

MINUTES  
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2023, 3:15 P.M.

Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne brought the monthly meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. Members and guests participated via video conference.

Members Present:

Armour-Gemmen, M.	Feaster, K.	Leary, M.	Sherlock, L.
Ballard, D.	Floyd, K.	Leight, M.	Sims, J.
Barghouthi, N.	Fullen, M.	Li, B.	Soccorsi, A.
Barnes, E.	Grushecky, S.	Lupo, J.	Sofka, S.
Battistella, L.	Haddox, C.	Malarcher, J.	Sowards, A.
Bhandari, R.	Hamrick, A.	Marra, A.	Staniscia, S.
Bianco, C.	Hanif, A.	Martin, J.	Swager, L.
Bolyard, J.	Hatipoglu, K.	McGinnis, R.	Szklarz, G.
Bonner, D.	Hauser, D.	Moore, M.	Tack, F.
Bresock, K.	Heady, M.	Mucino, V.	ter Haseborg, H.
Casey, R.	Hedrick, J.	Murphy, E.	Titolo, M.
Celikbas, E.	Hessl, A.	Myers, S.	Totzkay, D.
Cohen, S.	Hibbert, A.	Nix, D.	Utzman, R.
Cook, A.	Hileman, S.	Ogden, L.	Valenti, M.
Cottrell, L.	Hodge, J.	Olgers, F.	Waggy, C.
Crichlow, S.	Honaker, L.	Orr, L.	Wayne, S.
Dahle, G.	Huber, S.	Peckens, S.	Weislogel, A.
Davari, A.	Jaynes, M.	Phillips, T.	Williams, D.
Davis, D.	Johnson, D.	Reece, J.	Woloshuk, J.
DeMarco, F.	Katz, J.	Rinehart, L.	Woodberry, K.
Dey, K.	Kearns, J.	Ripley Stueckle, J.	Woods, S.
Di Bartolomeo, L.	Kelly, K.	Roberts, D.	Wuest, T.
Dickman, B.	Kent, A.	Rogers, T.	Zeni, T.
Dilcher, B.	Knuckles, T.	Rota, C.	
Dumitrescu, C.	LaRue, R.	Ruseski, J.	
Eades, D.	Leary, B.	Sabolsky, E.	

Members Excused:

Elliott, E.	Faber, T.	Prinzo, L.
-------------	-----------	------------

Members Absent:

Bernardes, E.	Elswick, D.	Martucci, A.	Sakhuja, A.
Bruyaka, O.	Evans, K.	Miltenberger, M.	Samuels, H.
Carducci, H.	Graziani, G.	Momen, J.	Shrader, C.
Cronin, A.	Gross, J.	Morgan, J.	Sizemore, J.
Cui, A.	Grossman, D.	Murphy, T.	Smith, D.
Dimachkie, Z.	Hines, S.	Murray, A.	Sokos, G.
Dionne, C.	John, C.	Nguyen, J.	Stamatakis, M.
Donley, D.	Kale, U.	Olfert, M.	Vaddamani, V.
Duenas, O.	Klein, A.	Petrone, A.	Watson, J.
Ellis, E.	Law, K.	Reece, R.	
Ellison, M.	Lorenze, S.	Renzelli-Cain, R.	

1. Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne presented the [Minutes](#) of the May 8, 2023, meeting of Faculty Senate for approval.

Motion to approve carried by unanimous consent.

Chair Wayne moved to change the agenda, placing the report from Provost Reed after all Faculty Senate reports.

Motion carried by unanimous consent.

2. Curriculum Committee Report (Lori Ogden)

For Approval – New Course Report – [Annex I](#)

For Approval – Course Change Report – [Annex II](#)

For Approval – Program Change – WMAN\_BS: Wildlife and Fisheries Resources, Key: 583

For Approval - Program Change – WMAN\_FS\_AOE: Fisheries Sciences, Key: 584

For Approval – Program Change – WMAN\_WS\_AOE: Wildlife Sciences, Key: 585

Motion to approve all times carried with 70 in favor and none opposed.

3. General Education Foundations Committee Report (Lisa DiBartolomeo)

a. Presented Annex III, adding four new courses to the GEF program

b. Di Bartolomeo noted that the committee is accepting courses for GEF approval until further notice.

For Approval – Committee Actions – [Annex III](#)

Motion to approve carried with 74 in favor and none opposed.

**Member:** Are new courses being approved moving forward?

**Lisa Di Bartolomeo:** As far as the committee is concerned, we are happy to accept new courses. There are mixed messages coming out from some of the colleges, but the Faculty Senate and the General Education Foundations Committee are happy to continue to accept new courses. Any questions about that can be directed to me, Scott, Frankie, or Mary Beth Angeline.

4. Teaching and Assessment Committee Chair Diana Davis had no report.

5. Committee on Committee Report (Lesley Cottrell)

a. Cottrell presented Annex IV, detailing Faculty Senate Committee rosters for the 2023-2024 academic year.

For Approval – Committee Rosters – [Annex IV](#)

**Member:** Question about the Shared Governance Committee – there is no one from Eberly, Beckley, or Kaiser on that committee. Can we hold off on that committee until those individuals can be placed on there, or at least consider that motion?

**Lesley Cottrell:** I think everyone, every single one of those committees would say the same thing in terms of representation. The committee tries as much as possible to find those people [for equal representation] by this date, but that doesn't always happen. That is on our radar and we are continuing to work on it. We will also be identifying chair-elects and making people comfortable for those roles. So there is more work to be done there and every month, once we achieve that, we will continue to add [to those rosters.]

**Member:** It appears there also isn't a representative from Chambers.

**Cottrell:** I have a question, then based on that as more comments come up. I haven't seen on the composition for Shared Governance that a representative from each college is required. If that is the case, the committee needs to take that back and work on it.

**Member:** When the committee was originally made, it was an ad hoc committee. The general idea is that we were trying to get as much representation across all colleges as we could, though we never had full representation. I would assume that some colleges aren't represented because they were left off, but because there were no volunteers.

**Member:** I volunteered from my college, and I know of other volunteers, so we may have been overlooked.

**Member:** With the feedback we have had on the requirements, it might be sensible for us to change that committee's requirements to make it so that we have a representative from every college or campus.

Motion to update the committee requirements for the Shared Governance Committee to require a member from each college or school (R. Casey). Seconded.

**Member:** I volunteered from the Beckley campus but do not see my name on the list.

**Member:** I would like to propose a friendly amendment to the motion to add the phrase "where practical." Sometimes people do not volunteer or for whatever reason it is difficult to find representatives. If we only get 16 out of 17, that shouldn't stop the committee from moving forward.

Friendly amendment accepted by R. Casey.

Amended motion: Motion to update the committee requirements for the Shared Governance Committee to require a member from each college or school [**where practical**].

**Member:** Would that requirement need someone to be a senator, or could the committee be populated by non-senators?

**Wayne:** Generally, the committees consist of both senators and non-senators, so it does not require that.

**Cottrell:** I will note that, if we have a volunteer that is active on three or more committees, we attempt to avoid over-utilizing one individual and do not place them on every committee that they have volunteered for.

No further discussion.

Motion to update Shared Governance Committee requirements carried with 77 in favor and one opposed.

No further discussion.

Motion to approve Annex IV carried with 77 in favor and none opposed.

~~6. Report from Faculty Representative to State Government (Eloise Elliot)~~ E. Elliott was absent and did not report.

7. Board of Governors Report (Stan Hileman)

a. Board of Governors May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting

a. Approved academic transformation timeline.

b. Approved rule changes to go out for comment for rules 3.9 and 4.7, dealing with reduction in force for classified staff and faculty, respectively.

c. Proposed severance package has been sent out for comment, senators are encouraged to leave their comments so that Stan, Ashley, and Frankie know how to proceed on this.

b. Next Board meeting is on June 23.

**Member:** There have been a number of comments that I have received on BOG Talent and Culture Rule 3.9. Should I direct all of those individuals to comment on the Board site?

**Stephanie Taylor:** I'm happy to answer that if that is okay.

**Wayne:** Sure, Stephanie.

**Taylor:** Yes, that would be great if you could direct them to comment on the online comment form. I would greatly appreciate that.

**Stan Hileman:** I would add the same, I think that would allow us to see common trends in this and get a direction on where to head on this.

**Member:** The concern was that they would be identifying themselves and potentially putting themselves at risk of retaliation for making a comment.

**Wayne:** Stephanie, we have talked about anonymity in those comments. Do you want to comment on that briefly?

**Taylor:** Sure. I'll generally state as a comment, no one will be retaliated against for submitting a comment. If someone feels they would like to submit a comment anonymously, they can do so by simply writing the word "anonymous" in the first and last name boxes and then putting "NA" in the email box. You just need to put text in those boxes in order to submit the form.

**Frankie Tack:** This idea of retaliation seems to be coming up a lot. I'm interest in knowing if this has happened? Is this fear, or have people actually been retaliated against from the general counsel office or the board?

**Member:** My impression is that it is not overt and that people feel like they have been targeted simply because of being outspoken in some areas.

**Tack:** Has anyone else had an experience? If people are being targeted in some way then we need to take that up and know who is doing that. I feel that if we are all being civil and asking questions, getting reasonable feedback, then there is no reason to be retaliating against people. If there is, we need to deal with that. So maybe when people say that to you, if they could send that information to Scott, me, or Stan, then we can follow up on that so it can be stopped so that we can have an open flow of feedback and communication.

**Member:** I feel like the teaching assistance professors and people not on the tenure track feel a lot more concerned about having their names associated. They don't want to be perceived as a troublemaker or problematic.

**Wayne:** Stephanie, there is a question asking how the Board of Governors comments are being used and will they be shared publicly?

**Taylor:** Absolutely. I also have to say that I, nor anyone in my office, have ever retaliated against anyone for a comment they have made or in any regard. To answer the question – the comments are gathered in a chart and presented to the Board unedited. We do not edit anyone's comments. Ten days before the Board will vote on the severance package or new rules, meaning on or around June 21, all the comments received will be publicly posted and we do have a determination made column that responds to the comment. Those responses are in varying degree of detail depending on the comment. We do redact the person's name and email address from what is publicly posted.

**Member:** Faculty have asked that some programs have been instructed to provide a normal Board of Governors review. Will additional information that is needed, other than in this review, be communicated with these programs following the initial document submission?

**Wayne:** I believe that is a question for the Provost's Office.

**Maryanne Reed:** I believe that is appropriate for Lou Slimak.

**Lou Slimak:** The way I'm going to approach this is that the regular five-year Board of Governors timeline will proceed. Any program that is identified, through the summer work of the Provost's Office, to complete a self-study over the summer that would have also been identified for their five-year review that would be due this December, will not have to complete the review in December. I'll work with them to have what they complete this summer satisfy the requirements of the five-year review that would have been due for the regular Board of Governors process.

8. Report from Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne

- a. Volunteers requested for the Country Roads Reunion Tour scheduled for June 13 in Preston County. We are working with Food for Preston package meals for their mobile pantry. Registration information was distributed from the Provost Office, the most recent email going out on May 31<sup>st</sup>. If you are interested you may contact me or Emily Murphy to receive the link.
- b. Summer meetings scheduled July 10, August 7, August 28.
  - a. July 10 and August 7 will be held via Zoom, with August 28 being held in person.
  - b. Frankie Tack will assume the chair position and preside over those meetings.
- c. Reminder that the public comment period is open for BoG Rule 4.7 and the severance packages. If it highly important that faculty provide their comments on the associated website.
- d. We have received several requests for presentational efforts to recruit new students and boost enrollment. Sharon Martin, Vice President for University Relations, and George Zimmerman, Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management, scheduled to be at the July 10 Senate meeting to provide information on that topic.
- e. Summer Transformation Group has met twice.
  - a. May 15, Reed discussed the role of the group, M. Latimer provided information on support and outplacement services to support faculty, and Lisa Castellino-Gergich discussed data analytics and data challenges.
  - b. May 31, Lia Castellino-Gergich presented additional details on financial metrics and analysis they will use in the program evaluation process. Mark Gavin discussed the academic support unit review process that the Provost Office is working on.
  - c. Next meeting is June 26. Fred King, Vice President of Research, will join that meeting to discuss potential impacts that transformation activities and the budget situation may have on research and the R1 status.

9. For Information – 2022-2023 Committee Annual Reports

Academic Technology Committee – [Annex V](#)

Committee of Retired Faculty – [Annex VI](#)

Committee on Committees, Membership, and Constituencies – [Annex VII](#)

Faculty Welfare Committee – [Annex VIII](#)

General Education Foundations Committee – [Annex IX](#)

Library Committee – [Annex X](#)  
 Sustainability Committee – [Annex XI](#)  
 Teaching and Assessment Committee – [Annex XII](#)

10. Report from Provost Maryanne Reed

- a. Note that the Office of the Provost is highly aware of the anxiety and concern on campus, and their goal is to be as transparent as possible.
- b. Deep into the data gathering process as part of the extensive review of all academic programs.
- c. There is both a centrally driven process and one at the department or college level.
- d. So far data has been gathered relating to enrollment, net tuition for academic programs, and are finishing gathering data relating to departmental costs.
- e. Process will be data informed and will take into account other factors, such as research productivity, in particular related to doctoral programs, enrollment trends over time, and a unit's contributions to the University's land grant mission.
- f. Two-part process
  - a. First identify a larger set of programs of concern – those programs that have been flagged on one or more of the metrics mentioned above. Those programs will then go through the formal program review process outlined by BoG rules. Each program of concern will then be asked to submit additional information. Some information is required by the BoG rules, such as description of mission and assessment practices, but it will be an opportunity for that unit to respond to the data we provide and give us any other information to make their case on why the program should be retained as-is.
  - b. The Office of the Provost will then review the preliminary recommendations, which will likely be a smaller set of that larger group of programs.
- g. Adhering closely to the timeline that was communicated, and programs of concern will be shared with the campus community by July 10.
- h. Contract with RPK will be added to the Transformation website, along with all invoices.
  - a. Caps have been set for how much will be spent
  - b. Much of the work is being done in-house to minimize cost, including gathering and analyzing the financial enrollment data ourselves. This has been conducted by Lisa Castellino and Institutional Research.
  - c. Given that the stakes are so high, we feel that it is important to work with an independent third-party vendor who has experience in this type of work with other institutions. They add a second set of eyes to our work, ensuring that our data and analysis are accurate, our methodology is sound, and that we are adhering to industry best practices and standards.
  - d. We are making and owning the decisions, not the consultant.
- i. EAB is not involved in this work, though they have provided context to what we are doing by sharing and updating national trends. EAB provides assistance in areas like enrollment management and student success through such systems as Navigate.
  - a. The EAB contract will also be added to the website.
  - b. We will be reviewing how we work with EAB in the future, and it is likely we will be reducing some of the services they provide to us.

Reed yielded the floor to Stephanie Taylor.

- j. Last month I mentioned that we would have a detailed process document associated with the program review process, both the dean-initiated and the larger provost-initiated processes.
- k. Within that document we will have hyperlinks to templates of the notification and other documents that we will be using both through the academic program review process, and also the reduction in force process. We are in the process of finalizing those templates now and that information should be posted on the transformation website soon.
  - a. This will provide access to the types of documents we will be using from July 10 to the end of the reduction in force document later in October.

Reed reclaimed the floor.

- l. Identifying additional efficiencies and cost savings in the academic support units. These units are primarily non-tuition generation units providing a variety of academic functions.

Reed yielded the floor to Mark Gavin.

- m. M. Gavin presented on the [academic support unit evaluation process](#).
  - a. Process only includes those academic support units (ASU) that report to the Office of the Provost. Those outside of Provost purview are not included in the process.
  - b. Units were asked to complete self-studies, and stakeholder surveys were distributed to faculty, staff, and students (where appropriate).
  - c. We have collected job descriptions, personnel rosters, and operating budgets.
  - d. Where more information is needed, we will follow up with interviews, whether that be with the units themselves or key stakeholders for them.
  - e. Primary examination is the ASU contribution to the University, either on revenue generation directly or indirectly, or through things like connecting to student success or overall University organizational effectiveness.
  - f. Final recommendations will be presented to the Board of Governors in late July, with ASUs being informed of decisions on August 1.

Reed reclaimed the floor.

Reed yielded the floor to Rob Alsop

- n. Began merging the ITS units from HSC with the main campus several weeks ago.
  - a. There will be a restructuring of several areas.
  - b. Restructuring has created 14 “new” positions that are essentially re-engineered positions, taking job duties and descriptions that may be part HSC and part overall University.
    - i. Those positions have been posted and general University ITS have been encouraged to apply.
  - c. Overall reduction of around six FTE positions.
- o. Continuing to look at other areas of the University including Shared Services, fleet management, and trying to determine the most cost-effective way for things like our provisions of steam for the institution.
- p. The finance team is in the final stages of collecting everything and rolling it up for the FY24 budget, which will be proposed for consideration to the Board of Governors at the June meeting. Reed reclaimed floor.
- q. We will be making announcements this summer and in the fall regarding some of those transformations and engaging with those units at that time.

**Wayne:** You mentioned some of those other units, Rob. What process are you using to assess those units, and will faculty be given an opportunity to provide some sort of input on what the Provost has done for the academic support units?

**Rob Alsop:** We are happy to seek faculty input. I think Shared Services, for example, seeks feedback on a continual basis on how they can improve moving forward. One thing I noticed that is on everyone's mind is that I have been working with Fred Kin trying to move forward on some of the bottlenecks with the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). A lot of what is being driven, from a manpower and a process issue as it related to working with Fred on OSP comes directly from faculty researchers, in terms of the need to improve that particular process moving forward. If we think of – or if we move forward on additional areas of consolidation or transformation, I'm happy to engage, Scott, with faculty as appropriate.

**Wayne:** Are we looking at reductions in some of those units, across the board, that report up? Other than the Provost's Office.

**Alsop:** Yes, we are, but as we've also discussed; our classified and non-classified staff since 2014 are down over 400. In 2019 we worked through a VSIP program where, primarily from a non-faculty perspective, there were administrative costs that were eliminated moving forward. For a number of our facilities, we have taken some reductions to protect the academic core over the past several years. So yes, I do believe there will be in each, and a lot of the administrative units were given the responsibility for budget cuts moving forward. In finance in my units and others, there are non-renewals and RIFs that are moving through as we speak. I want to make clear that we have tightened budgets before, and we took part in the budget cuts for FY24. A number of our non-classified and classified employees have been let go of as a result of that moving forward.

**Member:** We've had some concerns about Shared Services, I personally have had a lot of struggles just getting someone hired and knowing who to contact. I hear you saying that the administrative staff is decreasing, but these are the kind of people that we need to get our work done on a departmental level to get our work done. We need people to help us get people hired, paid, reimbursement, student employment. I think that, whenever we think of administration, we are thinking more at the executive level. There have been a number of people expressing concerns about the growth of executive leadership and also the people that answer to them. Is there any plan to reduce the number of people working in executive leadership and the people reporting to them?

**Alsop:** None of this has been a question that's come up. I can't speak for everybody. I was first hired at the institution, my title was Vice President for Entrepreneurial Engagement, Legal and Government Relations. The general counsel, who is currently Stephanie Taylor, reported up to me, as did the units that I just mentioned. When Narvel Weese retired, he was the head of the Department of Finance and Administration. Those units were retitled as Strategic Initiatives. I moved over and took Narvel's spot, and my position was not backfilled. Additionally, shortly before Narvel retired, Dan Durbin left the institution. Anjali Halabe took over a part of those duties with no backfill. Paula Congelio started acting as CFO, but there was no replacement for the CFO at the Health Science Center, as she did both jobs. So with respect to moving from that restructuring from the VP of Finance and Administration to Strategic Initiatives, there were actually two executive positions that were not backfilled as it relates to those units. And so happy to go through-- and I know there's been a request for some organizational information moving forward. I'm not going to get into the particulars of specific personnel action at the moment. I can't answer specifically for other units other than other than I will say that the bulk of non-renewals for July 1 are non-classified, which are the



administrative salaried individuals and not those hourly employees. There have been a few classified, but it has mostly been non-classified.

**Reed:** Let me add to from the provost level, I'm happy to meet with a smaller group and lay out every single position and sort of who we hired or who we let go. What I would say to you all is, and I'm being really transparent, we've added one associate provost position since I've started and that was Melissa Latimer, whose primary responsibility is to oversee faculty development and culture. It is very much of a faculty facing position. We've elevated some people either for retention purposes or because they were replacing people, that is they were replacing the job duties of people who left and whose positions we didn't replace. We eliminated three very high positions in global affairs, as well as we did not replace our Dean of Online. So, we've been making changes, but we just haven't necessarily shared them publicly. I do want to say there may be a little confusion because we put everybody on the website, and that may not have been the case prior to that, to give people a sense that they are a valued part of this team. I'm happy to sit down with any group and map out the positions we have and the positions we did not replace. I feel that we are looking at that, and we will continue to look at ways to make our office and the units that report up to us more efficient.

**Member:** I think there would be interest in that.

**Alsop:** I'm also happy to sit down with a smaller group to talk through the finance, administration, legal, and strategic initiatives units over time.

**Wayne:** Frankie and I will reach out and set that up.

**Tack:** I appreciate that there have been changes over time, and I think the academic side has had changes over time – positions not filled, austerity plans, etc., but here we are. I think what the faculty really want to know is that it is not just the academic side. I appreciate all the things that have happened in the past, but if we're going to be a smaller institution, which all of leadership says we are, and that that's a necessity, it seems that a very good analytical assessment of all of that infrastructure that reports to you also needs to be assessed in a systematic manner, unit by unit, to make sure it's right sized. I think that's where this whole question is coming from. There is a model coming out of the Provost's Office for how to do that – rubrics and things – and I know it may not be the same. But I think that's the spirit of what's being asked here.

**Alsop:** So, I'll say this. I am happy to go through an exhaustive review of each of the units that report up to me. I think if you look at what we've done over the past several years-- and to be honest, if you look at the employment levels from a faculty versus a classified and non-classified staff, Frankie, to your question, the drops have been much more significant on the classified and non-classified side as opposed to faculty. So if the desire is to make additional significant cuts on the administrative side of the house, I think that's a fine conversation. There was a question raised about staffing levels at shared services previously. I think to not recognize some of those cuts and to say everybody's on an equal foot, and we have to cut the same amount by everybody going forward, I think is a mistake. To suggest that we're not working hard on the administrative side to make some of those changes and that we've been making some of those changes is not fair to a lot of folks that have been working hard on that particular side moving forward. I'm happy to go through the particular analysis. At the end of the day, it takes a certain minimum level of people to run the PRT, unless we don't want to have it anymore. It takes a certain number of people to run shared services, unless we want to delay the times that we get responded for hiring and some of those things. And so I am happy to go through an additional analysis on each of those things, or if folks think that environmental health and safety is too heavy and we need to lay off people there, fine to have that. We just need to have a discussion with research and the work that they do for the chemical protection and all of those things for the institution on how we move forward from that particular perspective absolutely on that particular piece.

**Tack:** No one is asserting that you aren't working hard, anymore than - the people who are being laid off, anyone from administration – they are working hard. My question is are you 100% confident that all of the pieces that report to you are right sized for our new organization?

**Alsop:** I've never said that at all, and I've never suggested anything like that.

**Member:** Do the president and top administrators still use a helicopter and/or private jet? If so, what are the yearly costs and is this being considered as one of the line items for budget cuts? Second question, have horizontal salary cuts been considered? For example, the costs saving of deducting 10% of the salary above \$200,000 being calculated as a way to save jobs and programs? Thank you.

**Alsop:** The University does not own a plane. There is a chartering service that the University does take advantage of, and it is – the proposed line item for that budget in FY24 has been reduced over expected expenditures for an area where there won't be as much expense for the institution. I don't have the particular numbers off the top of my head but I'm happy to get those numbers and provide them to you. But yes, that is moving forward. As it relates to your question on, why not make everybody making over \$200,000 take a 10% pay cut – that would devastate morale across the institution. We are not going to be in a place where we're going to require individuals to reduce the amount of their take-home pay moving forward as an institution. We try to work forward as it relates to market and compensate individuals fairly. To just across the board require a broad swatch of individuals – to require them to reduce their pay given that I think everybody at the institution is working hard – we don't think that would be an appropriate step to solve our budget challenges.

**Member:** I have a question about how the long-term fate of the University will be sustained. I have a PDF [[document linked in chat](#), slides 23 & 24 referenced] that shows we've been very effective at delivering the quality of instruction and educational opportunities at a very low cost by in large. Our faculty salaries apparently are, as this info-graphic from the West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy shows, we're 47th in the nation. Nobody is here for fame and fortune and riches. We're all here for our dedication to being able to contribute our time and talent and effort to raising this state up, which has many needs. We're well aware of the great needs that exist. I hear the word rightsizing and I cringe a little bit, because what I see – my interpretation is that we're reducing the footprint, and we already have reduced the accessibility of what we offer students to the extent that our Promise Scholarship does not cover the tuition that it used to. That has nothing to do with how well we teach our courses or how well we recruit students. That's a financial barrier that exists that used to be invested in by the state of West Virginia. If we look at the funding levels, revenue coming in since 2017 has almost doubled. The state budget is very healthy. But if you look at funding levels coming from the state legislature, it's actually down in real dollars. And I see no discussion of how that disinvestment in what we do and as well as other higher education institutions in the state is going to be able to – we're leaving a vacuum. We're leaving needs that are going to be unmet. Maybe we're rightsizing it to the extent that our budget allows, but our budget is being capped by a limit and a disinvestment of dollars coming from the state. I see that part of the equation hasn't really been addressed. I feel like we've been coasting on the hard work that was funded. We had investments and, I recall about 2014-16, there was this kind of influx. We coasted, and we see the state budget doing well, and we're going to cut off the tree at the roots. I fear that will be really hard to recover from. So is there any effort to restore the level of investment in higher education in West Virginia? Do you foresee that happening in the future? Or is this becoming a lower priority for the state by in large? I guess, Rob, that's probably a question for you.

**Alsop:** That's a really good question. In the past couple of years, we've actually seen our state appropriation increase a little bit by \$2 or \$3 million a year. Moving forward, we are not up at the high watermark we were back to 2011 or 2012. Honestly, I think with having 5,000 students less than we had back in 2013, 2014 it's hard to argue for more money given less enrollment, particularly because our enrollment has dropped a little bit more in state versus out of state. I think that's a challenge. It is not for lack of trying and conversations in Charleston. What we've been told is that they are much more likely to fund projects for areas of growth as opposed to backfilling operations. This year the University was successful in two different ways. The legislature set aside \$200 million to take care of deferred maintenance needs on all of our campuses, and we're hopeful to get as much of that as we can from a WVU perspective. The legislature also awarded \$50 million, assuming there's sufficient surplus, to enhance our ability to move the needle on cancer results in Appalachia. That'll be a joint effort between WVU and the WVU health system. There's an instance where the legislature has taken, adding those two together, \$250 million, one-time monies albeit, but \$250 million of the one-time surplus that they're doing and dedicating that into higher ed. It's quite an infusion of additional monies from the state that we are getting moving forward. It would be great if they would just say, here's more money to backfill operations, but I think we're going to have to go on specific projects, whether they be for health or for economic reasons for the good of the state. We certainly are at it almost on a daily basis with our legislature and WVU's value proposition and the need to invest.

**Member:** Part of the drop in enrollment is due to decreased accessibility. Financial barriers are greater for our students today. They used to get more assistance from the state investment in our institution. There is a correlation there that hasn't been addressed, that we have a very low rate of attainment of higher education degrees in the state. I fear that is going to become even lower, which is going to have drastic cascading impacts. We need to make that case that we're hurting our West Virginia residents in being able to obtain a college degree, and that we're seeing them missing from our classrooms because of the disinvestment. I hope that gets heard along the way somewhere.

**Member:** I was wondering if there was going to be any taking into consideration spousal hires? For example, West Virginia always has a physician shortage, and many of our physicians at WVU Medicine are married to people that work at WVU the school. I was wondering if that is something that is going to be considered when looking at some of these non-academic units that we were discussing.

**Reed:** What I would say to you is that this is in many ways a small community, and we're all connected in some way. Everywhere you go, there are dual hires. People know people. I think that the goal will be to be as transparent as possible about these decisions and try to do the right thing. I think we have to be aware that if we eliminate a position, that individual may be married or be a partner to someone in another unit. We need to consider that, but it is going to be tough because we do need to make some reductions. I do appreciate what you are saying.

**Member:** This is the second or third time we've heard about reductions in administrative FTEs. I'm on the HEPC website and they have a personnel count on their human resources data portal. It shows that, since 2014, we've lost about 1,000 classified employees who average about \$28,000 a year, and we've added about 1,000 unclassified employees who average about \$85,000 a year. I'm not seeing how that is consistent with the idea that we have already cut administrative positions. It looks like that must have added about \$40 million to the administrative budget of the institution unless I'm misunderstanding something. Could you address that?

**Alsop:** You are, so I'm happy to address it. I'll get the data from our chief data officer where we got the information. Prior to 2014 there was a requirement in West Virginia that only 25% of our employees could be non-classified. Everybody else had to be classified. It was completely different from how the rest of the world works. Usually, classified employees are designated as hourly employees, and non-classified as salaried. We had a number of individuals at the institutions that had to be designated as classified at the institution going forward for that. It caused a huge amount of problems, particularly in the IT space in terms of job families, in terms of job ladders, in terms of recruiting, moving forward with the institution and was really an outdated step moving forward. In 2014 or 2015, the legislature changed that. They said that moving forward the difference for WVU is that classified employees have progressive discipline, and they're not at will. Non-classified are not. So we said that everybody who's currently a classified employee will continue to be a classified employee, but going forward, under legislative policy, if you are an hourly employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act, you'll be considered classified. If you are a salaried employee for the Fair Labor Standards Act, you will be considered to be non-classified. Because the mix of hourly and salaried employees was artificially skewed by this limit on the number of non-classified individuals that the legislature had declared, over time, a number of positions that had been classified were reposted as non-classified positions as people retired, not with a salary changed or anything like that. There was an artificial distinction that prohibited us from labeling a salaried employee as a non-classified individual. That mix that you see at the Policy Commission in that report is purely a function of classification and had nothing to do with rate of pay.

**Member:** I appreciate the breakdown on classified and non-classified employees. I don't have a question so much as a comment. In response to Frankie's question and rephrasing things, I think the concern among faculty and staff is that we hear about our positions being on the line as just the way it is. When questions arise about higher up positions, there's a lot of defensiveness, which I get that. We're defensive about our positions too. Just want to say that noting, because I feel like it goes back and forth, one of the morale issues that we are all facing and that our constituents are all facing is that we hear "hey, buddies, your programs, they're probably cut. Sorry, that's the way it is. We got to right size." That may be so, but when we ask if it is equitable, the response is "we're working really hard and that would be a morale issue." I think it is a matter of tone. It makes it feel like faculty positions are being cut but not administrative ones. I understand that we need administrators, it is a matter of the tone in some of the responses.

**Alsop:** I want to separate a couple of things if I could, and say that the question on my salary and whether I should take a pay cut or make a donation to the University to help moving through is a different question whether I'm going to go to senior administrators in Enrollment or Student Life or the Provost Office and tell them that they have to take a pay cut. If everybody would feel better, we can talk about my particular circumstances. If that would make feel better from that communications perspective moving forward, my defensiveness is not over me. I'm happy to talk about that here in just a second. But what I'm trying to be clear on is that there are a number of really good people at the institution at a variety of salary levels who are compensated for the work that they do, and what's equitable and what's fair are two different things. Where I'm coming from is, as a leadership position, we do not think it is a fair thing to do to require across the board to say, if you make "X" dollars, you're going to take a pay cut to continue to work at WVU moving forward. That is different from a personal decision that I might make as it relates to what I'm giving up to help make it through this particular piece. You raise a really good point about defensiveness, and so let me just take a minute to say this. I wish I had seen around corners better or seen things differently two years ago. I've done a lot of soul searching over the past several months as it relates to how I can do a better job. I had someone

tell me last week if this were the private sector, I may not be around because I let things go too far before we move forward as an institution. So I do wish that I had raised issues earlier. We can talk through the fact that I didn't think during COVID when we were seeing enrollment declines that things wouldn't bounce back. I wish in hindsight I hadn't made that calculation. I wish I had seen things a lot differently and regret that I didn't take actions earlier to move things forward all the way around as a particular institution. That's something that I have to live with, and it's not that I could have magically done something on enrollment. I went back through actually and looked at it. We had campus conversations as early as 2015 and 2016 talking about expense reductions and how enrollment was declining. We can pull all those out and sort of go on how we've transformed for all those things. I apologize if I've been defensive. It's not – it's a question on my salary is different from the others. I do feel strongly that would be harmful to do that on a broad scale basis. I do understand that people are frustrated, and morale is low, and this surely sucks to get through. I wish that I had been stronger earlier to move things forward as an institution and put us in a better position. I think hindsight would be 20-20 living through a pandemic and seeing some of the enrollment losses that we're looking at from 2014 and '15 and thinking that those were temporary, and we'd have bounce backs. I certainly wish that I had looked at things differently moving forward in how we do this. My job at this point is how do we pick these things up and move forward. The only point I was trying to make is to the comment on shared services and some of the administrative units, if we do need to make additional cuts, we will. But there have been cuts to some of those units where, if they go deeper, we're talking about the provision of services that if we do those, could have significant consequences at the institution. I think that just needs to be taken in as part of where we go on the overall perspective. If people feel better to get a pound of flesh out of me, I'm happy to talk about the sacrifices I'm trying to make and have made and committed to on how this moves forward. Some of these things as it relates to leadership, I think, are personal decisions on what do we do as an institution.

**Reed:** Let me just say from a communications perspective, I think we could have done a better job communicating all the changes that have been made over the years, and the efforts taken to protect the academic side of the house. I'm telling you, some budget cuts were really shouldered primarily at the central level, and there was a lot done to spare academics. I don't think we talked about that. Now in light of everything that is happening, I think it is important to share the efforts that have been made over the past several years to try to preserve the academic side of the house. It has come to this now because every effort has been made to spare the academic side of the house, and now we are at the point where we need to look at that additionally.

**Member:** Thank you both. I want to be clear that I didn't mean to have any specifics in that. I think, Provost Reed, to what you were speaking of, that was sort of the general point. Where this is coming from, it seems framed as all academics all the time. Maybe it is because of that process. I think where a lot of the frustration comes from is what about everything else. What about the whole unit? So that was my point. I appreciate the perspective.

**Wayne:** We hear a lot of a very well-organized process for reviewing academic programs. I think that is because that impacts us the most. I think one thing people are wanting to hear is, what are the processes to review and evaluate these other units. If that is a clearly defined process, I think that answers a lot of questions. I'll commend the provost that you've spoken about the academic support units already and there seems to be a process in submitting your feedback.

**Alsop:** Let me jump in. I announced the IT merger six weeks ago, and it is done and implemented. So just on the final point on this is that puts us on a path to savings immediately. I'm happy to talk through a process, but on the units where we can move quicker, I'm not going to take six months and review something, when I

tell my leadership “I need this done by the end of the fiscal year. Go merge and move forward so we can get cuts in as quickly as we can and move forward on that.” I’m happy to talk through the processes and how we work through all this moving forward, but I’m also asking my teams to move as quickly as they possibly can to get the savings generated to move forward as an institution. As I mentioned, there are six people at ITS that are there today and will not be there July 1. I think we need to understand that, when the administrative units can move quick to get cost savings, we ought to let them do it and understand that we are moving on that particular piece. I’m happy to provide an exhaustive document on all we are doing on the administrative side and have done moving forward. This is not an academic only enterprise on cost reductions for the institution.

**Member:** Historically, large enrollment math courses have had a team of two faculty member leaders, a coordinator and a lead instructor. These courses impact a very large number of students, and increasing student success in these courses has historically been a big priority at WVU. Recently, we were informed that the course coordination stipend would be reduced by almost \$3,000, and lead instructor positions would be eliminated completely. Most of the people who serve in lead instructor and coordinator roles are teaching faculty, and most of these faculty have base salaries less than \$50,000. Cutting these stipends and leadership positions is reducing take-home pay for many of these faculty members by anywhere between \$5,000 and \$10,000 and some up to \$20,000. That may not seem like a large number to administrators, but for faculty with base salaries under \$50,000, this income reduction will have a dramatic effect on them and their families. These are faculty members who have close interactions with large number of students, so impacts to their livelihoods will almost certainly trickle down to the students. Cutting lead instructor positions is going to have a very large impact on how these coordinated courses run, which is also going to negatively impact our students. It's one thing to ask faculty to lean in and do more work for the same pay, but it's entirely different thing to ask faculty to do more for less pay. Our questions are these-- is the administration expecting students to have the same experiences in these high-enrollment, high-stakes courses despite cutting the leadership teams in half? Has the administration considered the financial risks of decreased retention due to these courses receiving less support? And number two, how can the administration justify cutting income for some of the lowest paid faculty, who teach the biggest number of students, who have the biggest student footprint, if you will? \$5,000 is 10% of \$50,000 but only 1% of \$500,000. Thank you.

**Reed:** I’ll answer that the best that I can. What I would say to you is that what I talked to you about today is a central process of program review and analysis. What you are talking about are decisions that have been made at the college level in order for the colleges to meet their budget reduction. We are aware of this, but I can't speak specifically to the math department and those administrative stipends or the stipends that were provided to faculty, for example, to oversee courses. I can't comment on that right now. If you have a question on how that was done and whether that is appropriate, certainly send that. You can send that to the academic transformation website. We will look into it. Without being able to speak about specifics because I don't know every unit. We don't know every unit in our office. But what I would say to you is I know that these stipends, sometimes they were associated also with course release. Sometimes it was one. Sometimes it was both. The colleges have had to make hard decisions about where to reduce costs. I know these stipends – folks have grown to rely on them, and I really appreciate it. They're not part of the base salary, but I hear what you're saying, and there will be impacts from this that are not positive. I do know that is a decision that is being made at the “local level.”

**Member:** My comment would be we have been told that there will be no pay cuts, and then I go to my department and I am told that my pay will be cut. So I guess maybe watch your language when you say that there will be no pay cuts because pay cuts are happening just at the level that people get paid the least.

**Reed:** Not salary cuts, but I hear what you are saying. There's an expectation of pay based on stipend that you would have received in the past, absolutely.

Kim Kelly recognizes Marcello Napolitano and yields the floor. No objections.

**Napolitano:** I am very happy to hear the word transparency. I would like to ask a question about the Academic Common Market (ACM). I believe that models were made for pulling out of the ACM, that was a unilaterally probably poor decision. I believe that we are paying very dearly for that decision. I have first-hand data that showed me the enrollment in one of my classes, which is one of the key classes in aerospace, has dropped more than 50% in only three years. I believe my chairman has plenty of data to back up the conclusion that pulling out of the ACM has deeply, deeply hurt us. I'd like to know if we have any plan to go back to ACM, especially now that we are experiencing a demographic cliff when it comes to population of students from West Virginia?

**Reed:** Let me answer that to the best of my ability. I know we are having individuals from Enrollment Management coming to the next meeting that may be able to answer that more specifically. I don't know if anyone else on our team has answers. That decision was made several years ago, prior to me coming into this role, but my understanding was that those students as a whole retained far less and graduated at a lower rate than students who are not ACM. You could come up with all sorts of reasons why that is, right? But that is the data that we have, and a decision was made in the end that it was probably not beneficial to those students or even wise economically to continue with that. Instead, Enrollment Management worked on scholarships for the best students from those areas. I know, because your chair asked me about this when I talked to your team, that engineering was minimally as a whole impacted by the changes in ACM. Other units were impacted or other areas across the institution were impacted. What I would like is that certainly, we're going back and looking at the data, and there are discussions about expanding to reciprocity agreements with some other states. We currently have one with Ohio. I think you could get more detailed information at the July meeting. Does that help?

**Napolitano:** If we decided to pull out of the ACM on the grounds that we were not getting quality students, then all we had to do was to raise our standards rather than completely pulling out of the ACM.

**Reed:** I hear you, and those are always complicated decisions. I hope that is enough for now and we can address this more at the July meeting.

**Wayne:** Perhaps when enrollment management comes, they can provide some data on the impact that discounting and scholarships have had as alternatives to the ACM.

**Member:** So we are looking at big cost cutting. We know that many of these costs are hitting our staff and lowest paid faculty the most. I know from speaking to staff, friends, and colleagues, that there was a huge wave of staff layoffs last Thursday. I know from speaking with faculty friends and colleagues, that we're deeply concerned about that. We're not just here worrying about our own jobs but worrying about our administrative staff too. So on that basis, to kind of slightly change tack, ever so slightly, I have a question that many of my constituents have asked. How much is WVU paying for compulsory Clifton Strengths training? There are two related questions here. What does the University plan to do with the data that it receives when anyone completes the Clifton Strengths training? There's been a concern around privacy there. Also, another question that I've been asked to ask, has the University considered that badges featuring

President Gee's face and apparently other iconic WVU images might be a little tone deaf in the circumstances of what's happening right now to again, majority faculty and staff? When we're talking about administrative positions, just to go back to the earlier point, we're not as faculty, worrying and asking for there to be greater transparency about whether administrators will be assessed for RIFs. Sorry, what we're asking about is whether administrators will be assessed for RIFs. We are deeply concerned about administrative staff being laid off. We know that that's a problem. So again, the question is, just to be super clear, how much is WVU paying for compulsory Clifton Strengths training? What would be the costs of pulling out of that contract? If we're having to look at massive cost-cutting savings, might this also be one area where we can take some steps in ways that would honestly, help staff and faculty morale as well. I'm hearing from constituents that this process seems a little tone deaf. Thank you.

**Alsop:** I don't know the number of the Clifton Strengths Training, but I'll report back to Scott and Frankie on what that amount is. I don't understand the specifics on your second question about President Gee?

**Member:** I understand that badges will be distributed to students in the fall with President Gee's face on them. Is that not true? Are people distributing fake badges?

**Alsop:** I'm not in charge of badges, I'll say that. I don't know the answer on that particular piece. I will check on that particular piece as well and report back.

**Member:** I have talked to several faculty members who have expressed to me some concerns that I would like to share with you. Very quickly, WVU is not a factory. It's not a bank. It's not a real estate company. It is first and foremost an educational institution. The pillars that govern our activity are teaching, research, and service. Now, one thing that is very clear to all faculty members – and we live by that – is that when there is any kind of academic malpractice that swift consequences follow. We don't question that. We accept that. We live by that. So, what happens in the classroom and in the research laboratories are the most important activities at the University, and anything else, any other activity by non-faculty members are meant to provide support, to provide guidance, and to assist faculty members make WVU what it is. Now, the current crisis has been produced by a number of actions, mistakes, whatever you want to call them, but that have not been produced by faculty members. In other words, the current crisis has not been caused by what faculty members do in the classrooms or in their research laboratories. Nevertheless, to navigate this financial crisis most of the burden will be placed on faculty members by not having access to resources, by having travel restrictions, by not having access to overhead, by the reduction in force. And that has already devastated morale, and the performance will be affected somehow. It will also produce an exodus of bright and young faculty members. I think that is already in motion. My question to you is, and this is for the administrators, is what are the swift actions or consequences that will be conducted for mistakes or any kind of malpractice, administrative malpractice, that took place outside the classrooms and research laboratories? Acknowledging that helps a lot because now we're in this-- the house is on fire, and now we have to get through this. So the question is, what are those actions that will take place to address those mistakes? Thank you.

**Reed:** Let me just share with you my position, and that is this is not a manufactured crisis. This is a real budget shortfall. This is a budget problem that has to be addressed. Whether the administration could have identified it sooner, that is definitely another question. But this is an actual structural deficit that has occurred not because money was mismanaged or there was malfeasance but because we've had declines in enrollment, and we are facing future declines in enrollment. I hear what you're saying. I hear the desire for there to be some sort of punishment, but the reality is this is not a manufactured crisis or one that was created by malfeasance. What could have happened is that we would have known sooner, but we would still have been required to take action. Rob, do you want to follow up with anything?



**Alsop:** I think there are a number of headwinds that we're facing and things that have happened that have nothing to do with whether anyone did anything wrong moving forward. The fact is we have 5,000 students less today than we had in 2014. I actually think we're all accountable for that fact, and I think that if faculty are going to take the position that nothing that happened in the classroom had any impact on word of mouth or anything of that value for students and enrollments – I think there's plenty of things that we could have done better. But part of our problem is that drop in enrollment that we have seen. That's something we all, I would hope, would want to try to do better at as opposed to just saying, well, this has nothing to do with me. This is somebody else. Let's go chop off an arm or a leg or a head or move a senior administrator out because that's not going to fix the particular challenge going forward. I will tell you the \$10 million PEIA increase that we got this year was not the result of any malfeasance of any administrator. The 1,000 student drop in enrollment that we saw this year, I don't know how you could put that malfeasance on or say that that's malfeasance of someone in my position or finance moving forward. I don't think you can put the inflation that has impacted this institution moving forward. If this could be simply solved by me resigning and everybody blaming me, I would have already been out the door. We have some headwinds that as an institution, we have to address together. And we can talk about blame and who did this or who did that and move forward on that and answer a lot of questions. At the end of the day, we've dropped enrollment. Our expenses are up. Our state appropriations are not going to save us. We've got to figure out a pathway collectively forward as to how we move forward as an institution. I'm willing to accept responsibility and have talked about that previously moving forward. Maybe you guys think that is, in which you should go to the Board and the President. It's not as if we've grown enrollment, and our financial challenges are still there. There are some headwinds that are real that we have to face as an institution.

**Member:** I don't think that the idea is to find a scapegoat, but I think that faculty members are feeling that faculty members are being scapegoated on this because the consequences are going to be carried heavily by faculty members who have continued to support the mission of the University, who have continued to get programs accredited, who have continued to do research, but who are now being severely loaded with the burden of this situation that we have. It's that feeling that we have that we are being held to consequences for things that we didn't do, and we are not even sure that these consequences will get us through. Is there a light at the end of the tunnel? I don't think that that's a clear situation. What I would just like to offer and would like to ask you to just think about it, is that the low morale and the frustration is already in place. The exodus of bright and productive faculty is already in motion. So where are we going to find ourselves five years from now or 10 years from now? I think this is going to last for a long, long time. It's difficult to accept that we find ourselves in this situation suddenly. How could it not be envisioned, prevented? How come not every institution is in the same boat? COVID, the inflation, and all those things and the enrollment decline, those are affecting many institutions, but not all the institutions are in the same boat that we are, so it's difficult to accept that how this happens suddenly. That's very difficult to digest. To offer counseling services to deal with the stress, I don't think that's really appropriate. So I would just like to offer those comments, those feelings by several of my colleagues and myself. And I do it respectfully. I'm just not very polished in making it sugarcoated. It but I just say it as it is.

**Member:** There's this asymmetry between the accountability and the consequences. When I look at the state spending on higher education, 2013, it was \$464 million, 2023, state appropriations is \$442 million. That flat rate adjusted, in real dollars we had more funding in 2013 than we do now. So on some level, there has been an adjustment. We have had that budget decline to account for the lower enrollment. We see that other states are investing in their education. We can't compete with Florida with their \$5,000 a year tuition. You could

take the \$8,000 you'd spend as an in-state student in West Virginia, go get residency in Florida, and save money on your tuition. We'll never grow enrollment if we're not making our product as attractive as possible and competing with the other public institutions I think that are doing those things.

**Reed:** I hear what everybody is saying, and I know there is frustration, and I know there's anger and a sense of who's to blame. I get it. But higher education is going through an incredible time of disruption. You have to know that. You have to have been reading that. You have to see it in *The Chronicle*. You have to see it in *The New York Times*. You have to see it *Inside Higher Ed*. This is not just us. It is not. We are being very transparent about what we're facing and addressing. I guarantee you, if other universities aren't doing it now, they will do it. We are in a time where college participation has declined, where state support has declined, where the attitude about the necessity of a college degree has changed. It's terrible, but it is the world in which we live. To say that you're focused entirely on your teaching and entirely on your research and entirely on your service, I get it. But there's a bigger world around there that is things are happening, and we all have to be aware of that. Again, I understand the frustration. I understand the fact that this seems sudden. I understand that this is going to hurt a lot of people. And I shouldn't say I. We understand that as an administration. But we are not alone, and this is not just isolated to WVU. We may be experiencing some of these things more intensely right now, but other universities are also grappling with this, except perhaps those in the Sun Belt states.

**Member:** I think what Rob did earlier, not in the second part, was a great step in addressing a lot of the angst that I'm hearing from our faculty. The bigger question is not that we are here but how quickly we got here and who wasn't watching. I really appreciated Rob saying he wishes he had seen this coming. I think what the next step would be seeing what systems are being put in place to not get to this after we've gone through this hardship. Who will be responsible? This is more a comment, not a question – how do we make sure that can we get some more projections? Can we get projections earlier? Can we do some better modeling to ensure we don't fall back into this? I think that's the missing piece that could potentially start to feel that gap.

**Wayne:** I know there have been a lot of questions asked and answers given. Some of those answers have been communicated to smaller groups and in various email chains. We are going to try to start collating those questions and answers on the Faculty Senate webpage. We recognize we have not done as good of a job as we could have in disseminating the answers we have received.

11. No new business introduced.

**Wayne:** Thank you, Provost Reed, Vice President Alsop. I know this is tough. It's tough for everyone, and an unpleasant experience for all of us, so we do appreciate you being willing to come and answer questions and talk with us.

12. Motion to adjourn (V. Mucino). Seconded. Chair Wayne adjourned the meeting at 5:24 p.m. to reconvene on July 10, 2023.

Corey Hunt  
Faculty Senate Office Administrator