

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 15 October 2024
4:00 p.m. – Via Zoom

ACTION MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeremy Robinett, Chair; Ben Brewer, Secretary

ALSO PRESENT: Mark Mossman, Interim Provost; Krista Bowers Sharpe, Parliamentarian; Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Office Manager

GUESTS: Lee Brice, emeritus professor of History; Rich Filipink, CAGAS Chair; Jeremy Merritt, Director of Web Services, University Technology, and Bob Emmert, Director of Business Applications and User Support Services, University Technology

1. *Guests: University Technology CIO Group*

Jeremy Merritt related that he, Bob Emmert, and Stacie Hunt, Director of Administrative Information Management Services (AIMS), were assigned to take on the responsibilities of CIO after the former University Technology CIO left recently. He said one key initiative the three have been working on is implementing several technology policy changes, one of which is the email policy, introduced by previous CIO Greg Kain in late June. He said there have been several productive meetings to discuss this policy, including with Chair Robinett in order to enhance communication between Faculty Senate and uTech and continuing the partnership they are both committed to. He provided ExCo with a high-level overview of the rationale behind the new email policy and the plans to roll it out over the next few months, extending into 2025.

Mr. Merritt said the notable changes outlined in the June policy include:

- Employees cannot forward university emails to personal email accounts;
- Employees cannot download university emails to personal devices;
- Language was removed granting WIU email accounts to retirees and alumni;
- Alumni will lose WIU email access after two consecutive semesters of non-attendance.

Mr. Merritt explained these changes are being made to protect university data since personally identifiable information for employees and students and sensitive data does exist in WIU email accounts; this might include educational records, personnel, and/or disciplinary records that could put the university at risk if a personal device was stolen, compromised, or made available to a person not associated with WIU. He reminded that all data within university emails, even those of retirees, is subject to FOIA. Mr. Merritt noted that reducing the number of email accounts helps decrease the university's "attack surface" for cybersecurity attacks by significantly lowering the risk of phishing attacks, possibly compromised accounts, and potential exposure of credentials on the dark web. He noted that cybersecurity insurance, which the university must renew annually, is getting more and more costly and requires institutions to implement increasingly stringent changes to how their data is protected.

Mr. Merritt said limited resources are another factor in the required changes; the University Technology team is limited in staff, particularly for those that need to respond to cyber threats related to email accounts. He stated that every time an email account is phished or falls for a phishing attempt, many personnel hours are required to remedy the problem. He noted that these are cases that need to be handled very quickly in order to prevent the problem from escalating throughout the institution's Ecom system. Mr. Merritt also pointed out that Google storage is no longer unlimited, and allowing retirees and alumni to retain email accounts is unsustainable. He noted that by eliminating the email space for retirees and alumni, it will potentially allow for more storage to be allocated to faculty, staff, and students who are currently on contract or taking classes.

Mr. Merritt observed that the University Technology Use Policy already prohibits personal use of university computing resources, including email. He explained that providing email accounts to retirees and alumni dates back to a time when it was more difficult to obtain email accounts, but nowadays it is uncommon for

someone not to have a personal email account. Mr. Merritt noted that email accounts for retirees and alumni are increasingly left inactive for 90 days or more; 25 percent of retirees and a little over 50 percent of alumni accounts are currently inactive, so they are not being utilized to their full potential as they were in years or decades past.

Mr. Merritt told ExCo that University Technology has decided that current retirees with a WIU email account who retired prior to late June 2024 will be grandfathered into the new policy provided they follow two practices: they must login to their email accounts every 90 days and take the same mandatory security training as employees so that they understand the importance of protecting data they may have access to, how to identify and respond to phishing attacks, and be aware of the university's general technology policies. He noted that if an employee were to retire today but has an ongoing professional relationship with WIU, even if informal, this relationship can be formalized so that the retiree can keep their WIU email account. He said that a faculty member who is still doing research for the institution, for example, can obtain sponsorship from a department or current employee in order to retain their email account. He added that standard practice would be that uTech would swipe all the data from the email account before returning it to the retiree, but there could be exceptions granted based on the former employee's need or the particular situation. Mr. Merritt assured ExCo that these changes are not intended to prohibit access to University Libraries by former employees because the loss of an email account will not necessarily result in the loss of an Ecom account.

Mr. Merritt acknowledged that uTech realizes some clarification may be needed in the portion of the policy discussing downloading emails. He explained the intent is to prevent downloading sensitive or otherwise protected data to personal devices; this is not intended to prevent people from forwarding personal information, like sending photos to grandma. He added all the policies will be reviewed regularly and ambiguities addressed during the next review process.

Mr. Merritt told ExCo the State University Annuitants Association was informed of these changes earlier this month and assured that current retirees will be grandfathered in. He said current employees, alumni, and retirees will be notified of the changes in November, including "offboarding" instructions for preparing for the closure of their retiree and alumni WIU email accounts. He assured ExCo that uTech wants everyone to have the steps necessary to know what to do with their email accounts prior to the closures, such as setting up a personal email, notifying their contacts and any third-party systems they may have signed up for with their WIU emails, and moving information over to new personal accounts. Mr. Merritt said the first step in January 2025 will be to close inactive accounts that have not shown any logins for 90 days; notifications will still be sent to these inactive accounts up to the time they are deleted in case their owners happen to check these accounts. He said the next step will be to address student alumni accounts for those who have not attended WIU for two consecutive semesters; the same 60-day notification process will be used. He added that this will become a semesterly notification process going forward; every 11th day of the semester, uTech will check to see which students have not attended for two consecutive semesters and notify them of their impending email closure.

Chair Robinett pointed out that, as Dr. Brice has noted, communication has been one of the challenges when working through this process. He thinks one thing that has made this challenging is that this policy emerged as the aftereffect of an audit so was implemented fairly quickly. He recognizes that the CIO Group has now been working to communicate more effectively; an announcement went out to the campus community in the weekly announcement email, but he thinks the CIO Group plans to be more deliberate going forward to send specific emails that address specific problems. Mr. Merritt stated that the CIO Group has been striving to get communication out over the past two months, but there have been instances where discussions needed to occur about how to handle certain situations that were not fully understood initially. He said this has required the CIO Group to ramp up their understanding of the history of the policies and what the previous plans were, so they have appreciated everyone's understanding in that regard as they have strived to communicate correct information.

Chair Robinett related one issue that has been raised to him is the number of email accounts some institutions are maintaining compared to the number of their staffs. He asked what the staffing is at WIU compared to what other institutions may have in their information technology areas. Mr. Merritt responded that in regard to email support for phishing or accounts that may need unlocked, for example, WIU only has one full-time individual; that individual was away at their child's wedding last week when 15 accounts were phished,

which delayed the response to handling that phishing outbreak by a couple of days because of the lack of staff available to respond to such breaches. He assumes that other institutions have more resources than WIU or a dedicated cybersecurity person, which WIU does not; the CIO Group is learning about a lot of cybersecurity tools and relies on cybersecurity auditors to identify gaps that the institution might have. He added that uTech is not staffed to the degree that makes the risk of allowing every alumnus and every retiree to retain email accounts possible.

Interim Provost Mossman asked if emeriti faculty with professional affiliations who continue to maintain an active research agenda, attend professional conferences, etc. will be able to maintain their WIU email. Mr. Merritt confirmed this is correct, as long as they have somebody who can vouch for that. Interim Provost Mossman remarked he has numerous mentors of emeritus status that email him frequently from their institutions. He wants to make sure this is an option because emeritus faculty often continue their professional obligations after retirement. Mr. Merritt confirmed that University Technology has identified a mechanism they can leverage to make this happen, and this will be explained in an email to retirees. Chair Robinett remarked that emeritus faculty members Lee Brice, Steve Rock, Charlene Callison, Ginny Boynton, and others have been very helpful in providing explanations of the services they are performing for the university. He explained that the sponsoring department, dean, or other individual will need to complete a jot form explaining what role the emeritus faculty member is providing to their area. He remarked that in his last conversation with Mr. Merritt they discussed whether an exception to the swiping of the email account would be built into this process. Mr. Merritt said uTech recognizes they will probably have to create a form specifically for this purpose that will allow them to ask the kinds of questions to determine if a retiree needs access to the email account they used as an employee; if the sponsor identifies a legitimate case, the email account will not be swiped before returning it to the retiree. He added that if there is no need to retain it, uTech's recommendation is to swipe the university data from that email account. Chair Robinett recalled he was very concerned when he heard the term "swiping" because he assumed it meant the information was deleted forever, but that is not correct because some data must be maintained even though the individual email user may not have access. Mr. Merritt confirmed that everything will be retained in a Google vault so that if it needs to be restored or accessed for archival purposes, it can be made available.

Dr. Brice said he understands and supports the email policy, where it is coming from, and its goals, and supports University Technology proceeding through this process. He noted that what still concerns him is the level of communication to people who have retired already and need this information. He pointed out that the June message about the email policy was sent out only to those on contract; it was hit or miss whether emeritus faculty members received it. Dr. Brice related that as a result of talking to someone in uTech, he accidentally deleted 37,000 emails in an effort to clean up his Google drive and free up space for the university; while he did not need most of them, he did need about 100 of them and has been desperately trying to reconstitute his connections with people he worked with professionally as a former professor of WIU. He stated that while this is his fault rather than uTech's, it is very important to emeriti faculty to explain what is being removed and why, which he does understand and supports. He plans to talk to his former chair in History to have him complete the form when it becomes available.

Mr. Merritt said it is University Technology's expectation that they will send an email to every retiree of WIU with an email account on November 1 outlining the changes and letting them know that if they are a current retiree they are grandfathered in and can retain their email account without taking any other action with the exception of maintaining activity and taking the security training when that becomes available. He said they will also email every alumni with a WIU email account and every current employee of WIU. He promised to continually send emails to everyone with a WIU email account between the months of November and January.

Dr. Brice remarked that it seems like some parts of the institution do not understand what it is that emeritus status involves based on communications he has received. He still reports to History Department Chair Tim Roberts the things that he does that reflect on the department; when his book comes out next week, it will say "Lee Brice of Western Illinois University" so the department and university can take credit for that. He added that he is on numerous editorial boards, which the university can also take credit for. He stressed that an emeritus faculty member is still performing a service to WIU even if they are no longer teaching or concerned too much about day-to-day operations of the university. He knows that Interim Provost Mossman appreciates this but thinks it needs to be clearly communicated. Chair Robinett said that since he began

meeting with the current CIO Group in August, they have been very interested in learning about this and respectful of the contributions of WIU's retirees.

Parliamentarian Bowers Sharpe asked if University Technology envisions the sponsorship process for retirees to be a one-time submission or whether the sponsorship would last a certain amount of time, such as for the length of a project. Mr. Merritt responded that right now uTech is envisioning this to be an annual request. He anticipates some sort of cyclical time period where the retiree would need to re-request that sponsorship. He thinks this is still open for discussion but that there should be some sort of time limit associated with it; that is the way the process is currently set up when email access is granted to non-contract individuals until a certain expiration date, when access would fall off, although it could certainly be renewed. Parliamentarian Bowers Sharpe observed this should be an important part of the communications going out. Mr. Emmert added that the renewal would just involve the sponsor confirming that access is still needed; the form would not need to be formally submitted again. He explained that University Technology would email the sponsor with a list of people, and the sponsor could verify that email access is still needed for those individuals. Mr. Merritt added this is already in the draft of uTech's communications email.

Chair Robinett expressed his thanks to Mr. Merritt and Mr. Emmert. Chair Robinett meets monthly with the CIO Group in order to be informed about information technology issues that they are navigating. He pointed out that at the same time the CIO Group is navigating this process, they are also dealing with the new ERP system and a variety of other software that is being implemented across the campus.

2. *CAGAS-approved policy proposals*

CAGAS has submitted its approval of four policies: three submitted to it by Admissions and revisions to the Disruptive Student Policy. ExCo approved adding these to the October 22 Senate agenda under Reports from Committees and Councils. CAGAS Chair Rich Filipink told ExCo the changes to the Disruptive Student Policy were to update some links and the names of offices, but basically the policy itself remains intact. He related that the changes were approved as submitted for the revised Dual Enrollment and Transfer Admissions Policies; for the new Policy on Adult Student Admissions, CAGAS added a sentence requiring that the student have a high school diploma or obtain a GED to be eligible after dropping out of high school five years ago or more. Chair Robinett remarked it does not seem like any of these policy proposals were particularly contentious in CAGAS; Dr. Filipink confirmed there were no real issues with any of them.

3. *Proposed elimination of "Y" class graduation requirement*

Chair Robinett related that Interim Associate Provost Christopher Pynes requested that ExCo submit this request to CAGAS. He asked if this is something which has already been decided by the Provost's office and whether it is being requested for Spring or for Fall 2025. Interim Provost Mossman confirmed this is a proposal for Fall 2025 and will have to go through the appropriate governance process. Dr. Filipink observed that Interim Associate Provost Pynes is instructing chairs to cancel their Y courses for spring semester. Interim Provost Mossman explained there are usually only a handful of Y courses offered in the spring; historically, there have been 38-41 sections of Y courses offered in the fall semesters and only three to four sections in the spring. He noted that this spring there are two Sociology classes with Y designation and one in Music; the initial conversation with advisors indicated there was not enough coverage for these offerings. He said the thinking was that since this proposal is going through, there is no need to add an additional section for Spring 2025 and instead the Y requirement should be waived for students who would need to take it in the spring. Interim Provost Mossman added that waiving the Y requirement has historically been a responsibility of the Provost's office.

Chair Robinett said he reached out across campus to ask questions and seek guidance and input on this proposed change. He said some professors in other areas than Sociology and Music have told him they planned to teach Y courses this spring, but their department chairs have already denied this and switched those classes. Interim Provost Mossman replied he is not aware of this and does not think there are many schedule changes occurring right now for spring semester. He explained that historically Y courses are taught in the fall semester; there may have been some discussion by a faculty member wanting to teach a spring Y course because there were two social science courses being offered, but the university simply does not have the quantity of students who need to take a Y course in spring now or historically. He added the suggestion is that if removal of the Y graduation requirement is approved, the new policy could be

implemented for fall. He noted that usually the three to four Y courses offered in the spring included an online course and were available to transfer students or students who failed a fall Y course.

Chair Robinett asked if the request to be sent to CAGAS is to eliminate the Y graduation requirement beginning fall semester; Interim Provost Mossman confirmed that is correct. Chair Robinett asked if the Provost's office intends to issue a blanket waiver for students who needed to take a Y course during spring semester. Interim Provost Mossman responded that since he became Associate Provost in 2018, this determination has been the responsibility of the Associate Provost. Chair Robinett asked if the waivers were granted on an individual basis. Interim Provost Mossman replied the decision has historically been made in conversation with the student's chair and advisor.

Dr. Filipink remarked that the request did not indicate what the rationale is for the proposed change; the initial email was just a list of courses and did not include any explanation or data. Interim Provost Mossman explained the issue on a fundamental level is trying to be more efficient with scheduling; the larger issue is the effectiveness of the Y course to begin with. He noted that the way the First Year Experience (FYE) program has evolved, the U100 course has become a central strong course for students. He said the original purpose of the Y courses was to get Unit A faculty more engaged with the FYE program, which was effective but became more problematic during and after Covid. Interim Provost Mossman thinks that given the university's current fiscal situation which the administration is trying to resolve, it is important to have a schedule which is more efficient. He said the proposal is intended to whittle the FYE course down to a single U100 course rather than additional Y courses. He noted that there are no longer funds to pay peer mentors; when the FYE program was first formed under former President Goldfarb, there was hundreds of thousands of dollars in the budget for it, but when Interim Provost Mossman was asked to do a presentation on FYE 18 months ago, the budget was less than \$19,000 to fund all the different aspects of the program. He said the Provost's office was trying to get other offices across the campus to cover the budgets for peer mentors or Leatherneck Success leaders, which was somewhat effective, but there is no longer the budget to support all these students.

Chair Robinett asked if U100 is a graduation requirement for REACH students but not for other students; Interim Provost Mossman confirmed this is correct. Chair Robinett asked if the U course is no longer included in General Education; Interim Provost Mossman confirmed this is also correct. Chair Robinett asked if the U course is actually now part of the REACH program and no longer part of the FYE program since it is only required for REACH students. Interim Provost Mossman replied it is still part of the FYE program because, although it is only required for REACH students, it has historically also attracted students from other areas of campus, including student-athletes. Chair Robinett summarized it is an elective course that some special populations are taking. Interim Provost Mossman remarked there has been a need for an online version of U100, so there were two or three online sections offered last year.

Dr. Filipink asked if thought was given to refocusing the Y component to REACH students since they would seem to be the biggest beneficiaries of small class sizes and a class targeted to them. Interim Provost Mossman replied he does not think this was considered, but the Provost's office has a lot of things to accomplish, and a reimagining of FYE is one of the things on that list once the university gets past its budget woes. He thinks this is an excellent suggestion. Dr. Filipink pointed out that part of the solution to the university's budget woes involves retaining students, which would seem to be a logical outcome of this since the goal of the FYE program from the beginning was that small, targeted classes would help retention. Interim Provost Mossman agrees this is a good idea and noted that this is the model Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville has.

Chair Robinett remarked it sounds like the pedagogical and philosophical standpoints of FYE are not being questioned by this proposal; because of scheduling issues, the limited number of faculty, and a small freshman class, the administration is requesting that the Y course be eliminated as a graduation requirement. Interim Provost Mossman confirmed that the budget and need for efficiency are the primary drivers.

Chair Robinett requested an updated request letter because the one originally submitted does not exactly match what the request seems to be. He stated that once this is received, the request will be forwarded for CAGAS input. He told Dr. Filipink that he would share the comments he has received so that CAGAS will have feedback from a variety of people across the campus to this proposal.

Chair Robinett observed that the contract specifies that the Union be notified of the intent to form such a committee. He asked if UPI has been notified. Interim Provost Mossman replied UPI has not been formally notified yet, but he will send an email request to UPI President Merrill Cole to form an APER Committee and copy Interim President Mindrup and Chair Robinett. He said once this is received, Faculty Senate is requested to populate the committee.

Chair Robinett asked if there is any timeline for this process. Interim Provost Mossman replied he hopes to send the email out this week. He hopes that everything can be completed by the last week of November or the first week of December. Chair Robinett asked if the Interim Provost has any idea of the number of programs given this very short timeline; Interim Provost Mossman replied there will be a small number of mostly graduate programs at this point.

Chair Robinett stressed that Faculty Senate is only charged only with the election portion of this process. He said that once the formal notification arrives, the election notice will be sent out as soon as possible; a little over a week will be allowed for petitions to be submitted and time will be allowed for electronic voting in the case of any contested elections.

Senator Brewer asked if the election is for the individuals who will actually serve on the APER Committee; Chair Robinett replied affirmatively. Senator Brewer asked if ExCo appoints any of the representatives; Chair Robinett replied they are all elected. He stated that the contract requires one Unit A faculty member from each of the academic colleges and one Unit A representative from University Libraries. Senator Brewer asked where a faculty member from the School of Law Enforcement and Justice Administration (LEJA) would fall in this process and whether they are considered part of a college. Chair Robinett replied that this was clarified at an Executive Committee meeting earlier this year: for the purpose of representation, the Executive Committee will consult the LEJA faculty member to verify which area they wish to serve in. He added that if a faculty member from LEJA submitted a petition requesting to be considered as a representative of the College of Education and Human Services, ExCo would be asked to verify that.

5. *CARLI statement for possible support by Senate*

A faculty member has asked if Faculty Senate would consider endorsing a statement of support from the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI). The Executive Committee approved a motion endorsing the CARLI statement. A vote on the endorsement will occur during New Business on October 22.

6. *Resolution from Southern Illinois University's faculty senate*

Chair Robinett told ExCo he saw the resolution in support of WIU's faculty in the agenda for the Council on Illinois University Senates (CIUS) meeting on October 18. He said SIU's faculty senate did not reach out to him about their resolution, and he knew nothing about it until seeing it on the CIUS agenda yesterday. Chair Robinett told ExCo he has reached out to the SIU faculty senate chair but has not heard back from him. Interim Provost Mossman remarked he hopes that attached to this resolution to the CIUS there could be a statement of larger advocacy for increased statewide funding for higher education because everything that is happening at every institution is because of a fundamental lack of funding in the state. Chair Robinett noted that a discussion of state financial support for higher education is one of the first items on the CIUS agenda. He added that the Council on General Education has asked him to discuss general education across the state with the other faculty senates at the CIUS meeting, especially as related to IAI.

7. *Committee to Assess Presidential Appointment – Faculty Survey*

Chair Robinett received notification today from Trustee Wise, who will be chairing this Board of Trustees (BOT) committee, that the first meeting will be held tomorrow. He said the initial letter indicates there are two questions the Board wants members to survey their constituencies about in whatever method the governing groups usually use. He added that tomorrow morning's meeting is intended to verify what those questions will be.

Chair Robinett said he is very concerned when looking at the composition of the committee that there is a

lack of representation from females and marginalized populations. He shared this concern with several faculty members who asked Chair Robinett to make sure that he reaches out directly to some of those marginalized populations and to women to make sure that they feel their concerns are heard.

Chair Robinett noted that UPI has distributed a survey to their members; he has tried to clarify with Board members that UPI and Faculty Senate are not the same entity and explain their different roles. Chair Robinett appreciated that one Trustee asked the question that enabled this clarification to be provided.

Chair Robinett told ExCo that Faculty Senate does not have to submit the data to the BOT until November 15. He would like to take the time, in collaboration with other faculty members, to design a survey instrument that would allow for a better understanding of how faculty feel, not only about the possible presidential appointment but also about what they see as the most pressing issues at the university and how they feel about the overall climate. He asked if those at the meeting have any thoughts on making the survey include more than the two questions required by the Board.

Interim President Mossman responded he supports whatever way ExCo wants to handle this, adding that if ExCo feels it would be better to have a wider survey, he does not think that undermines anything. He said it sounds like Chair Robinett would like to get a feel for what the faculty feel about Interim President Mindrup's leadership, and he does not think she would object to that. Chair Robinett remarked he is concerned that a survey of only two questions would not conceptualize something as important as the appointment of a president. Dr. Filipink remarked that a two-question survey might give the impression that it is a rubber stamp committee.

Parliamentarian Bowers Sharpe stated that, coming from a social science background, she wonders how comparable the data will be coming from the various groups and is very interested to see it. She thinks a survey that would provide additional context would be very helpful. Chair Robinett said he will not know more about the survey questions until tomorrow morning; the only information he has now is what was said at the most recent Board meeting and the information in the letter.

Senator Brewer wonders about the urgency on the Board's part. He does not know why the Board needed to call a special meeting to discuss this when Interim President Mindrup already has a contract through June. He wonders if there was a reason for the urgency, such as a timeline for when the university has to name someone permanently to the position or decide on a search. Chair Robinett responded that his understanding from attending the meeting is that 1) several Trustees spoke about the number of emails they are receiving asking them to take a course of action, 2) there was discussion of the number of internal appointments that exist, 3) the last time the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) visited they mentioned as a concern the number of interim positions the university has administratively, and that number is potentially higher now than when they were last on campus, and 4) there are concerns about the cost of a search and questions about whether the university should wait until it could be afforded or take the step of appointing a president now. Associate Provost Mossman confirmed that, while he does not know the reasons behind the Board's decision to convene the committee, the number of interim positions in Academic Affairs is a concern of the HLC as well as the number of interims in the Cabinet. He thinks it would be good to reduce the number of interims in light of the four-year cyclical report to the HLC.

Chair Robinett related there were several questions raised at the special meeting about the suddenness of calling it. He said the special meeting was announced at the Board retreat, and one Trustee indicated that it had already been stated that this discussion was going to happen at the retreat, but because a vote would need to be taken to do the assessment and appoint a Trustee to chair the committee, a special meeting needed to be called.

Senator Brewer commented that he understands the money issue, but he hears faculty around the university question the continued appointment of individuals into positions that may be not even needed. He noted that there are many associate positions and individuals getting promoted, and while Senator Brewer does not doubt their work, it contrasts with the concerns expressed about money and laying off faculty without having replacements for their positions. He said one faculty member pointed out to him that she was serving under an interim chair, an interim associate dean, an interim dean, an interim provost, and an interim president, so he understands the interim piece of this.

Dr. Filipink remarked the Board telegraphed they planned to do this when they postponed the search for a president until March. He noted that an offer has been made to the Board for them to visit WIU to see what is actually done at the university but none of them have accepted the offer. Interim Provost Mossman confirmed this was a recommendation from the HLC; they suggested Trustees learn different parts of the university by spending time in the Financial Aid office, visiting a dean's office, attending a Senate meeting, or other aspects of the university, but that has not materialized.

Interim Provost Mossman remarked that the Provost's office is profoundly understaffed, even compared to when he arrived in 2018. He acknowledged that civil service, faculty, and staff are all doing about eight more jobs than they normally would, and everybody feels that. He added that the two associate provosts work non-stop and do not get much praise for it.

Chair Robinett told ExCo he will ask senators to help create a survey instrument. He hopes to move quickly to have a survey distributed by October 28 and due back on November 8. He will report back to Faculty Senate on November 12 about the results of the survey because faculty should know the results before they are given to the Board sometime between November 13 and noon on November 15.

8. *Finalize agenda for Senate meeting of October 22 – guest Paul Bubb*

Chair Robinett pointed out that election of a Faculty Senate Vice Chair is on the agenda under Old Business.

The Executive Committee meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Office Manager
and Recording Secretary