



FACULTY CONFERENCE AGENDA 11/18/22

I. Call the meeting to order Approval of the Minutes for the 9-30-22 Faculty Conference Meeting	Dr. Jennifer Jordan
II. Report from the FC Chair	Dr. Jennifer Jordan
III. Report From the Provost	Dr. Peter Judge
IV. Report from Academic Council	Dr. Alice McLaine
V. Report from FCUP Chair	Dr. Amanda Hiner
VI. Unfinished Business	
VII. New Business	
VIII. Announcements	Gina Jones Chuck Rey
IX. Adjournment	

Faculty Conference Minutes 11/18/2022

(Minutes prepared by Hope Lima, Asst. Professor of Human Nutrition)

--Meeting called to order at 2:01 PM

--We have a quorum at 98 faculty conference attendees; quorum was reached with 153 in attendance.

I. Approval of the Minutes for the September 30, 2022 Faculty Conference Meeting

- a. Motion made to approve minutes and seconded
- b. Minutes were approved unanimously

II. Report from the FC Chair (Dr. Jennifer Jordan)

- a. Communication updates with the board
 - I. Portal created and that has been helpful
- b. Asked to speak during executive session and provide responses to a few questions
 - I. Trying to gather background information about values, what strengths are, and what programs might be beneficial to add
 - II. Shared opinion on faculty job satisfaction
 - I. Shared that moving jobs for faculty is much more difficult than staff job changes and that may be the reason for the discrepancy between faculty and staff losses
- c. Dr. Wildman was chosen as the faculty representative for the VP of advancement search based on his extensive expertise in the area
- d. Faculty on the provost search
 - I. There will be 6
 - II. Jennifer Jordan will be going to each college and asking for names of who the college would like to be on the committee
 - I. People will be nominated and faculty will be able to vote by college on those representatives
- e. Shared governance with new president/provost
 - I. Jennifer feels very optimistic and feels that things are significantly different than how it has been in the past with the new administrators
- f. Jennifer is working with FCUP and FCUL on the policy repository
 - I. Would like your opinion about any policies that you are aware of that may need an update or have issues that you feel need to be addressed
 - II. Please sent to jordanj@winthrop.edu if you have comments/concerns/feedback
- g. Questions
 - I. Margaret Gillikin asked about the decision to meet solely virtually and the concern that it does not meet Robert's Rules of Order
 - I. Robert Wildman stated that given that Robert's Rules of Order were written long before virtual meetings were an option, might that specific rule now be considered obsolete?
 - II. Margaret Gillikin states "I think the faculty should make the decision about how we meet. Not being able to speak inhibits faculty voice and participation. If virtual meetings are in line with Rober's, I would recommend a platform like regular Zoom instead

of BB Collaborate or Zoom Webinar. In person meetings could always have a virtual option

III. Andrew Besmer states for future that Whitton Auditorium may offer the possibility of both an in person meeting and a high quality zoom meeting where speakers will be clearly heard and seen, it may be worth exploring

II. Wendy Sellers asked why this meeting was made to be in Webinar format

III. Report from the Provost (Dr. Peter Judge)

a. Sabbatical applications

I. Under review and recommendations will be submitted to the president who will provide decisions around December 1st

II. Happy about continued commitment to providing sabbatical applications despite the economic

b. Faculty policy review

I. Faculty work group with Tim Drueke on reviewing and updating policies that apply to the faculty

c. General Education review

I. Provost has asked this committee to explore the possibility of updating/revising the program and this is in view of the coming work with Gray Associates

II. Jo Koster stated that we did reconsider the GNED program in the 2015-2016 academic year so it has not been as long as administration is stating that is has been

d. Flight Ready/ACUE

I. Information about registration coming soon for spring and summer courses

II. This is an important retention tool

III. Remember the \$500 department grants for three or more completers

e. Thompson Scholar applications

I. Information and application now available under Academic Affairs > Faculty Honors > Awards

II. Due January 14, 2023

f. Questions

I. Dr. BRB – are there any specific things that are to be discussed about the gen ed committee review it would be helpful for faculty to know

II. Ephraim Sommers – regarding faculty hiring policy: as someone who has served on two search committees for professor lines in the past, I was wondering why we don't list the exact salary offer in our job ads up front. It would save everyone's time on the committee and those applying to the job, knowing that information up front, as we would receive less overall applications.

I. Dr. Judge states that usually we put "salary dependent on experience" but he is not opposed to having a salary range

III. Wendy Sellers gave an update on Gen Ed revision, stating that we are in phase 2 of the review which includes data collection and review to provide information about systematic/thoughtful revisions of curriculum based on

data. Unsure about how this will move forward because Wendy Sellers will be leaving at the end of this semester so she will not be heading this effort anymore.

- I. Dr. Judge updates that it is possible that they will not change anything
- g. Update about retention and enrollment
 - I. Concern about retention because we want to be sure to keep the students that we recruited as we were already below our annual goals
 - II. Encourage advisors and department chairs to reach out to students to encourage them to register
 - III. Applications are up 24.4% compared to last year and decisions are being sent sooner, with an increase of 22.5%. This speaks to marketing successes.
- h. Encourage faculty to join in on Tuesday 11/22 to join “A Latte Fun” in Tilman 106 from 9 – 11:30 AM.

IV. Report from the Registrar (Gina Jones)

- a. GR degree candidate grades due Wed, Dec 14 by 3 PM
- b. UG degree candidate grades due Thur, Dec 15 by 9 AM
- c. Grades due for all students Fri, Dec 15 by 5 PM
- d. New grades that are happening this semester “UF” and “UU”
 - I. UF – “unearned F” – failure due to nonparticipation or nonattendance vs. F where they did not pass assignments
 - II. UU – unearned U – failure due to nonparticipation or nonattendance vs. U where they did not pass assignments
 - III. If student was never in class, please put a 0 in the hours attended column
 - IV. This does not have to do with an attendance policy but with a student not passing due to not showing up for class at all
 - V. Faculty have discretion at grading – you won’t be approached if you put the wrong thing. This is an effort to differentiate between students not grasping the subject material vs. students that did not attend the class

V. Concerns from Margaret Gillikin

- a. Sharing concerns about the format
- b. Does not like being in a meeting where she can’t see who is in the meeting because of when someone is speaking
- c. Feels this hampers conversation because the time it takes to type
- d. Also concerned about chat defaulting to host and panelists
- e. Kent Miller states that we may be able to clarify meeting platform in the bylaws by amending them for future meetings
- f. Several people said they appreciate the virtual option
- g. Several people agree that the method needs to be in a way that does not silence the faculty
- h. Several people said that hybrid allows some people being more comfortable with commenting

VI. Report from Academic Council (Dr. Alice McLaine)

- a. Encourages training on CourseDog
- b. CourseDog is now available for curriculum action

- c. New Minor of Global Arts and Visual Culture does not require vote from Faculty Conference
- d. Cultural Events committee proposal to continue offering virtual cultural events – academic council voted unanimously to continue to offer virtual events. Proposal can be found in appendix A.
 - I. Faculty moderator would continue to keep track for attendance by having cameras on/being in attendance for the entire program
 - II. Committee suggested that there should be a maximum of 12 cultural events virtually each semester; however, this semester has only had 5 and so the committee does not see this as a current problem
 - III. Vote required by faculty conference
 - I. Poll given
 - II. 96% approved, so allowing virtual cultural events will continue
- e. General education assessment committee proposal to remove SLO 3 from the global perspectives component of general education
 - I. Proposal can be found in Appendix B
 - II. Language shifted from listing global events that are available to students during the semester to asking students to identify relevant connections between course material and a global cultural
 - III. This shift in language was never actually approved, so academic council is asking it just be removed
 - IV. Vote required by faculty conference
 - I. Poll given
 - II. 96% approved, so removing SLO 3 is approved

VII. Report from FCUP (Dr. Amanda Hiner)

- a. A detailed overview of FCUP report to faculty conference can be found in appendix C.
- b. FCUP is employing a hybrid approach to concerns brought to FCUP by colleagues
 - I. Sometimes they take issues directly to the president, sometimes directly to the provost
 - II. Sometimes they bring to other administrators across campus
- c. Have been very happy with the response to concerns with FCUP and feel president/provost are working with FCUP to get concerns resolved
- d. Working with FCUL closely in some manners
- e. Updates on current issues brought to president/provost:
 - I. FCUP report on progress on campus internal communication plan
 - I. Hybrid approach, where they identify pain points in communication and provide recommendations rather than a specific internal communication plan
 - II. Will be reaching out to faculty for input in the form of focus group/survey – watch for this
 - II. Method of tuition reporting/perception of cost of Winthrop in SC
 - I. Other universities strip out program fees and Winthrop does not
 - II. Net cost is actually in the middle of the universities in SC

- III. VP responses included confirmation of the cost but that student fees are lower than other schools
- IV. Plan to coordinate with other administrators to help adjust reporting to be better in line with SC
- V. Tuition pricing models are complex and can make difficult – but want to have a strategic approach to shifting perception of actual cost
- III. Questions about the plan for finding from Gray Associates
 - I. How transparent will the process be? Will it be shared with faculty? Will it be shared in totality? Will faculty be involved in the decision making process?
 - II. President Serna's response is yes to everything – it will be shared in it's entirety with the university; analysis will be focused on cost savings – this is not intended to be used as a weapon and faculty will be very involved about report data and we will make decisions together about how the campus community will respond to the report.
- IV. Faculty involvement with/inclusion on provost and other key leadership searches
 - I. Current thought: 6 faculty members from across the college, 2 staff, and 4 administrators
 - II. Faculty will be voted on by each college
- V. Midterm window and timing for cyber-security training
 - I. Feels onerous to faculty
 - II. Reached out to Patrice Bruneau and he responded that IT is currently working on a new process that will be based on a 12 month anniversary period from prior training – window will be opened to 60 days rather than 2-3 weeks
 - III. Does that push someone's window to a non-contract time? This is something they may take up again moving forward
 - IV. Question about timing – if someone completes the cyber-security training early in the window, will that move your due date up to that 1-2 day window?
 - I. Patrice Bruneau states that if you complete the training on Sept 1 for example, your next deadline will be 12 months after that day. Your new window will start 60 days before Sept 1.
- VI. Allowing faculty have received major faculty awards the option to delay post-tenure review for five years
 - I. This is small, but meaningful to faculty morale
 - II. This practice has gone away and we asked for it to return
 - III. Both president and provost were highly in favor of reinstating this practice
- VII. Ongoing concerns about the campus technology/laptop campus initiatives
 - I. There was an extensive research period that went into the recommendation to move to a laptop campus

- II. Concern is that we do not have the infrastructure to support that which can result in frustration for students and faculty
- III. Upgrades in technology need to be used to recruit students and it is being put into rooms in Kinard where everything is run down. The room doesn't reflect the investment in technology.
 - I. Working group went into these rooms to talk about ways to upgrade the rooms to reflect the value of the technology so that room doesn't detract from the technology
- IV. Questions
 - I. Kinard was a strategic choice because it is on the tour twice and has an accessibility ramp right near the room.
 - II. What does the term laptop campus actually mean? Andrew Besmer came on to discuss this
 - I. It means that the technology will be improved in the classrooms as well – professor can teach while moving through the classroom and the students can send data to the smart screens as well
 - II. Kinard is supposed to be the proof of concept that will be then tested and feedback gathered to improve upon the concept
 - III. Biggest concern was that the room would not be completed by the date that they originally set – and that did occur. Right now the room is not functional and it cannot be tested at the moment. Once it can be tested it will be deployed out to other rooms.
 - IV. Concerns: cost is very high; may need to be tiered (e.g. some that are fully upgraded and some that are partially updated) and scattered throughout different departments. Also need to pay attention to aesthetics by respecting campus spaces. Also concern about wifi connectivity in specific areas of each building.
 - V. Wifi is not under the committee control and has been recommended as a pain point with implementing a laptop campus
 - VI. There are very real problems with getting technology software due to supply chain issues
- III. Patrice Bruneau came on to update about Wifi
 - I. Age of the buildings has been hurting efforts for Wifi. Only most recent buildings have good coverage. Older building are terrible for installing technology.
 - II. Installing technology requires wiring, power, cooling, etc. that are really difficult to put into older buildings

III. Kinard is on the radar right now. It has been surveyed twice. These companies are trying to figure out what is the way that can maintain the building. Then a quote comes in and it has to be approved. Then supply chain is on a 6-12 month backorder so even if this was fixed/approved tomorrow it would be a year before things got in.

IV. IT just lost their only network administrator

VIII. Faculty roles and rewards – review of policies affecting faculty members and establishment of rewards if possible

I. Going through policies to see what policies are all updated/correct in different spaces

II. FCUP is concerned about looking at faculty policies that can be tweaked/modified to improve faculty morale by adding rewards

III. If you know if a policy that is problematic then please submit to Amanda Hiner or Jennifer Jordan

VIII. Unfinished Business

a. No unfinished business

IX. New Business

a. No new business

X. Announcements

a. Reminder that there is a graduate faculty meeting directly after this meeting

b. Chuck Rey invited to give athletics update

I. Chuck has been at Winthrop since 2008

II. Research and development focus

I. Deepen/cultivate professor and campus relationships

I. Ex. Gatorade development was out of a university

II. Student and student athlete internship and work study opportunities

III. Engage with the community

IV. Goal of at least 1 student embedded with each team

I. Currently Mass Comm, Phys Ed/Sport & Human Performance, and Human Nutrition are integrated

V. Fall sports update

I. Volleyball, golf, soccer, track & field are all performing very well to bring good marketing for the university

VI. Hybrid sports update

I. ESports, Disc Golf, Cornhole, BMX, and Spirit Squad

I. These are “club” type sports that athletics are helping to support

II. ESports now functions out of athletics with now 40 students participating. By fall of 2023 there is a goal to bring in 150 students with a goal of over 500 under ESports umbrella.

c. Kimmarie Whetstone

I. WOOL updates

I. Learning glass video recording space in 307 bancroft

- II. Blackboard day in January 2023
 - I. Soft launch of blackboard learn ultra
 - III. If you want to use blackboard learn ultra, you can join the ultra squad for spring, summer, or fall 2023
 - IV. Winthrop online teaching recertification required faculty certified to teach online renew their certification after five years to ensure that faculty remain current with Winthrop's strategic vision for online education
- d. Jessi Lessenberry
- I. Senior at Winthrop, co-chair for students of accountability in action
 - II. Winthrop Gratitude Week – Nov 28 – Dec 2 dedicated to faculty and staff and student employees

XI. Future Meeting Dates

- a. February 24th
- b. April 21st

XII. Adjournment

--Motion to adjourn and seconded

--Meeting Adjourned at 4:02 PM

Appendix A

Proposal to Allow Virtual Cultural Events for the Foreseeable Future

Dear Academic Council:

My colleagues and I on the Cultural Events Committee would like to recommend to the Academic Council that we continue to allow Virtual Cultural Events.

For context, we have been approving virtual cultural events since the beginning of the pandemic. In the interim during this semester (Fall 2022), we have received no word from a larger body about a specific policy on virtual cultural events, so we submit this proposal to you with the hope that both faculty and committee can have more clarity on this issue.

It is our belief that continuing to allow virtual cultural events each semester grants our students greater access to a diversity of ideas and cultures that keeps with the spirit of the cultural event requirement. This would give student athletes, students studying abroad, and students who may be taking courses fully online in other cities, especially, more opportunities to satisfy their cultural event requirements. In addition, it would also provide departments who may be facing funding issues the opportunity to virtually host lecturers/academics/authors/artists who might otherwise be unavailable for travel to our Rock Hill campus.

We have one recommendation for your consideration:

-We recommend that the onus for regulating student attendance and participation going forward would continue to rest with the faculty moderator of said cultural event (this has been the standard practice. The moderator usually employs the help of a “camera monitor” to help with this). The faculty moderator must also submit the zoom attendance report after their event (this has also been standard practice).

My Very Best!

Dr. Ephraim Scott Sommers
Cultural Event Committee Chair
Associate Professor of English
Winthrop University

Appendix B

Proposal from the GE Assessment Committee):

Motion: Remove SLO #3 from the Global Perspectives component of General Education.

- Rationale:
- Somewhere back in the day (long, long ago), the language regarding this particular SLO shifted from asking instructors to provide a “list of ‘global events’ that are available to students during the semester” to asking students to “identify relevant connections between course material and a global cultural event.”
- The magical shift in this language was never actually approved through faculty governance.
- Since it was never approved by faculty governance, then the approved “tweaks” made to this particular SLO last year were actually tweaks made to a phantom SLO.

Appendix C
FCUP Report to Faculty Conference
November 18, 2022 Meeting
Report on Resolved and In-Progress Items

Submitted by Amanda Hiner

Progress on Campus Internal Communication Plan

Submitted Concern: Throughout the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 academic years, faculty members submitted concerns to FCUP members about issues related to campus communication. Information about significant topics such as campus COVID policies, furloughs, the salary compensation study, and plans for "right-sizing" academic programs were filtered out inconsistently across campus, or faculty members heard inconsistent and contrary information from different sources at different times.

FCUP members presented this topic as one of two large areas of concern to President Serna during the July 2022 FCUP meeting. President Serna acknowledged the seriousness of the issue and asked FCUP members to devise a "campus communication plan" that represented how they would like for information to be distributed. The plan should be focused on increasing transparency, eliminating "middle steps" in the communication chain, and creating a more consistent timeline and explicit process for campus communication.

Action Steps: FCUP members, headed by a sub-committee consisting of Tracy Patterson, Crystal Glover, and Diann Smothers, are working draft an "Internal Campus Communication Plan." Committee members are currently working on crafting faculty surveys and focus groups and creating a "hybrid" communication plan that identifies problem areas and provides recommendations for future action, including a possible campus-wide task force to investigate campus communication strategies and offer a comprehensive plan for internal communication practices. The plan will recommend that an explicit communication strategy must be included or implemented in the decision-making process for strategic campus policies or initiatives. This issue was discussed with the President in an 11/7/22 FCUP Subcommittee meeting.

Method of Tuition Reporting/Perception that Winthrop has the Highest Tuition in the State for a Public University

Submitted Concern: Faculty members have expressed concerns (in FCUP communications, in CAS Dean's Council meetings, and in the CAS Provost's Town Hall) about enrollment and budget numbers and asked if the university has diagnosed possible reasons for the continuing decline. One faculty member in attendance at the Provost's Town Hall stated that "The word on the street is that Winthrop has the highest tuition in the state [for public universities], so why should I send my child there to live in residence halls like that?" The idea that "Winthrop is the most expensive school in the state" is very prevalent and works powerfully against us when families are considering universities in the region. An [online comparison](#) of public university tuition confirms that we do, indeed, have the highest tuition in the state – higher than Clemson, and much higher than other universities in the state. Faculty members have asked

administration about this issue in the past and have been told that other schools do not include all their fees in their published tuition price, but Winthrop does. Faculty members feel that this practice is unfair to our own institution and gives families in the state an incorrect understanding about the real cost of attendance. Faculty members believe that either dropping our tuition or changing the way our tuition costs are reported could go a long way toward enticing students and families to consider us, especially as we may be heading into a recession period.

Action Steps and Response: The FCUP Chair shared this concern with Vice President Oates and Vice President Joe Miller via email on 10/11/2022, and the concern was shared with the President and Provost during the 11/7/22 FCUP Subcommittee Meeting. The President stated that Joe Miller and Justin Oates are currently working on a detailed analysis of our tuition and fee structure in relation to other universities in the state, and they plan to submit a new model for tuition reporting that works in program fee structures similar to other universities in order to bring our tuition reporting process into alignment with other universities in the state. Both Vice President Oates and Vice President Miller responded to FCUP with detailed information regarding this issue. Vice President Oates acknowledged that Winthrop does have the highest tuition list price in the state, but Winthrop does not have program fees that other universities have that make the actual cost of attendance higher at those schools. Vice President Oates noted that, if you look at data across the state that includes financial aid and net price costs, Winthrop is actually in the “middle of the pack” for net cost. Members of campus leadership are currently evaluating what an alternative tuition/fee model might look like, and, though this analysis is still in its early phases, they plan to collaborate with members of academic leadership to create a new proposed tuition/fee model. He noted that the President understands the need to revisit our current price to our students and align them better within the state.

Vice President Miller also shared with us detailed analysis that demonstrated how complex tuition pricing models are and confirmed that Winthrop is actually in the middle of universities in our state in terms of actual net costs. We are currently ranked by U.S. News and World Report as #40 among institutions within our peer group as a “best value” university and stated that he believes that our “best value” ratings could be stronger if our total costs of attendance were lower in combination with our current #6 and #7 positions for Best Public University in the South and Best in Undergraduate Teaching rankings (respectively). His key “takeaway” is that leadership on campus is taking active steps to identify and assess our current market position and how we can work together to find ways to remain competitive and affordable to our students.

Questions about Plan for Communicating Findings from the Gray Associates Study

Submitted Concern: How much information from the Gray Associates study will be shared with the faculty and with the campus as a whole? How transparent will the process be? To what degree will faculty members be included in curricular initiatives or modifications going forward? Will faculty members be consulted or surveyed before making significant changes to our

curricula or programs? Will faculty members be included in decision-making processes regarding our curricula?

Action Steps and Response: This concern was shared with the President at the November 7th FCUP meeting, and he stated that all of the Gray Associates data and recommendations will be shared with the campus community. The university will be given 30 site licenses, and the President expects the collected data and the report to be shared in its entirety with the university. The analysis will be focused on identifying cost savings, but it is not intended to be used as a “weapon” to punitively cut programs. Faculty will be “very involved” in all decisions that result from the report data, and we will make decisions together as a campus community about how to respond to the data and recommendations.

Faculty Involvement and Inclusion on Provost and Other Key Leadership Searches

Submitted Concern: Faculty members have asked questions about their inclusion in search committees for key administrative positions such as the new Provost position. How many faculty members will be included in the Provost search and other administrative-level searches? Can faculty members elect representatives rather than be appointed to these search committees? To what degree will faculty feedback and opinions be considered in selecting a new Provost?

Action Steps and Response: This concern was shared with the President at the November 7th FCUP meeting, and he stated that he would like to have six faculty members from varied colleges and disciplines across campus on the committee. The committee will probably consist of six faculty members, two staff members, and four administrators. The President charged the Faculty Conference Chair with deciding how faculty members are selected for the committee, and after discussing this issue during an FCUP meeting, the Faculty Conference Chair and FCUP members agreed that faculty members should be able to nominate themselves or others for the committee by providing a brief statement of qualifications or special interest in the role. Nominated faculty names and brief statements will then be included on a survey for a faculty vote. Faculty members will be elected as representatives from their respective colleges.

Midterm Window and Timing for Cyber-Security Training

Submitted Concern: Faculty members have submitted requests to FCUP regarding the narrow timeframe to complete mandatory cyber security training each year. This year, the training period was only two weeks long, and it typically falls during midterm exams, midterm grading, and advising. Here is a representative submitted concern: "Faculty members really struggle with the compressed window for the cyber-security training – it falls in October, and this year it was only a two-week window. It always falls during midterm exams and grading deadlines, and it's just a really hard time in the semester for faculty to remember to complete the training. Would it be possible for the cyber-security training to keep the same October deadline (in recognition of cyber security month), but to open the window in August when faculty members have more time to complete the training modules? Widening the training windows or giving

faculty members time to complete training in the summer would be a huge morale boost for them – it may seem like a small thing, but every small benefit really counts for us right now."

Action Steps and Response: The FCUP Chair submitted this concern to Patrice Bruneau, Assistant Vice President of Computing and Technology, on November 2, 2022. Based upon his reply, this issue can probably be considered "resolved." Vice President Bruneau stated that IT is currently working on a new process that will be based on a 12-month anniversary period from the employee's last completed training. The October training timeframe will go away as each person will have their own deadline based on the date that they last completed the training. In addition, the new process will open the training 60 days prior to the deadline in order to allow more time for people to complete the training. Faculty members will always have 60 days to complete the training, and it will fall on a rolling schedule based upon the date of their last completed training date.

Request to Reinstate Practice of Allowing Faculty Members who have Received Major Faculty Rewards to Delay Post-Tenure Review for Five Years

Submitted Concern: The practice of rewarding faculty award winners with a delay in post-tenure review was in place previously but seems to have been revoked in recent years. Faculty members would like to request the President's approval to reinstate this reward.

Action Steps and Response: The President and Provost were both highly in favor of reinstating this practice. They offered their formal approval to move ahead with reinstating the practice of delaying post-tenure review for five years for major campus award winners. Provost Judge hopes to investigate this and develop formal language to put this practice in place in time for the December 2022 Kinard Award winner to benefit from the reinstatement of this practice.

Ongoing Faculty Concerns about Campus Technology and Wi-Fi Connectivity in Support of our Laptop Campus Initiative

Submitted Concern: "The spotty internet on the 3rd floor of Bancroft is a real problem for our students at a 'laptop university.' Students are often not able to do important parts of their work when on our floor, both in and outside of classes. I honestly think that this discourages students to be fully present in the department's physical spaces, which, in turn, may have effects on our ability to build the relationships that allows us to best retain and serve our students." Similar concerns about Wi-Fi connectivity have been expressed to us by faculty members regarding McLaurin, other floors on Bancroft, and other campus academic buildings.

Action Steps and Response: This issue was shared with President Serna in the November 7th FCUP Subcommittee meeting. In addition, FCUP Chair Amanda Hiner and Faculty Conference Chair Jennifer Jordan talked to Dr. Andrew Bessmer, Chair of the University Committee on Campus Technology, about these concerns and relayed information shared during this meeting to the President and Provost. The university technology committee spent an entire year researching the costs, benefits, and possible concerns of instituting either a "Laptop Campus" policy or a "Digital Learning Initiative." As a result of this work, they recommended that the

university not adopt a “Laptop Campus” policy until Wi-Fi infrastructure on campus could be updated and enhanced in order to support the laptop requirement.

In the November 7th FCUP meeting, the Provost stated that additional issues and concerns regarding the technology upgrades in Kinard classrooms are being addressed by a group of people including Vice President Joe Miller, Vice President Justin Oates, Provost Peter Judge, Associate Vice President James Grigg, and Ms. Kelly Huber. One ongoing concern has been that technology has been upgraded in classrooms that are outdated and that contain worn fixtures and furniture, jeopardizing our ability to highlight these upgrades to prospective and current students. The model technology rooms in Kinard are going to be outfitted with new furniture, paint, blinds, etc. to enhance the appearance of the rooms and draw students’ attention to the new technology.

Faculty Roles and Rewards – Review of Policies Affecting Faculty Members and Establishment of Rewards if Possible

Submitted Concern: Faculty would like to request that Academic Council be tasked with investigating faculty roles and rewards considering that many faculty members are being given new assignments/responsibilities. The Roles and Rewards policies and documents should be modified to reflect increased faculty workloads, decreased staffing and administrative support, etc. AFTP or the Provost’s Office should attempt to identify and institute faculty rewards (even non-monetary ones) if possible to support faculty and build morale.

Action Steps: Jennifer Jordan, Amanda Hiner, and Tim Drueke met together on Friday, November 11th together to review universities policies related to faculty roles and rewards and to outline plans to review faculty policies to make sure they are correct and aligned with other documents on campus. The central focus of this work will be on identifying policies or practices that could be modified to support faculty and build morale. This task may be shared by FCUL and FCUP members.