



2. Curriculum Committee Report (Lori Ogden)  
For Approval – New Course Report – [Annex I](#)  
For Approval – Course Change Report – [Annex II](#)  
Motion to approve all items carried by voice vote.
  
3. General Education Foundations Committee Report (Lisa DiBartolomeo)
  - a. Rubric created for internal use in the General Education Foundations Committee when determining course eligibility for the GEF program. Rubric will also assist in communicating course expectations to those seeking to submit a course for GEF approval.
  - b. Developing a survey with Tracey Beckley regarding the future of the GEF program.
  - c. Currently evaluating courses for removal from the GEF program based criteria such as significant time since last offering.

For Information – General Education Foundations Definition – [Annex III](#)  
For Information – General Education Foundations Rubric – [Annex IV](#)
  
4. Teaching and Assessment Committee Report (Diana Davis)  
For Information – TACO Committee Updates – [Annex V](#)
  
5. Committee on Committees, Membership, and Constituencies Chair Lesley Cottrell did not have a report and noted that the committee is still populating committee rosters.
  
6. Faculty Representative to State Government Eloise Elliott had no report.
  
7. Board of Governors Report (Stan Hileman)
  - a. Board met on April 21
  - b. Significant time dedicated toward current affairs
  - c. Annual report from SGA with newly elected officers
  - d. Five rule changes were finalized: 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 3.5 These were minor changes with no significant comments received for any change.
  - e. June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, but regular meetings expected throughout summer.
  
8. Report from Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne
  - a. TLC Celebrate on May 10, which will include discussion on ChatGPT, AI, and other topics
  - b. Annual Committee reports are sought by the May 22 Executive Committee
  - c. Tentatively scheduled summer meetings for June 5, July 10, and August 7, to be held via Zoom.
  - d. Summer transformation workgroup chosen by Provost Reed: Damien Clement, Dana Coester, Mark Fullen, Hal Gorby, Kimberly Gray, Ann Marie Hibbert, Justin Legleiter, Renee Nicholson, Andrew Nix, Mark Olfert, Frankie Tack, Scott Wayne, Amy Welsh, and Vicki Huffman.  
List is available for review [online](#)
  
9. Representative to State Government Confirmation
  - a. The Representative to State Government represents WVU on the WV Advisory Council of Faculty (ACF) which is governed by WV State Code Chapter 18B Article 6.2

- b. ACF terms are two years, while Representative to State Government term is currently one year. There are plans to adjust the representative term to match that of ACF.
- c. The Executive Committee appointed Eloise Elliott to a one-year appointment with a vote of 9 in favor and none opposed at the April meeting. That appointment is subject to confirmation by Faculty Senate.

Motion to confirm the appointment. Seconded.

Motion carried with 73 in favor and none opposed.

10. For Approval – Resolution to Create Faculty Research Committee – [Annex VI](#)

- a. Faculty Senate has two research-focused standing committees.
- b. Research and Scholarship is charged with matters associated with maintaining and enhancing the University’s environment for research, scholarship, and creative endeavors. It makes recommendations to the Senate as deemed appropriate, and reviews applications for Senate Research and Scholarship Advancement grants. This committee is typically only active in the spring.
- c. Research Integrity is charged to serve on hearing panels to evaluate cases of research integrity violations. This committee has not been called to review a case since 2016.
- d. Based on the above, it has been recommended to combine the two committees. The resolution would abolish the Research and Scholarship Committee and the Research Integrity Committee, and establish the a new standing committee combining the responsibilities of the two abolished committees.

Motion to approve the proposed resolution. Seconded.

Motion carried with 76 in favor and none opposed.

11. For Information – Executive Committee Election Results – [Annex VII](#)

12. Report from Chris Schimmel, WVU Faculty Ombudsperson – Ombudsperson Office Services

- a. The office served 20 individuals and two academic groups this academic year.
- b. Office provides a confidential service for faculty dealing with difficult situations at work with WVU. This could be promotion and tenure, conflicts with students, eSEI redactions, and any number of other situations.
- c. With support from the Provost’s Office, the Ombudsperson Office will be open and available throughout the summer for the first time. Appointments will be via Zoom when able.
- d. More information and contact information is available at <https://facultyombudsperson.wvu.edu/>

13. Report from Janie Howsare, Faculty and Staff Assistance Program Director – Support Resources

- a. The Faculty Staff Assistance Program is a benefit provided by your employer, as required by law
- b. 3 sessions per employee per year are provided, dependents are also eligible
- c. Confidential Brief Supportive and Informational Therapy/Counseling from licensed clinicians
- d. Individual, couple, and group work are all eligible
- e. No diagnoses, no cost, and fully confidential
- f. More information available at <https://www.hsc.wvu.edu/fsap/>
- g. Over 1200 visits from faculty and staff in 2022.

14. Report from President Gordon Gee

- a. Offered gratitude toward Scott Wayne for his excellent service as Faculty Senate Chair.

- b. Inflation, loss of public support and investment, demographic cliff, and a sharp increase in college dropouts nationwide, 4 million, have all led to the current situation.
- c. The pandemic and the resulting complications, such as mental health, social disruption, and academic struggles, are a compounding issue and accelerated the budget crisis.
- d. Institution must lean into programs of demand, innovation, and service.
- e. Full intentions of announcing all changes, positions as soon as possible.

15. Report from Provost Maryanne Reed

- a. Four key areas of work
  - a. More extensive review of academic program portfolio with a goal of streamlining the institutions offerings to ensure that we are leveraging limited resources in the most impactful way possible.
    - i. Additional data will be used to view program metrics, such as cost to deliver each program, enrollment & revenue trends, contributions toward R1 position, and employment data where available.
    - ii. RPK Group hired as consultants for assistance with the academic transformation process.
    - iii. Programs that are considered high caliber may still be identified for reduction or discontinuation due to program demand, market factors, or other variables.
  - b. Further work in academic restructuring.
    - i. Likely to result in college and department mergers, which is expected to reduce redundancies and increase inter-program support. Announcements on this are expected over the next few months.
  - c. Identifying additional instructional inefficiencies
    - i. Enforcing equitable and reasonable faculty workloads.
    - ii. Reducing reliance on part-time instructors.
    - iii. Reducing teaching overloads and course equivalencies.
    - iv. Reviewing and standardizing administrative stipends.
  - d. Working with RPK to identify greater inefficiencies across academic support units that report to academic affairs.
- b. This process will move rapidly to ensure that faculty positions eliminated will receive early notice, and to avoid prolonging the institutional budget.
- c. A high level of work is expected over the summer, and responsible parties must be expected to respond to requests for information.

Reed yielded the floor to Rob Alsop.

- a. Leadership is committed to listening to feedback from the university community, but the process must still move quickly and efficiently.
- b. ITS merger between HSC and the general university has been announced and is in process.
- c. The new budget model will be a step forward in transparency, investment, and decision making.
- d. Examining effective use of space in buildings and negotiating contracts with the steam plant for cost savings.
- e. Reductions in administration, including nonrenewals, are ongoing.
- f. Most employees will remain at the institution. The institution will continue to operate, but there are structural changes that must be made.

16. Report from Stephanie Taylor, Vice President and General Counsel – Proposed changes to BOG Rule 4.7, Reduction in Force Process, Severance Packages

*Post-Meeting Notes: Additional information released via email on 5/11/23 – [Transformation, Budget Updates](#)*

*The transformation site is now available at <https://transformation.wvu.edu>*

- a. Slides detailing [program review process, timeline, and proposed BOG rule amendments](#) are available for review.
- b. Voluntary requests for work-time reduction are being processed.
- c. Between now and the end of June the Provost Office will be working to gather data on academic programs. They will be using that data to begin the assessment of whether a program might be of concern.
- d. Deans, chairs, and university community at-large will be notified which programs are of concern the week of July 10.
  - a. July 11-31 – Deans and chairs will seek input from faculty and staff on the program review self-study form before it is submitted to the Provost Office.
- e. August 1 deadline for deans and chairs to submit finalized program review self-study form.
- f. August 18 deadline to appeal preliminary recommendations via online form.
- g. Appeals will follow the guidelines set forth by [BOG Rule 2.2](#) and there will be an opportunity to sign up to speak at the board meeting on September 14<sup>th</sup>.
- h. Board will vote on final recommendations for program reduction or discontinuation on September 15<sup>th</sup>.
- i. Reduction in force plans for affected programs will be reviewed and finalized in October.
- j. Employees will have 45 days to review the severance package offered and decide if they want to sign it or not and will have seven days after signing to revoke their signature.
- k. This is the first RIF for faculty – revisions to BOG 4.7 are intended to add transparency and clarify the process. Revisions change the severance package language, removing “the value of the severance package should be equivalent to one year of the Faculty member’s annual base pay” and replacing it with “the amount of severance that a faculty member may be offered will be determined based upon a schedule approved by the Board.”
- l. October 16 – notice date for reduction in force.
- m. 30-day comment period on proposed amendments to BOG 3.9 and 4.7 runs May 22, 2023, to June 21, 2023. The BOG will vote on proposed amendments on July 31.

Member: Is seniority being looked at as a positive or negative factor?

Taylor: I would say a positive factor. If someone’s skills and knowledge are equal, we will look at seniority to determine who remains with the institution. The individual with seniority would remain.

Member: How does the timeline relate to support units? Are they a part of the process and will it be public?

Reed: Yes, those are the academic support units that will be the fourth area of work. This includes Extension, Libraries, and other groups. We will be updating the timeline with more information about that work, but we will also be looking at that work this summer and working with the consultants to look at those areas.

Member: Does this October deadline for RIFs apply to all programs or just those proposed for reduction?

Taylor: In order to do a program reduction of force, you must have a program reduction or discontinuation. The answer is it will apply to the programs recommended for reduction or discontinuation. Managing other needs, staff classified or non-classified, typically happens in the spring.

Member: Could there be flexibility in this assessment – could a colleague not targeted for reduction in force volunteer to take the place of a colleague that was selected?

Taylor: I appreciate that. We will be doing that self-affirmation in the beginning, where faculty can say that they don't want to continue in the unit, or with new workload requirements, or any reason. Those faculty will automatically be a part of the faculty selected for reduction in force.

Alsop: As a corollary to the classified staff side, as it relates to reduction in force, after a decision is made that, for example, we will take a 10-person unit down to 7, there will be a discussion of folks that may say, I was thinking about retiring at the end of this year anyway, or thinking of a life change. There will be limitations on the faculty side due to expertise and knowledge, but there will be opportunities within units to work through reductions. The goal is to minimize the involuntary reduction in force if we can manage it.

Member: So there will be that flexibility within units?

Alsop: There will be units where that flexibility is not possible, but the goal is to work with the units on what is the best way to treat everyone moving forward.

Member: How much is the university spending on the RPK consultants?

Alsop: We can try to get information to you for general consultants. The RPK contract is based on an hourly rate. I realize and appreciate the inquiry. I think that if we were doing this on our own there would be questions as to why we don't have an outside opinion, but since we have the outside opinion there will also be questions on the cost. I don't know the hourly rate off-hand, but we are aware of that cost and are thoughtful about getting value for the money we spend on the service.

Member: We've been hearing about the need to engage and retain our students, which I believe we have heard and attempted. What are we doing to engage students in this process of looking at programs and what their needs are, as far as keeping things satisfactory with students when working on engagement and potential?

Reed: We have been working hard on retention and we appreciate faculty efforts. For engaging students, we are working on a very tight timeline. There will be an opportunity for feedback from units, and we will use data to determine what students are interested in, but we will not be engaging students in this process.

Member: I ask that because we heard that we should provide more online classes, but we also see that students are less engaged in those classes. Just balancing that and making sure the student needs and perspectives are put into the mixture of what is considered.

Member: Do these changes apply to the University system or only the main campus?

Alsop: These changes are system wide.

Member: The financial situation, as stated, is it also due to high interest rate bonds and new buildings, or is it only enrollment and PEIA?

Alsop: The last major debt we were issued was for Reynolds, Hodges, and some athletics spending, during the early stages of COVID. It was a very low interest rate period. The rest of our debt has pretty low fixed interest rates. During COVID and in the last year, we are closing on a debt issuance for WVU

modernization and some projects like storm water and projects at Jackson's Mill. The interest rate for that is 5%. Over the last decade, we did issue quite a bit of debt. Over the next 5-7 years there is a lot of principal being paid on that debt, after which the debt service will go down. We did not have a bunch of variable interest rate debt that raised and caused a spike in debt. We are in a bit of an arch on our debt payments.

Member: Typically, decisions on this type come together with some kind of effect, like cost and benefit. In terms of the reduction in force, there will be a significant impact across the institution. While the benefit is evident and driven by difficult financial circumstances, what do you think the impact is going to be in many of these units? We talk about being competitive and working hard in retention, enrollment, research, and R1 statuses, and yet these types of decisions are going to impact all of those things.

Alsop: We knew these decisions would cause some negative impact to the institution. We have discussed that, as we work through this over the next several months, there will be negative impacts to the institution from the decisions that are made. As a public institution where we have notice and comment, we work through issues and allow employee feedback, it is a longer process. That long of a process leaves a lack of clarity and consternation that I hate. I would like to move quickly, but we cannot move as quick due to those facts. I wish we had those additional 5,000 students back, but we do not. I've talked to the president and said, I wish during the depths of COVID that I considered that enrollment might not bounce back and we needed to adjust. If we had done that, the university community likely would suggest that we emerge from COVID and see where we stand. I wish I could have seen around the corners to make changes back then to avoid an accelerated timeline. We have a number of situations that are not ideal. That being said, with all those variables and all the terrific things that come with WVU, I think the best way to proceed are to have a number of transparent conversations, make decisions in the fall to ensure long term success, and make hard decisions so that we resource what we have left.

Reed: I think you said it well. We want to grow, we want a bright future, we have very limited resources right now to do that. We are working very closely with our Office Research to identify and prioritize those programs that contribute the most to our R1 position. We will try to do this thoughtfully, as that R1 status is very important to us.

Member: What was the cost-benefit analysis of hiring a third party outside of what was stated regarding objectivity? What was the decision as to spending this additional money rather than leveraging existing expertise at WVU?

Alsop: As we talked through the timeline and expectations from our Board and president, and the need to move through this in an appropriate fashion, and knowing that this will impact peoples' lives, we believed that using foundation money to hire these consultants would be a good use of our resources to add a level of comfort that we were making decisions that, while hard, were directionally in the best interest of the institution moving forward.

Member: What was the process of reviewing whether or not we had the expertise that could have answered those questions? Or was it just assumed that we would not, so we hired a third party.

Alsop: Our finance team and I met several weeks ago when we realized that, not only did we have the \$14 million problem, but we saw the finances we were looking at and received the charge from the board on the enrollment gap. The university leadership discussed the financial situation for the next few years – following that discussion, we have done a series of campus conversations, board presentations, discussions as an internal leadership team, conversations with other institutions, to discuss what are the steps we need to take to navigate this financial crisis. The result of those conversations was to leverage that expertise [of a third party].

Reed: I will also say that, while we do have a great deal of expertise at the university, we have not been through this before and we want to make sure we will do it right because of the impacts it will have on the community. We wanted to make sure we were doing it right. I've talked to other provosts that have gone through this, and determined that there was a consultant that could help us do this and do it right.

Member: We have heard a lot about students first, value of service, increasing enrollment, but the changes that have been made already seem to be in direct conflict with that. Things like tripling class sizes, increase faculty workloads off of contract, things that are really going to impact our ability to teach the students we already have or service we already do, slashing funding for graduate service assistants – I'm just curious how the decisions we've already made are data driven and in line with those goals.

Alsop: Fair points, fiscal years 2023 and 2024 are going to be hard. What I will tell you right now is that, given the number of students we have, the tuition we receive for them, and the state support we receive, we do not generate sufficient resources to pay for the expenses we currently have. You are right that it is hard, and it is not sustainable. It is not sustainable to ask a researcher not to travel, it is not sustainable to do some of the things we are asking you to do moving forward. I don't disagree with you at all. But unless the trends change and a bunch of new students come through the door, we are going to have to go through, look at the things we are doing, and stopping some of them so that we can get back to a place where we are not asking for things we wouldn't normally ask to do in normal operation. Provost Reed may be able to speak about rules and discussions on faculty workloads and enforcement of those across the institution. The fact is that, right now, we are going to have to say no to some things to prevent stress across the institution.

Reed: The colleges and other units have not had a chance to strategically approach this, as we have a very short window of time to meet our budget for fiscal year 2024. The whole goal of the extended academic transformation effort is to allow us to make strategic decisions that will have pain and will likely result in losing positions, but making decisions that will make strategic decisions and not just to meet an immediate budget shortfall. We appreciate that this is having a big impact on the institution and people.

Member: It feels like lip service to say some of these things about a land grant institution but to not back it up.

Reed: We are doing our best.

Member: I'd like to yield the floor to Suzanne Gosden Kitchen to speak.

Kitchen: Thank you, I'm an incoming senator but not official yet. After the October 16 date, there is an 8-10 month severance package proposed and it was outlined. Seven of those 8-10 months are really just us playing out our contracts – that isn't a severance package, it is just our salary. Can you address that?

Alsop: I understand that. We gave a preview to Faculty Senate last week so that they would not be surprised, as we wished a level of engagement. We did receive pushback on how we were approaching a few things, so we reconsidered how we were addressing severance. We had hoped to come today with the very specifics down to the day regarding the situation, but we do need a little bit more time as we are trying to be good listeners. Generally speaking, a faculty member notified in October that their contract will not be renewed the following August, will have their assignment through May should they want it. Depending on what level, and what level of experience, the severance will be from anywhere to 2 to 12 weeks after that.

Member: Do you have a feeling for the number of faculty positions that will be impacts or discontinued due to the budget?



Alsop: I do not. I do not want to predict and over or undershoot moving forward. There have been reductions, primarily on the nonclassified staff side for FY24. Once those are complete we will be transparent about the number of individuals from that particular perspective. We are considering a number of things – for example, moving Research faculty to the waterfront and selling that current building. We are working as hard as we can to identify as many of those savings as we can, that will allow us to limit the number of cuts we are forced to make for FY25. The \$24 million cut for FY24 will be met by those things I mentioned and other cuts we can make, additional cuts to administrative units, and cuts to the academic units through academic transformation and other items the deans are working on. Those streams will come together as we get to July to determine what levers we need to pull for the fall going forward. As we hone in on the specifics of those, we will let you know regarding decisions on personnel.

Member: I'd like to be a little more forward thinking. Enrollment is one of our core issues, right? I've been a part of institutions that have cut faculty, and you see a large decrease in enrollment due to programs being eliminated. Is RPK helping us look at other sources of students and revenue, like non-traditional students or transfer students?

Reed: For my colleagues in enrollment management, they are looking at every possible angle to increase enrollment. That includes opportunities for non-degree, nontraditional students, and so on. RPK is not helping us with that, we have those resources. We are partnered with EAB to help us identify trends. We do have a resource problem where we cannot invest in growth. We see some potential growth opportunities, but we do not have the resources to contribute toward them.

Member: Is there a preference for retaining tenured faculty versus annual contract faculty?

Taylor: It is a holistic assessment. It is hard to say in individual circumstances whether there is a preference for one type of faculty member versus the other to determine what a program will look like after a reduction – would it be more focused on teaching, or more on research than teaching.

Member: Faculty have been confronted by sacrifices they need to make going forward. Many are wondering if they will have a job at all, and those of us that will, we will likely face larger class sizes and higher workloads without additional compensation, and most are willing to chip in. Yet we also hear that we are one WVU and need to work together to bolster enrollment and erase the deficit moving forward. Given that the salaries of administrators are several times higher than the average faculty members, it would send a strong message of motivation, solidarity, and one WVU spirit if some members of the administration took a voluntary pay cut to contribute their share to the cost saving of the institution. Has anyone in the administration of WVU considered such a solidarity pay cut piece, and if no, why not?

Gee: That is a fair question. I have contributed \$2.5 million to the institution, much of it going into scholarships and a variety of other things. That is how I have used my resources, and I believe that all of us up here contribute and do it in a number of different ways. I welcome everyone to start thinking about the Day of Giving and the other opportunities we have. We don't want to have a divide between faculty and staff. I think everyone earns the salaries that are appropriate for them. We do not have bloated salaries here compared to most places. When I was at Ohio State, salaries for administrators were much higher and we had many more of them. When I came here I kept the number of administrators low. We have one of the lowest administrator cadres in the county and we will keep it that way. When we start to talk about these kinds of things, I think it is important to understand that we are all contributing to the general welfare of the institution. I am grateful that I

am able to do that, and that is something I will continue to do that. I think others are contributing toward solidarity in a variety of ways.

Member: There will be comparisons of faculty, right? Will that comparison happen at the program level, or across programs within a college?

Taylor: It is a holistic assessment and will be done based on the program that is subject to the review. So, it is not across other programs, but only the program identified and recommended for reduction or discontinuation.

Member: Following up on administrative salaries. At the department level, as part of the process, administrators are having to take major cuts. In Political Science, the Director of Graduate Studies is going to have no stipend whatsoever, as he would have to give up his course release. So it was either the money or the course release. I don't doubt that administrators work very hard for the university, but at the department level, people that are giving service in that way are taking serious pay cuts. I hope the administration keeps that in mind moving forward

Member: The language in the BOG rule is that the university MAY offer severance pay if a faculty member is removed by reduction in force. Does this mean that some faculty may not receive severance pay?

Taylor: We are planning on offering severance packages based on the detailed schedule presented to the Board of Governors, which will also be subject to the 30-day public comment period.

Member: Can you clarify what the number is for budgetary shortfalls? There was an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education that stated the number as \$75 million and we hadn't heard that, so we weren't sure if that was true or not.

Alsop: The numbers we are looking at were mentioned at the campus conversation. If we do not increase our market share, and given the enrollment cliff, that number will go from \$45 million next year, to \$75 million in FY2028.

Member: Question on the timeline. If I read it correctly, programs will be identified through academic transformation in early August, at which time programs can put an appeal together at that point, or faculty can appeal.

Taylor: The week of July 10 is when the programs will be identified as those of concern that will go through the program review process. From July 11-31 is when faculty will work with deans and chairs to place information into that review form. The week of August 11-14 is when the Provost Office will announce which of the programs of concern the office is recommending for reduction, discontinuation, or to operate as-is. After that point, the faculty member can file a notice of appeal during the seven day window.

Member: My question is, will there be sufficient data made available to the Office of the Provost for faculty to mount an effective appeal for your program to be transformed? We would need the departments data and other comparative information to structure an appeal.

Reed: We haven't figure out what data sharing will look like just yet, if you will have a password protected site or similar, but we will be providing that data to you.

Member: There are a number of specialty-track faculty in Health Sciences. The tracks listed on the presentation did not account for all of those. I was wondering if there would be clarity on, for example, clinical faculty, other clinical tracks, and so on?

Taylor: We will work on that and make sure that it is clearer.

Member: For programs identified for reduction or discontinuation, is the program and the faculty subjected to the RIF considered a major or department?

Slimak: BOG Rule 2.2 defines a program as a program constituted by the degree designation, all its constituent majors, a single major, a minor, a certificate program, or any other curricula as defined by the college dean's office or the provost office.

Wayne: So it could be parts of departments and certain degrees, not necessarily a complete or full department?

Slimak: Correct.

Wayne: So it could be particular degrees within a department, minors with a department, or an entire department.

Member: Are there any plans to eliminate or sell some of the properties acquired or developed as public-private partnerships?

Alsop: Let's talk about our student housing, public-private partnerships and how they work. We own the ground, and the private party borrowed minor, take for example U-Park. I'm sorry – we bought the land, and then leased the land to them for 40 years. They then took and borrowed against that lease \$110 million and built the building on that ground subject to that lease, and then the building was donated to the university. So we own that building, but it is subject to a lease with 37 years left on it, subject to a loan issued by a bank. So we cannot sell those properties based on the terms.

Member: Do you have any estimate on the number of programs that might be identified as programs of concern?

Reed: The short answer is no. Hopefully by mid-summer we will have a much better idea.

Member: Has there been any discussion about how the budget cuts could create a mass exodus of faculty from the institution?

Alsop: Yes, we are worried about the fact that some of our key talent might leave. We spend about \$600 million on our personnel, \$230 million on supplies, in a \$1.1 billion budget. There will be some reductions, but the overwhelming majority of the university community will be here moving forward. I know that what we have indicated from a budgetary perspective has led to some consternation. Our thoughts were, let's be transparent about the cuts and the timeline. While there might be some folks concerned about waiting to July to hear about programs of concern or August to reach a decision, we knew there was a need for us to be more transparent. The next few months will be hard, but we will turn the corner on this much faster than most institutions will be able to. Most faculty will reach July and see that their program was not identified as of concern, or if it is a program of concern will still have a job, but yes, it is weighing on this leadership team, the decisions we are making, how it will be interpreted and how it will impact the university community.

Member: Regarding startup funds and guaranteed funding in contracts. Some folks are concerned about ability to access funds, even if they have good justification for it, especially for those that have external funding

obligations or expectations in our contracts for promotion. What assurances can early career faculty, pre-tenure faculty, and incoming faculty who have funds they are obligated to, what assurances do they have that they will have access to those funds, particularly in the years moving forward?

Also: It is our intent to do everything we can, and it is a priority as it relates to startup funds. We know there were delays due to COVID, and that we will have to work through this process from a budgetary perspective, but we know that it is a priority of the institution that those startup funds need to be funded and need to be spent over the next several years. I will say that it is a priority moving forward for the commitment we've made on startups and to try to work through them. I've met with Fred King, I've met with the STEM deans, we have discussed this internally and if we can rely on some foundation funding or if we need to cut into other areas to make that work moving forward. I will restate that, while the present is going to be hard, we are working to get to a place where we are able to live up to our commitments. We just need you to work with us on timing.

Member: Based on that, would you be willing to work with faculty on extending the time in which we can use our startup funds? Generally speaking there is a several year expectation on that – will we be able to extend that?

Reed: We will look into that, and we will do something about it.

Wayne: If you submitted a question in the Zoom Q&A and did not get an answer, we will submit those to the Provost Office and post the answers online.

Wayne: Are cuts being anticipated for athletic programs?

Also: Athletics is expected to carry their own weight, and our finance team has been in contact with the athletic programs to ensure that they are good stewards of the monies they use, and a good university citizen as we work forward. As an auxiliary, they have a certain set of revenues that they can generate and spend, and we've tried to work through that with them thoughtfully. A specific cut for an auxiliary is a little different, but athletics is not the reason we are here but they are a part of our institution. A few years ago we talked about the increase in applications when Grier was in the Heisman discussion. Just like how we have to have the ability to invest on the academic side of things, so does it go with athletics as the institution moving forward. They are not spending and continuing to spend. If you look at our expenditures, especially once you take out travel and look at the discretionary spending and investments in our program, we are at the bottom of the BigXII. We do and need to do more with less moving forward.

#### 17. No new business.

Wayne: It has been an honor to represent faculty and the campus community as Faculty Senate Chair this year. It has been a rewarding, though time consuming, experience for me and I have learned more than I could ever have imagined. I'm incredibly grateful to Ashley Martucci, Stan Hileman, Eloise Elliott, Dave Hauser, Corey Hunt – I want to thank you all for all of your hard work. I'd like to thank the committee chairs for all the dedication and work. I am also grateful for the support and engagement from President Gee, Provost Reed and her team, and the other administrators I have worked with. It is tradition for the incoming Faculty Senate Chair adjourn the last meeting of the year. While I will likely have one last meeting on June 5<sup>th</sup>, I am going to make the ceremonial presentation of the gavel to our incoming chair. Frankie has been a steadfast assistance and supporter throughout the year, and has devoted countless hours to meetings to conduct the actions of Senate. Frankie, your year of apprenticeship comes to a close. I know you'll be a strong voice for faculty as the Senate

Chair and as a member of the BOG. I greatly appreciate all you have done to support me, and I look forward to supporting you next year. Know that you too will have the help of a strong team behind you.

18. Motion to adjourn. Seconded.

Faculty Senate Chair-Elect Frankie Tack adjourned the meeting at 5:33 p.m. to reconvene on June 5, 2023

Corey Hunt  
Faculty Senate Office Administrator