

Faculty Senate Minutes – November 18, 2014

Senators present: Linda Cowan, Lihua Chen, Greg Chase, Judy Stechly, Ken Sexton, Aaron Huffman, Herb Minch, Matthew Inkster, Jim Haizlett, Jeff Pfister, Aaron Harper, Jeremy Larance, Sheli Bernstein-Goff, Susan Herrick, Ronny Warrington, Tracy Zang, Fuhua Chen, Jon Serra, Matthew Zdilla, Rick West.

Absent members: Corey Reigel, Dave Blowers, Frank Noble (*BOG Representative*).

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from October 17, 2014. The motion passed

Administrators and Honored Guests: Robin Capehart (*President*), Brian Crawford (*Provost*), Sylvia Hawranick-Senften (*ACF Representative*)

1. Senate was called to order by the Senate Chair Linda Cowan at 3:33 pm.

2. Approval of Minutes: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes as presented. Minutes approved. A big thank-you was given to Judy Stechley for taking the minutes while Tracy was medical absence through September and October.

3. Administrators

Robin Capehart, President

The president thanked the faculty for all the ideas and discussion at the recent luncheons at his home. A number of ideas came out of that including several task forces that they will be initiating. These will include a technology task force and an athletic task force this fall and a housing task force down the road. We want to get these together before next year. The President's Council has generated some ideas to raise revenue. Some of these are to create and implement new degree programs, some three-year programs and graduate programs, and employ innovative tuition and fee structures. One fee change that we are looking at is a fee structure based on per credit fees for students over a certain number of credits. Other changes include the ideas to offer out-of-state students a tuition discount that will be the equivalent to in-state tuition if they live in the dorms, and in-state tuition for all veterans. We are also exploring a program for employees to be eligible for a 50% tuition scholarship for graduate level programs offered at WLU. All of these ideas are under discussion and may need approval before we can implement them.

Brian Crawford, Provost

We are updating the scheduling process and are putting together a new schedule for classrooms together for next fall. In the past we did scheduling alphabetically. Now we are going to schedule the larger classes first. We've done away with the class size limit of 49 that was artificially set years ago because it is no longer needed. We have two policy drafts under review at the moment. Policy 215 is the Student Course Evaluations Policy that is under review by the Policy 215 Committee. We want to update the course evaluation survey very soon. The annual faculty evaluation Policy 214 is also under review by the Policy 214 Committee and the Deans Council. It does two things: it adds a form to the faculty performance activity report, and replaces the point system with a rubric. This complements Policies 216 and 217, and will allow the annual policy to reflect the recent changes as far as significant versus reasonable contributions. It removes the mid-year conference, but if you want the conference back, he can put it back. It addresses the roles of program directors doing faculty evaluation and the role of chairs. Merit decisions are moved to the college level and program directors and chairs become eligible for merit. It adds classroom and online course observation forms and minimum requirements for doing the observations. His goal is to get these policies done this spring.

Faculty Senate Minutes – November 18, 2014

The academic reorganization proposal is also under consideration as a consequence of one of the luncheons the president had with faculty senators. Social work, athletic training, and exercise physiology all came up in the discussion as to why they are where they are. He suggested looking at the whole thing and making sure that things make sense. This will be important for the graduate studies development as well. We also have three dean searches going on, and if we are going to make a change, then it should be during this time. The Provost is looking for input from faculty senators on this. He hopes to begin conversations soon on potential models, and would like to present a proposal to the BOG hopefully in time for the March meeting. A question was asked about whether the restructuring included administration. He replied that this includes academic administration only.

Sylvia Hawranick-Senften (ACF Representative)

Sylvia suggested that all faculty members attend the PEIA informational session and also fill out the survey about the changes to the insurance program.

Frank Noble – Board of Governor Report

No report - there hasn't been a BOG meeting. Linda stated that she sent the last BOG meeting report out.

Jeremy Larence (General Studies Committee Chair)

The General Studies Committee is in the process of working out the logistics of reporting the assessment data from Com 101 and Eng 101. The big question is how to take the data and put it into a form we can use. Eng 102 and the social sciences will be participating in assessment data collection this spring. A question was asked if there would be any faculty training on the use of live text for those in the next wave of required collection of assessment data through Live Text. Jeremy replied that there is a simple tutorial available.

4. Committee Reports

Green Initiative Committee Minutes - David Thomas (Chair)

The GIC's next meeting will be Wednesday, 19 November 2014. At the meeting the following will be discussed: 1) The unavoidable delay of the recycling program because of Republic Service's inability to get our four outside drop-boxes to us; 2) 800 recycling bins have been received and will be distributed campus-wide for use beginning in January; 3) Also, 850 desk-side recycling containers have been ordered and will also be distributed around campus during the holiday break; 4) The need for campus-wide cooperation in educating everyone about the proper methods of recycling; 5) The request for participants for WLUEED 3 on 22 April 2015; 6) The recognition of Dr. Vishakha Maskey for winning Green Apple Day of Service Award and her and Pat Henry's saving WLU \$1,019 in utility costs. The committee requests that anyone with ideas for participants for WLUEED on 22 April 2015 contact Dave Thomas or a Committee member. The Green Committee would like to recognize Dr. Vishakha Maskey for winning the Green Apple Day of Service Award, as well as Dr. Vishakha and Pat Henry's saving WLU \$1,019.00 in utility costs.

Policy 214 – Matthew Inkster, Chair

This committee meets next week and he will have more information at the next senate meeting. Linda suggested that she send out the draft of Policy 214. A request was made to name the committee members. They are: Bob Gall, Katherine Hastings, Doug Schwartz, Carrie White, Scott Glysson. A concern was expressed that the evaluations of the chairs, deans, and upper administration require the faculty member's name, thus making the evaluation results ineffective.

Faculty Senate Minutes – November 18, 2014

Ethics Committee – Aaron Harper, Chair

We had our first meeting a couple of weeks ago in order to discuss which ethics matters to pursue first. Issues of particular interest to the committee are the possibility of sexual harassment training and the development of an ombudsman position. The committee is currently seeking additional information on these matters. Linda suggested that the committee speak with Jim Stultz. A faculty member brought up the issue of plain harassment. The committee felt that the structure of what to do with ethical complaints would be the place to start. Concerns were expressed about changing the current faculty ethics statements, as they are fairly vague right now.

Policy 215 – Jon Serra, Chair

Two new, online course evaluation pilots are underway in CoS and Ed. Those two systems are to be evaluated and one chosen for implementation in Spring 2015. The committee met without a draft of the policy or questions to review. Some general, overall comments the committee is concerned with: (1) What is the purpose of this document? Evaluate course effectiveness or evaluate faculty performance? (2) We need: The policy, Questions, Delivery Format (3) Faculty want feedback on course effectiveness. Dr. Crawford provided the committee with the new questions, and current draft of the policy. Committee will be reviewing both.

The Policy 215 Committee meeting will be held next week with the new direction from Dr. Crawford. We had already begun looking at the course evaluation questions at the last meeting. The committee wanted to know the goal of course evaluations. Is the goal to look at faculty performance or to look at student learning? The committee also discussed questions that Paula sent out a while ago. Tracy Tuttle discussed many issues from her committee that is deciding between the two types of computerized student evaluations based on the experimental trial taking place. The Policy 215 that we currently have is purely procedural, and does not address the questions.

Senate comments about Policy 215 included questions about the following.

1.) The timeline on which we are giving course evaluations. 2.) Colleges giving the trial new student course evaluations are testing two different systems. One college was asked to have evaluations done by the end of October. Committee members were concerned that that may be too early for an effective evaluation. 3.) Members questioned the evaluation questions and the scale used because there was no neutral response provided. There was a lot of discussion on the type of question we'd like to see on the course evaluation. Jon asked senators to please send him any comments before we meet next week so we can include input.

The Provost stated that if the faculty members have a concern, then they would be able to use the old system as well, although that may upset administrative personnel. Send comments on student course evaluation questions to jon.serra@westliberty.edu. A question was asked whether we all have to use the same form, or if we could have a core set of questions and tweak some of the others. One of the options is that we do have a few questions at the end that can be program specific, or college specific. The General Studies Committee also wonders about whether the evaluation questions could be specific to that class.

Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee- Rick West, Chair

No report.

5. Announcements:

Policy about dead week: Linda questioned the Provost if this policy is being enforced. The Provost replied that we do try to enforce that. They rely on the deans to handle this. Linda asked Provost to send a message about the dead week policy to all faculty members throughout the university.

Faculty Senate Minutes – November 18, 2014

Rick West commented that this is an undergraduate policy only and does not apply to graduate programs. Education faculty expressed concern that the performance based assessments that they use requires a great deal of time to correct. They need more time before grade are due.. Linda suggested that we modify the policy to reflect performance based assessments timelines.

6. Action Items:

Linda stated that she sent the letter to the President about the restructuring issue. It seemed that there was a definite timeline for this process. She expressed the faculty concerns about not having any input on this. Along those lines, we could suggest a committee. She asked the Senate what we want to do about the proposed restructure and suggested collecting ideas. She also suggested that we talk to our constituents about what is going on, and direct all comments to provost. We will discuss reorganization in January and see where the new direction is. The Provost will have better idea then about what the plan is. Questions the Senate had included: Is this the next step we are ready for? Does a regional campus make more sense? What is our goal? There is a big difference between being a teaching institution and a research institution. Please send your thoughts to Dr. Crawford. Concerns were expressed that each of us understands our own department well, but this restructure would change the culture significantly.

Approval of Letter to Administration – Procedure 213 –This was tabled at a previous meeting and we have no action on it at this point. Senators chose to leave this tabled.

Academic Program Analysis Committee

Linda brought up nominee names that had been forwarded to her to represent the Faculty Senate on the Provost's Academic Program Analysis Committee

Fine Arts & Communication_ Brian Fencil was the sole nominee

Business – Jean Bailey and Mike Turrentine

Education- Keeley Camden and Rhonda Noble

Science: Melinda Kreisberg

Liberal Arts: Sheili Bernstein-Goff, Susan Herrick, Peter Staffel, Robert Gall, Robert Kruse (one of the Deans representatives on the committee).

A motion was made and seconded to either give the list of nominees to Brian today, or to take the names to the individual colleges and let each college select their own representatives from the list of nominees. The motion passed with three abstentions and zero opposed.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the motion into two separate motions with a separate vote for each action in the motion above. The motion passed. The vote was as follows:

1. A motion was made and seconded in favor of giving the list to Dr. Crawford today by 5:00 pm Friday: There were 17 against and one abstention for this motion. The motion did not pass.

2. The motion was made and seconded to let each college select their own faculty representative for the Program Analysis Committee from the list of nominees. There were two abstentions and the rest were in favor of this option. This amended motion passed.

7. Faculty Forum

A discussion was held regarding the Academic Programs Review Committee and selection of members. Sylvia commented that we should clarify that the academic reorganization is different from the program analysis. The program analysis committee will look at every program across

Faculty Senate Minutes – November 18, 2014

campus and develop criteria for assessment. Another comment was made that the program analysis had more to do with the viability and sustainability of the university.

Parking – The President mentioned that there will be a Parking Summit tomorrow with box lunches provided. Greg and Linda will attend, and he will run point on this.

Linda asked for ideas. A suggestion was made to get data on the number of tickets, when are they given, timeframes, etc. The president is in favor of resident and commuter dual tag system for students, such as an airport model. In the airport model, if you are a resident, you would park in different regions. Raising ticket fees is an idea that is on the table. The gating of the library lot idea has been around for a while, and they plan to discuss this.

Enforcement is a concern. We plan to ask how these will be enforced, because no rule means anything until it is enforced. Senate discussed the possibility of having student workers go around and issue tickets, but many Senators felt that this option could easily be misused. A question was asked about where the money we pay for parking now goes. Linda stated that she has asked for data from John Davis in the past, but never received any. A question was asked about why the dirt lot is blocked off to Faculty Drive side but open on the other side. Why can't we park there? Linda suggested that we be aware that there is lots of glass and nails there, and recommended against driving a car on it.

Judy commended Tracy on taking the minutes for the last few years and noted how time consuming and difficult it is.

Jon Serra noted that students petition him who need to keep a certain average and question what do they need to do for an 'A'? If we had a plus minus system, it might help with retention for those students who need a higher average to keep their scholarships. Susan Herrick said this has been discussed before, and she had asked John McCullough about it in the past. He replied that it would take 60,000 dollars at that time.

Susan Herrick asked a question about faculty members who are on adjunct status that teach 5-10 courses/year. They are the workhorses for many departments. She suggested a policy that if a person is doing that kind of work for three years that they become an instructor. She felt that they are being exploited unnecessarily. Linda said she would ask about Scott Cook about this.

A question was asked about Banner – what is it? Banner is a data retention system for basically everything. It runs banner WINS, transcripts, financial information and student enrollment programs. WINS is a user friendly system but Apex is the state-run system that lives in Charleston.

Linda stated that the Student Body President suggested that plus and minus be added to the grading system. A question was asked about the impact on financial aid for students who have been here a while if grading with plus and minus were to occur. The transcript will have a notation on transcripts indicating that the institution went to a plus/minus system. You can't go back and redo grades.

8. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and approved. The Senate adjourned at 5:58

Respectfully Submitted,

Faculty Senate Minutes – November 18, 2014

Tracy Zang,
Faculty Senate Secretary

The next Senate meeting will be January 20, 2014 at 3:30 pm in Room 202 of Arnett Hall.