2026-2027

Faculty Senate Minutes for the 2026-27 academic year

- October 2, 2026
- September 18, 2026
- August 21, 2026

October 2, 2026

ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 2, 2026

HSS 1028

Attendees:

Banafsheh (Bana) Aghayeeabianeh, Kacie Altom, Timberly Baker, Kousik Biswas, Robert Bradley, Toccara Carter, Jason Causey, Michael Cooper, Nicole Covey, Eric Dry, Gary Edwards, Melany Fulton, Stephanie Gotay, Bert Greenwalt, John Hershberger, John Howard, Mark Lewis, Anne McGee, Suzanne Melescue, DayDay Robinson, Veronika Scudamore, Richard Segall, Alexander Sokolov, Rollin Tusalem, Kim Vickrey, Rob Williams, Jason Zhou

Teams Attendees:

Scott Mangan, Stephanie Hoeckley, Pradeep Mishra, Pankaj Nagpal, Mohamed Milad

Proxy Attendees:

John Howard for Matt Weeks, Kevin Berry for (Kristen) Renee Sumler; Alexander Sokolov for Eric West; Alexander Sokolov for Julie King, Alexander Sokolov for Audrey Folsom

Guests:

Dominique White (Access and Accommodations); Gregory Hansen (Faculty); Hans Hacker (UPRTC)

Absentees:

Kristin Sumler, Eric West, Julie King, Audrey Folsom, Andrea Brown, Khem Aryal, Marceline Thompson-Hayes

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by John Hershberger

Order of the day:

Motion to approve the order of the day made by Richard Segall; seconded by Rollin Tusalem; all are in favor, the motion carried.

Approval of Minutes:

The motion to approve the September 18, 2026, meeting minutes was made by Eric Dry, seconded by Rob Williams; all in favor, the motion carried.

New Business

Dominique White--Access and Accommodations (New Policies)

- Old policies caused delays
- All exam materials must be received by 8am the business day before the exam. If materials are not received by 8am the day before the exam, faculty are being asked to proctor their own exams with the accommodations. A&A offers training for what it looks like to meet accommodations.
- This reduces anxiety for students and chaos for staff. Low distraction for students includes having the exam ready to go when the student gets there.
- Students must request to take an exam in A&A at least 3 business days prior to the exam. There is only space for 10-11 people at a time, so other spaces have to be reserved when exam loads are high.
- It has always been an expectation to have the testing contract. What if there are last minute changes to the exam? You can call A&A to notify them of changes.
- Is there a reason that the document is called a contract or agreement? The data management system uses that term. It cannot be changed.
- What happens when a student is found with a phone in the exam room? How are faculty notified? How long after the incident?
- Incident report is filled out, and faculty are notified after that.
- All exams are proctored via camera. Students are asked to put their belongings in a locker. They are not being searched, but are requested to leave items at the front. If student says they have done so, they are trusting that. Faculty can request footage of the exam when reasonable suspicion of cheating occurs, and at minimum a screenshot is sent. A&A won't pre-emptively send footage due to privacy for other exam takers. There is "no reason footage wouldn't be provided if requested." A faculty can request the full video of the testing session to ensure that additional instances of use of the phone (or other items) are not located on the footage prior to the incident caught by A&A staff.
- Are they monitored live? Student workers and testing coordinators are monitoring sessions live.
- Unless the contract specifically states to end the test on suspicion of cheating, the student will get to finish the test. That is why the agreement is so vital. You can type it into the contract and edit the contract if any time.
- Can that be added as a question? A&A will look into this as a possibility.

Gregory Hansen--Faculty to speak on disruption caused by afternoon class cancellations

- Gregory expresses thanks for being allowed to address the senate.
- Expresses appreciation for the good intent of administration in allowing additional time off on a Friday before a holiday weekend. However, also expresses concerns as follows:
    - substantial loss of instructional time
    - tendency of students to skip morning classes when afternoon classes are cancelled
    - chance of exams or guest speakers being scheduled
    - results in extra work for faculty who teach in those courses/sections

    - syllabi are considered a legal document, and changes due to class cancellations should be minimized
    - Sends the wrong message to students
    - Cancellations disproportionally affects those who teach in the afternoon
    - May be an issue for accreditation of various programs where classes are required to meet for a certain number of hours
- Additionally, he cites that during the most recent cancellation, he had planned a review for his class and wasn't able to do so adequately because of the cancellation. Results in extra work.
- Faculty might make different plans if we had more advance notice, but advance notice cannot be made and align with governing bodies.
- Some express understanding that there is a long standing tradition of letting staff leave early for holidays when classes are not in session, but cancelling class is a separate concern.
- Administration seems to feel the practice is acceptable, so there may not be much movement. It is worth discussing.
- Is anyone interested in creating a resolution?
- Can we invite administration to senate to discuss the concern? Can discuss with provost at next meeting? Some would not feel comfortable speaking to it or voting on any resolution until talking to others in their department/college.
- John Hershberger asked Gary to draft a resolution that could be presented and voted on at the 11/6 meeting.
- It may be better to draft a list of concerns and harmful results of recent early closures rather than a statement that communicates disapproval of the practice. If it becomes more of an issue we could produce a proposal at a later date.
- This has happened before, and has been discussed by faculty senate in the past. When administration turnover happens, sometimes those past events are forgotten.
- Kacie Altom will create a Qualtrics survey for senators to provide feedback from their departments/colleges.

Hans Hacker--University PRT Committee Chair (New wording for PRT documents); Role of Chairs in PRT process; Non-tenure track promotion and retention

- The UPRTC voted unanimously for changes to the PRT process at UPRT level
- Now, tenure track faculty are presented one set of PRT criteria on hire and guided on their work in the first 3 years based on those criteria. Then, at the 3rd year review, if there have been changes to the criteria, the faculty is affected.
- Essentially up until the 3rd year, they have one set of requirements and are potentially ultimately evaluated for tenure/promotion on different criteria.
- The UPTRC drafted and voted on a proposal that would change PRT process to reflect that faculty will be evaluated based on the PRT criteria in place at the time of their hire.
- Senators express agreement with the sentiment for sure. Anne McGee brought up in email and Kacie Altom asked if there was the potential for revision of the current proposal to reflect an ability of the faculty to choose which criteria they are evaluated on if changes are made during the pre-tenure appointment (in case the requirements were to become less stringent during the pre-tenure period).
- There may be and option to edit further in the shared governance process, but the proposal already left the hands of the UPRTC
- Section 3.c.2 of faculty handbook—minimum time in rank 3 years. Early tenure is not necessary for early promotion. Minimum time in rank for associate professor is 5 years. Current administration is in favor of early tenure if requirements are met. Might want to consider tying promotion and tenure more closely together.
- Role of department chair: it is inappropriate for a department chair to dictate who will be on and/or chair the PRT committee. Faculty are to choose committee and chair of the committee. There are chairs and deans that are dictating PRT members and chairs, and this has the potential to sway the decision of the committee. This should

not be happening.

- Path to promotion for Non Tenure Track faculty
- There is a section for instructors (4.b pg 64) promotion to assistant professor. That is not a subject in the purview of UPRTC. Clarifying process and making it more frequently used is something that would have to go through shared governance and would have to originate outside of the committee.
- Anyone can submit a proposal to shared governance. Language can be sorted out departmentally. Hans states he will need to look into this more closely. Promotion is in the name of the committee, but traditionally it has dealt primarily with TT faculty. If a NTT faculty is hired as an assistant professor, they have no mobility within the organization. There should be a uniform policy across colleges.
- Do we as a senate want to have committee to develop a proposal?
- Hans will ask UPRTC if that is something they want to get involved in as well as discuss with Will McLean the proper channels for proposal origination.

Timberly Baker--First read of Teams policy

- Presented proposed policy establishing the option to meet virtually while retaining all rights of physically present senator.
- See attached proposal
    - Decisions needed:
        - Eligibility to attend virtually
        - Senator choice or eligibility standard for virtual attendance (if second option is chosen, need to establish that criteria)
        - We voted last meeting for all senators to be able to have an option.
        - The option was left open because the motion at the last meeting was for temporary approval until a more formal proposal could be drafted
- Kacie motioned to utilize option A citing the vote from the previous meeting.
- Stephanie Gotay seconded the motion
- 1 opposed; no abstentions; motion carries
    - Implementation Needs
        - appropriate classroom will be needed consistently
        - Faculty would need to join from their university account to be counted as present and able to participate in votes
- Required in person meetings: would not have virtual offered during those meetings. Not punitive to be absent.
- Original discussion was that some distance faculty may not ever be able to come to campus. There is an allowance for those who could never come.
- This will be sent out for discussion prior to voting on the full policy.

Healthcare Coverage

- Do we want to put forth any resolutions?
- There could be a policy created for votes similar to this that is more fair than what was done in this case (one vote for each campus in the system). Because the Jonesboro campus has 60% of the employees, it seems irrational to give one vote to 60% of the employees and 6 votes to 40% of the employees. Ask board to consider weighting votes in the future based on % of employees employed on this campus?
- May need to do a list of outcomes; in other words the ways that employees are going to be affected by the decision to remove spouses from health insurance.
- We want to retain faculty, and this type of decision may make that challenging.

- Some question if it would it be possible to “grandfather in" those whose spouses are already covered and have the change affect new hires? There was a question about compliance. May be consequences of non-compliance.
- There was more than one issue. Want more time to think about it.
- How often has something like this happened? It may happen fairly regularly, but has not usually been a decision that was as impactful as this one.
- Timberly Baker will help draft a resolution. Kacie Altom, Anne McGee, and John Hershberger will help with review of the draft.
- Additional questions related to changes:
    - Are dental and vision insurance involved?
- What if spouse is not working but is old enough for Medicare?

Old Business

Committee Reports

Constitutional Review Committee

- Still looking for a couple of members
- Alex Sokolov, Julie King, Rollin Tusalem, and Kevin Berry

Meeting adjourned by John Hershberger at 4:52 pm

Minutes Recorded by Kacie Altom

September 18, 2026

ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

September 18, 2026

LSE 219

Attendees:

Banafsheh (Bana) Aghayeeabianeh, Kacie Altom, Timberly Baker, Andrea Brown, Toccara Carter, Michael Cooper, Nicole Covey, Eric Dry, Gary Edwards, Audrey Folsom, Stephanie Gotay, Bert Greenwalt, John Hershberger, Stephanie Hoeckley, John Howard, Julie King, Mark Lewis, Anne McGee, Suzanne Melescue, Pradeep Mishra, Pankaj Nagpal, DayDay Robinson, Veronika Scudamore, Richard Segall, Kristin Sumler, Alexander Sokolov, Rollin Tusalem, Kim Vickrey, Rob Williams, Jason Zhou

Proxy Attendees:

Fredrick Webb as proxy for Melanie Fulton; Julie King as proxy for Eric West; Alexandr Sokolov as proxy for Jason Causey; Anahita Izadyar as proxy for Koushik Biswas

Guests:

Will McClean, Alyssa Wells

Absentees:

Eric West, Fredrick Webb, Jason Causey, Khem Aryal, Kousik Biswas, Robert Bradley, Scott Mangan, Mohamed Milad, Melany Fulton, Marceline Thompson-Hayes

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by John Hershberger

Order of the day:

Motion to approve the order of the day made by Andrea Brown, seconded by Audrey Folsom; all are in favor, the motion carried.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion to approve the August 21, 2026 meeting minutes with noted edits (date and location of meeting) was made by Andrea Brown, seconded by Alexander Sokolov, all in favor, the motion carried.

New Business

Provost Q & A

Interim Provost McClean here to answer questions and provide updates.

Dr. McClean expresses the desire to be transparent with faculty while also maintaining the privacy and confidentiality that is necessary in circumstances when decisions may not be final or when negotiations are ongoing.

Interim Provost McClean noted there were a couple of question submitted ahead of time. One was, “What did Dr. White mean when in his email when he said, ‘be careful what you ask for’?” Will expresses that this was referencing the housing challenges we are currently facing. We “asked for” increases in enrollment and students on campus, and the housing challenges, parking challenges, etc are a byproduct of increased enrollment and increased number of students living on campus. Campus was empty post-COVID. When Dr. White came to A-State he questioned where the students were (the physical presence of students). Housing occupancy was at about 40%. Today we occupancy is 100%. As enrollment grows, there is pressure on the system as a whole. It can take time to resolve those concerns. Enrollment and retention both increased from last year. Class sizes have gone up and will continue to, especially in general education courses. As those cohorts move through the system, upper level courses will also have to grow. This requires strategic planning for scheduling and utilization of classroom space, etc. These are good “problems” to have because it means we have students here to teach. Even some large, public, well-known institutions are having to make cuts. Getting students here helps make sure we don’t have to do that. Short answer to housing issue would be to go and build a new, expensive dorm, but thinking long-term is important and prevents undue burden on students. We are on a growth trajectory. We have to grow. We can’t be static or the institution will fail.

Next Question: In the April meeting Dr. White discussed budget prioritie. What went to the board was shared. Priorities were as follows:

1. Faculty promotions and equity

2. 2% merit raise and non-classified employees

3. 2% increase in Grad assistantships—necessary to attract quality graduate students and grad assistants

4. Operating budget for the College of Veterinary Medicine—building is bonded, but everything else is being fronted by the university. They will pay it plus some. Those funds will be pushed back to other areas as well. Hiring is also happening in phases as more faculty will be needed to teach additional years of the program.

5. Expanded research support (ABI and Office of Research and Technology Transfer)

6. Utilities and property insurance increases

Plan to continue to increase faculty salaries and equity pools. Make starting salaries more attractive to people, etc.

Only 9,000 of the 40,000 high school graduates in the state of Arkansas matriculated to higher ed. UofA pulls about 1/3. We then compete with other institutions for the remaining 2/3 of the students. We cannot focus only on recruiting from within the state, and we have to expand what we offer to compete.

Do not hire someone you don't want to hire or inferior candidates. Dr. McClean promises departments WILL NOT lose lines that are needed just because a search failed. We want to get good faculty who have longevity. We don't want to hire people that aren't going to stay or aren't going to be good at their job.

Financial aid hiccups have occurred this semester due to changes to guidelines and job turnover in the financial aid office. Try to be patient and help students as financial aid continue to work on things.

Work through chain of command when possible, but Will expresses he is here to support faculty.

On the issue of the upcoming spring schedule:

The schedule was copied, and that was bad for some departments due to the need for deletion of courses. Each course deletion requires an individual form. For some departments forms required reached the triple digits. Wouldn't it have been easier to seek input from the stakeholders before deciding to proceed in this fashion?

Dr. McClean states that he accepts ownership in part. All courses are in Banner and Coursedog; when we went from 4 to 5 digit course numbers, we couldn't make the transitions during the middle of the semester because of Banner. We had to have a "bandaid" approach in one semester or another. Schedule was getting built from scratch every semester. When the transition happened, it had to be done as a whole instead of as separate colleges, so it wasn't an option to allow one college to do one thing and another college a different thing. Though it was difficult and burdensome, it should never happen again. Once the schedule is rebuilt this one time, it should be easy moving forward. Going from scratch probably would have created a lot of errors as well and

inevitably there would have been some that wouldn't have liked that either.

On the issue of deductible for ABI insurance claim: will this affect budget?

There was a smoke related incident with overheated equipment. The sprinkler system went off and there was a lot of water damage, so a deductible has to be paid. The University has reserve funds that can cover this cost. They just aren't funds that replenish, so we have to hope that we don't have multiple similar issues in the same small time fram. There is recurring cost and one-time expense funds. There might be some money sitting there, but it won't be recurring. The university is "healthy but not wealthy".

On the topic of promotion for non tenure track faculty:

Dr. White has mentioned in the past that he would like a pathway for advancement opportunities for NTT faculty. This has still been in discussions. It has to be thought out and proposals presented. Dr. McClean is willing to entertain the idea of promotion without tenure, etc. However, the work would be best completed from the ground upward with each college coming up with criteria and agreeing on terminology that could then be used to create a University-wide policy through UPRT. An additional consideration is a funding formula. If this pathway is created without funds to back it, it would eat into raises for other faculty initially. Implementation phases would likely be required as funds are not available at this time. Provost's office has no problem with changes to titles, but funding for raises is another issue. There is not a committee at this time who has been charged to work on this. It has been discussed for years, but hasn't gone forward.

On the topic of Merit Raises:

Merit raises are intended to function as meritorious increases. In some departments they are giving flat raises to everyone. Why is it called that if it isn't that? Deans and chairs make those decisions. They have been told it should be for meritorious service with rubrics and standards in place to decide percentages to be given to faculty. It is a 2% merit pool that is dispensed at the college level. Faculty should be told the standards by which they are being evaluated and raises assigned. It is your right to know what you got and why. Faculty should be asked to sign their evaluation each year.

Regarding Changes to Insurance:

When will we know if our spouses will be denied insurance moving forward? Much concern was expressed for lack of timely notification of the potential for changes.

Provost office only found out what the suggested changes were a couple of hours before faculty did. HR hasn't always even shared the changes with us in advance.

A-State stood alone and got outvoted by other campuses in the ASU system. Other campuses voted for Option 2 and to cut spousal insurance. We voted Option 1 and to keep spousal insurance. There was only one vote per campus regardless of number of faculty represented. We do not know yet what is going to be done. Even if a spouse misses their open enrollment, loss of insurance is a qualifying event, so the spouse would be eligible to request coverage from their employer outside

of open enrollment.

Stand up Faculty Senate Constitutional Review Committee

Julie King and Rollin Tusalem volunteered to be on the committee to review the Faculty Senate Constitution for necessary updates. John Hershberger charged them with beginning this work and including others if they desire and will touch base with them.

Discuss Teams Attendance policy for 100% online faculty who do not live near campus

Timberly Baker requested that we consider adding an option to attend Faculty Senate meetings via Microsoft Teams citing that some programs are 100% online and have faculty that work remotely. If they are unable to drive in for meetings, they are excluded from Faculty Senate Service. Allowing those individuals to meet via Teams would increase their ability to participate in shared governance. Location of meeting and technology needed for the meeting could be a concern. An Owl camera could be used, though we would have to be in an alternate location as this room won't work with the monitor. Security has also been expressed as a concern. When setting up a meeting with a Teams group, only members of the group have access to the meeting link. Unless a senator sent the link to someone, there should not be a way for anyone else to join. The president would need to be the operator of the Teams meeting. John Hershberger expressed that the initial discussion was that if you are an on campus or in Jonesboro, the expectation is that you would attend in person. This consideration is primarily intended for remote faculty who do not live in Jonesboro. Some concern is expressed about recordings and transcripts created by Teams. The meetings would NOT be recorded, and AI transcripts would not be utilized. Some suggest that it would be appropriate to allow others to meet via Teams as well in certain circumstances. While some prefer this not happen, others recommend that they simply be required to ask for permission. Others do not feel permission should be required. Would this need to be written into the constitution or be a proposal so that we can have more official documentation?

Kacie Altom made a motion to create a temporary policy to allow 100% online remote faculty 100% who don't live in Jonesboro to meet via Teams until a more formal policy can be established.

Julie King seconded this motion.

Further discussion:

What is the problem with all being on Teams?

Not the same community connection

Staff senate is hybrid

Note taking is complicated

Cultural shift in behavioral expectations would be required

Some don’t pay attention in the meeting; are doing other work

For many there is value to being face-to face

Could prevent need to get proxy if traveling, etc.

The “danger” will be that everyone will sit in their office doing their own thing and not be involved.

Mark Lewis requested to amend motion to be more permissive and allow any senator to attend via teams for any reason without the requirement to ask permission.

Vote on amendment was conducted first. 15 for—9 against; motion to amend the motion carries.

Overall vote--3 against; motion carries

We can change this policy again later if needed. Timberly Baker volunteered to draft an official proposal.

Ask for input on others to invite to Faculty Senate

Access and Accommodations

University PRT Chair

Administration would like to build it from bottom up so it isn’t a directive but a collaborative.

Creativity Garage Manager, Michael Alexander

FRAC candidate names revealed--vote needed

College of Science and Math—Alam and Lorence

College of Castro, Duckworth, Kulkarni

It might be helpful to have a biographical paragraph for future votes. It may also be best to do these votes as a Qualtrics survey sent to senators.

Discuss how best to navigate future short-turnaround requests of faculty and/or Faculty Senate

What can be done about this? The email spelled it out clearly, but then it went into the faculty listserv and the discussion got muddy. Some senators didn’t send it out in time, etc. Qualtrics or a Teams poll is a good way to gather feedback. Larger faculty body would be easier to do Qualtrics. If it is a shared governance issue might be easier to do poll. Weighted votes of people in the college might need to be considered. John Hershberger will explore a bit more.

We could create a resolution regarding time required when senate is asked for feedback. We could send it up the chain, but it doesn’t force anyone to give us more time.

Old Business

Committee Reports

None

Meeting adjourned by John Hershberger at 4:30

Minutes Recorded by Kacie Altom

August 21, 2026

ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

August 21, 2026

LSE 219

Attendees:

Audrey Folsom, Amanda Mohler, Richard Segall, Rob Williams, Eric Dry, Suzanne Melescue, Alexandr Sokolov, Michael Cooper, Julie King, Jason Causey, John Hershberger, Scott Mangan, Rollin Tusalem, Veronika Scudamore, Stephanie Hoeckley, Anne McGee, Guolei Zhou, John Howard, Eric West, Robert Bradley, Banafsheh Aghayeeabianeh, DayDay Robinson, Gary Edwards, Timberly Baker, Stephanie Gotay, Nicole Covey, Andrea Brown, Melanie Fulton, Pankaj Nagpal, Koushik Biswas

Proxy Attendees:

John Howard for Jeremy Weeks

Guests:

Kevin Hennings (parliamentarian), Carlitta Moore

Absentees:

Kacie Altom, Kristen Sumler, Kim Vickrey, Toccara Carter, Mark Lewis, Marceline Thompson-Hayes, Pradeep Mishra, Bert Greenwalt, Mohamed Milad

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by Amanda Mohler and John Hershberger

Order of the day:

Motion to approve the order of the day by Andrea Brown, seconded by Alexandr Sokolov; all are in favor, the motion carried.

Approval of Minutes:

The motion to approve the April 17, 2026, meeting minutes was made by Richard Segall and seconded by Rob Williams; all in favor, the motion carried.

New Business

Vision for Faculty Senate

Community

a. Propose peer-selected awards for Spring 2027, unique recognition awards (Should this be done by the Faculty Association?)

b. Listening Tour – John can come to each college/unit to listen to their concerns and see how we can help, doing it all year.

c. Partnering or hosting events to recruit and retain students and/or future senators

d. Mid-semester meeting with the summer CETL teaching summit participants

e. Overall goals: increase visibility and generate a pipeline of senators

Shared Governance

a. Current opaqueness with shared governance

b. What is the role of faculty in shared governance at A-State?

c. Talking with Deans, Chairs, Faculty to get clarity

d. Goals are to clarify goals and responsibilities of each group in shared governance, increase transparency, and build trust among shared governance groups

e. Definition of shared governance: “a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication amongst themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.” 1966 joint statement by AAUP, ACE, and AGB.

f. Shared governance oversight committee makeup/membership; proposals come through one of the constituent groups

i. President of Faculty Senate

ii. President of Staff Senate

iii. Chair of the Academic Deans Council

iv. Co-Chair of the Chairs Council

v. President of Student Government Association

vi. President of Graduate Student Council

vii. Chancellor/Provost Representative

viii. Six Faculty Senators (one from each college)

ix. Six Staff Senators

g. Can we use a system to track proposals in shared governance? Maybe Curriculog?

Ask for Senators'/Guests' vision for Faculty Senate

Continued information dissemination

Faculty Association – Dr. Carlitta Moore

See the link in the email about the Faculty Association sent by Carlitta Moore.

Faculty pay dues for this. We have a constitution and a bank account with the new officers. Nominations are open and come from Faculty Association members.

Join through Marketplace, through the Pack Portal. Dues are $15 for the year.

Main purpose: provide programs .... (get from CM or the KB): philanthropy and social interaction. Bylaws are created and approved by legal (will upload in the KB). The voting for officers is run through Slate; current Faculty Senate Association members are blind to the nominations. All current officers are at the end of their term. We are trying to revive it so that the work can continue and grow. If you join the association early, you will get a gift.

Carlitta also pitched doing a Study Day social, with a space for faculty and staff to unwind and socialize. For a mental break during finals week.

Election of Vice President and Secretary for 2026-2027

Kacie Altom indicated this summer that she is interested in the secretary position; Rob motions for Kacie to serve as secretary, Eric West seconds.

Audrey Folsom and Alexandr Sokolov are interested in the VP position. Senate votes on paper; Kevin counted the votes. Audrey Folsom wins with 16 votes; Alexandr had 10 votes. Audrey Folsom is appointed as Vice President.

FRAC appointment procedure overview

FRAC increases research output, and student travel is also managed through it. Deans will put names forward for the 3 colleges that need members on the committee, and we will vote on those names to appoint people to the FRAC.

-

Old Business

Committee Updates or reports?

None

Some concerns were raised about the Pay Equity Policy from the Deans. This policy is not a shared governance matter, but we can make recommendations.

Meeting adjourned by John Hershberger at 4:08

Minutes Recorded by Audrey Folsom