselves available.

Thanks to everyone for staying for this very long meeting. No intention to make every meeting this long. I appreciate that we can have these kinds of discussions.

Motion to adjourn Long/Reneau

Next Meeting: September 8, 2020, 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 1, 2020 for consideration by the Executive Committee.**