**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, Susan Herrick, Sheli Bernstein-Goff, Corey Reigel, Tracy Zang, Fuhua Chen, Jon Serra, Matthew Zdilla, Rick West.

**Absent members:** Frank Noble *(BOG Representative),* Ronny Warrington, Dave Blowers

**Administrators and Honored Guests:** Robin Capehart (*President*), Brian Crawford, (Provost), Sylvia Hawranick Senften *(ACF Representative), Bridgette Dawson,* **(***Director, Learning and Student Development Center & Title 9 Coordinator), Paula Tomasik (Director of Institutional Research and Assessment)*

*The meeting was called to order by Senate Chair Linda Cowan at 3:31 pm.*

**Approval of Minutes**: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes for January 24, 2015 as presented. Minutes were approved unanimously.

**Administrators**

**Robin Capehart,** *President*

The president stated that in October the budget was ‘about $800.000.00 down,’ but that the university is now $190,000.00 to the good. West Liberty will be in good position by the end of the year. For next year we set a target of 2800 students in fall based on projected student numbers that will be in decline for next fall as is the trend currently. In this current year, Graduate school revenue was close to 2 million dollars, about 11% of total revenue that we bring in. We have various graduate programs on the horizon, MBA, criminology and MSDH. If we hadn’t had graduate programs this year our financial outlook would be more negative. If in the future, we can get further graduate programs rolled out without the HLC reviewing each one, we have hope for the future. The president then discussed strategies for dealing with decreased revenue next year including the budgets associated with non-classified staff positions; outsourcing two to three items; six vacant faculty positions, of which two to three will be filled; and the reorganization process in order to create greater efficiency. The primary reason for the reorganization process is for WLU to have an office of graduate studies as we increase the numbers of graduate programs offered.

**Brian Crawford,** *Provost*

The president is making changes to the timing and procedures in administrative Procedure 10. He is also asking for the budget to be moved back so that we know what the budget will be on the assumption that we will have less students next year based on demographics. If we base a budget on a projected 5% decrease in student numbers, then we should have plenty of money. The MS of Criminology is on the March HEPC agenda, and will be sent to the HLC after HEPC approves it. The Revised MBA Program is up for review by the Senate today. He has asked the Board of Governors (BOG) for a special meeting this week to have the Revised MBA Program passed in order to get it on agenda for March at HEPC. These are our 4th and 5th grad programs. After five graduate programs we can ask for approval so WLU can generate these without the long process. The Academic Reorganization comment period continues until the end of the month. Please respond to the [provost @ westliberty.edu](mailto:provost@westliberty.edu) account so that all comments are together. The deadline is Feb. 28th. A question was asked about the president’s statement regarding the expectation of the number of students predicted to enroll next year. Is there a discrepancy here? The Provost replied that that number stated by the president includes graduate students, while the provost’s number does not. If you look at high school graduation rates in the metro region, they are continuing to drop, so we expect a drop in enrollment as a result of that. Linda asked Dr. Crawford to address the faculty positions that are currently open. He said there are two in nursing and this is an accreditation issue so we have to fill these. There are three in Computer Information Systems, two music positions, and several classified staff positions in academic areas. We will not be able to fill all the open positions. The College of Business is looking for a Dean and that search is active again. The others positions are waiting, and there will be some prioritization, but I doubt if they will all be filled.

**Sylvia Hawranick Senften *(ACF Representative)***

Sylvia discussed bills we need to pay attention to right now, including Senate Bill 439 that replaces or repeals parts of Senate Bill 330 regarding market equity and compensation of classified/non-classified staff and faculty. The Chair of the committee says that he was not interested in supporting unfunded pieces of legislation. This bill does several things including:

1. Eliminates the concept of a required relative market equity study. This has been put out to proposal on at least 2-3 occasions.

2. Eliminates the comparison of salary between faculty and classified and non-classified staff.

3. Provides greater flexibility to the institution to appoint non-classified personnel.

4. It appears that institutions will be able to do their own salary surveys.

5. Reduces the role of oversight from the chancellor of human resources office and puts that back into the institutions human resources.

There are many changes to SB 330, now called 439, but it is not out of committee yet. It also repeals the 20% rule which means that institutions must have non-classified staff at levels of more than 20% of classified staff. Senate Bill 433 is still in committee and has a $1000.00 graduated salary increase over the next two.

Senate Bill 437: Allows a representative from a higher education institution to be represented on the PEIA Insurance board. There has never been a representative on the PEIA. The representative will be from largest state institution- WVU. If people have concerns, talk to your legislator and see if an amendment is possible. See if the representative could be ACF representative and not have all the representation housed at WVU. This bill is still in committee.

Sylvia shared her experience in contacting her legislator about a bill unrelated to higher education. She called the legislator, who answered the phone. The legislator said Sylvia was the only person who had called, but that she had received over 400 standard emails. The legislator stated that the phone call had much more weight than standard written emails do. Sylvia suggests that we call the legislators about any bills of concern and recommended that we avoid calling between 11:00 am and 12:00 pm because the legislators are out on the floor.

**Frank Noble *– Board of Governor Report – no report.***

**Jeremy Larance** (*General Studies Committee Chair*)

The General Studies Committee had encountered problems with the data collection in Live Text last semester. They found a better way to create the rubrics. Instead of creating each of the rubrics, they will take each individual rubric element separately. For example, an element could be communication, or organization of thoughts. Then each general studies faculty member can select 2-3 elements to assess in their class. Live Text will collect all the data on that particular element. The committee is working on creating the elements, so every general studies class will select 2-3 elements at least to assess for next fall. The committee will have the elements done by next week. Then they will have some workshops on how to use these in Live Text. A question was asked about what the problem was with using a standard rubric instead of these? The committee found it was difficult to create rubrics that would work across disciplines. They needed a common point to use for many different classes. They scrapped the idea of assessing critical thinking because each faculty member had different ideas of what that was.

**Bridgette Dawson (***Director, Learning and Student Development Center & Title 9 Coordinator)*

Bridgette came to speak with the Senate about the Title 9 requirements on campus.

1. Title 9 is a1972 law that prohibits discrimination by sex. Any school must comply with Title 9. Now in 2011 and again in 2014 there have been a series of Dear Colleague letters on how to handle sexual assault here on campus. We revised Policy 32, (on the WLU website) which is now in compliance with all the regulations. It is similar to WVU and Concord’s Title 9 policy. All faculty members are mandatory reporters, which means that if a student comes to you and discloses that they have been assaulted or harassed, you are required to report this to Bridgette. She will report the incident to the police as appropriate. Even if you suspect, overhear, or think something, you are to report this and she will take it form there. We are also required to tell people/students that we are mandatory reporters. There are several confidential reporters. You should tell student that there are confidential reporters such as Lisa Witzberger or Deb Daghue in in her role as campus minister. If person wishes to remain confidential, it makes it hard to continue an investigation, but they have to continue it to the best of their ability. Many students are hesitant to report.

2. Title 9 includes pregnancy: If a student is pregnant, they can be excused from their work as long as a doctor excuses them. These will be excused absences as long as there is a doctor’s excuse. You would be required to give them a reasonable time to complete the work.

3. All faculty and staff must be trained on a regular basis. In November, you received an email from Jim Stultz about this Haven program that takes 37 minutes. This is free for one year, but she is looking for a program that will be more cost effective. For our current program, the deadline is March 6th to complete the training. Bridgette gets a report every week with a list of those faculty members who have completed the training. She will be emailing those who have not completed the training. Next year will be dependent on funding as to what the training entails. Questions were asked about pregnancy. Can we ask the student if they want an extension, or do the students have to tell us? What if a student never says anything? If it is a question of a student who says they are going to drop class because they can’t get all the work done, then you should offer them the option of an extension. The Dean of Students says that we are to make arrangements for a student and give them a deadline. The policy seems to be that they have until next semester as a typical deadline. There are currently 3 campuses with open investigations in WV. The investigations are impacted by things such as no effort was made to get everyone trained. Bridgette has to have required items on our web site, and all employees need to know who the confidential reporters are, and who are the mandatory reporters. You cannot just respect the student’s wishes to not report. A question was asked about a scenario in which a student tells you before you can tell them that you are mandatory reporter. If the student does not want to report an incident, then they are considered a reluctant alleged victim.

A question was asked about how much overlap exists between Title 9 and the Cleary Act. The Cleary Act established confidential reporters that can report to Marcella as an anonymous reporter. Attendance issues were also discussed. Social work has a separate attendance policy required for those under ADA. A senator queried Bridgette as to whether this social work policy will be in compliance with these laws regarding the ADA and pregnancy. Bridgette answered that you cannot tell a student to drop a course and you must allow the student to make up the work. The student must have a doctor’s excuse and cannot just miss class because of not feeling well. You must also give them a reasonable timeframe to make up missed work. The Policy is that the Provost says they have until end of next semester. Aaron Harper mentioned the mandatory reporter part of this policy. We must report anything in the policy: violence, assault, harassment, bullying, etc. What if someone in authority makes a comment that is off-color? Is this covered under the policy? Bridgette stated that she will look into it and that not every investigation has legal action. She also stated that the first thing she asks the student is: ‘Did you talk to person and explain that this is unwelcome conversation?” Bridgette said she would encourage facilitation of that conversation. Faculty asked Bridgette to please send another email out about the training and that you cannot begin the training and not finish it without having to start from the beginning next time. The deadline is the Friday before Spring Break, on March 6th.

**Revised MBA Program:** *(Greg Chase)* The HLC is looking towards a more standardized MBA Program, and has mandated that masters programs have 30 hours. Our redesigned program will be totally online for the convenience of the student. It is an accelerated format, with 8-week sessions, so that a student could take it and complete the program in one year with a two-year option. A question was asked about whether any additional faculty would be required.

Greg replied that no new faculty would be needed, but that they may adjunct out some of the classes.

(*Action item moved up.)*

A motion to approve was made to approve the Revised MBA Program and seconded. The motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

**Policy 215 Committee:** *(Jon Serra, Chair) with Paula Tomasik*

Policy 215 has completed the suggestions for student evaluation questions. This forth revision takes into account the comments that we received. We also invited Paula Tomasik here today to discuss the new online course evaluation system.

*Paula Tomasik* (Director of institutional Research and Assessment): The new online course evaluation system will have a core set of 17 questions. These will be asked of every student in every course with a maximum of 26 total. You could then do 4 questions for department, then 4- 5 that you can use for your own purposes as the course instructor. The chair or dean will not use the 4-5 questions for evaluation. These questions are only for your use as an instructor. These can be filled whenever we like. The students will continue to receive emails until the questionnaire is filled out. There will be training. Faculty can be as involved as you want to be. Faculty and instructors can send their own email to students to begin the course evaluation process, or it can be sent from Paula’s office. Training will probably start next week. We plan to launch next semester in full, with just core questions for this semester. A question was asked about whether students who have withdrawn from a class would be able to fill out the evaluation. Paula answered no. This system pulls information directly from Banner. Do not ask any demographic information from Banner. Paula does not have an exact start date yet, and that will depend on when she gets the final student course evaluation questions. Faculty members were concerned that it should begin towards the end of the semester, and not near the beginning of the semester. Paula stressed that the instructor of a course sets the date to begin the course evaluation, and also can send the emails out to students. Faculty will have control of their own emails. If faculty members are not watching these, then Smart Evals will be emailing reminders. Paula suggested that the survey close the day before graduation.

Jon presented the student Course Evaluation questions that the Policy 215 Committee has worked through several times.

Concerns about specific course evaluation questions were as follows:

#1. A comment was made that we should divide up question #1 on resources. This is a mixed question in that it mixes up required classroom materials with other material. Jon replied that the committee wanted to make sure the student understood what course materials were.

#2. A faculty member suggested that we give examples of what learning activities are for students to have a better idea*.*

#7- A concern was whether students know what rigor means.

# 11. A concern was expressed that critical thinking has too wide a definition for us to pin it down.

A discussion as held about the use of the N/A on the course evaluation survey. The majority of senators felt that the N/A should be kept in the scale. An extensive discussion took place regarding the questions with many suggestions. Questions were modified and some removed. *(See Attachment)* A motion was made to approve the modified questions and recommend them to the Provost. The motion was seconded and approved with one abstention, and no opposed.

The second item from the Policy 215 Committee was the actual Policy 215. Most feedback was to keep item number 1 from the old Policy 215 to set aside 15-20 min. to have the students fill out the course evaluations. Another issue was the title of the policy. Originally there were two titles. One was faculty evaluation, and the other was course evaluation. The committee suggests using the title Course Evaluation. A motion was made to change policy name to Course Evaluation and seconded. The motion passed unanimously and was approved. A motion was made and seconded to approve the amended Policy 215. The vote was one opposed, no abstentions, and the rest voted yea. The motion passed.

It was brought up that no discussion was called for regarding the acceptance of Policy 215. A revote was called due to nullification of vote. A motion was made to accept the amended Policy 215, and seconded, and then Linda called for discussion. A faculty member stated that all we did was change the name. It does not address doing online evaluations. A Policy 215 committee member disagreed that specifying in that much detail is necessary. A more general policy allows for greater flexibility. A motion was made and seconded to close discussion. The vote for closing the discussion of the amended Policy 215 was 16 – Yea; 3- Nay; with no abstentions. A faculty member called the question. The vote for accepting the amended Policy 215 was one opposed, no abstentions, and all the rest in favor. The motion passed.

**4. Committee Reports**

**Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee-** *Rick West, Chair-* Rick stated that the committee is working on getting survey questions together on the faculty file and promotion and tenure processes.

**Green Initiative Committee Minutes -** *David Thomas, Chair—No report*

**Ethics Committee –** *Aaron Harper, Chair. No report*

**Policy 214 -** *Matthew Inkster, Chair*. The Policy 214 Committee met and decided to send to the Provost to get feedback. They are currently in an ongoing discussion with him to change policies. Concerns in committee centered on the level of power the deans have to control merit pay. Brain’s point on that issue is that it is already the case. Deans do get chair recommendations and go through this process already. He feels that having the college-wide determination of merit will be beneficial. They suggested that probationary faculty maintain the mid-year review meeting and added an option for everyone to make mid-year corrections. Another thing the committee and feedback expressed concerns about was unannounced class observations. Some faculty members were very concerned about this, and if you have concerns, he’d love to hear from you. The committee feels that they are at a point for an all faculty survey to give them a handle on what this group needs to do in working with Brian. If you have a concern about a Policy 214 issue, please let us know. Brian’s goal was to make sure chairs and program directors have a seat at the table in terms of merit pay. Some senators raised that point that deans and chairs are already compensated for the dean and chair positions. Brian responded that for deans and/or chairs that go back to being just faculty after leaving a chair or dean position, there is a lag in compensation. He envisioned that chairs and program directors will bring evaluations for merit to the dean, and the dean will lump into the mix the chairs and program directors and take forward. Be sure that everyone looks at this by next month.

**Policy 215 –** *Jon Serra, Chair* - *See above*

**5. Announcements:** None

**6. Action Items:**

Revised MBA program – *Greg Chase* *(See above)*

Policy 215 & Student Course Evaluation questions. – *Jon Serra, Chair (See above)*

**7. Faculty Forum**

1. A faculty member mentioned that graduate programs do not seem to be governed by our policies. There does not appear to be a course evaluation for graduate students, for example. Linda suggested that we contact the Provost about what policies govern graduate programs. The existing policy does not prohibit course evaluations by graduate programs.

2. A discussion was held about initial letters of appointment and why can it not be titled yearly. A faculty member’s appointment may change. Linda will take this to Provost. Some confusion was expressed about the weight held by the letter of appointment. A question was asked about a scenario in which a faculty member their chair or dean reach an impasse on what constitutes an adequate contribution. Is this letter of appointment a legal document or is this policy? Could you be fired for not signing, or if you don’t do what your job description says? Linda responded that it goes back to what the letter says your job is. Things differ so much as to letter of appointment content in each college. There is no salary or repercussion in there. Where does this letter fit in, what kind of weight does it hold, and how does it affect tenure were other questions discussed. Linda also stated that she would ask Brian to talk to us about it. Other faculty members discussed the confusion between having a new letter of appointment when they already have a legal contract. In some departments, they have worked yearly reviews through Live Text, and this new process creates repetition. Faculty also mentioned that the review process was difficult because of having to click back and forth instead of the way Live Text has it all right there. Sylvia brought up the security issue since Live Text was all done in the cloud. A concern was expressed about flash drives used in Provost Office and whether they could be copied. Rick West is working on a policy for this. Please remind constituents and people on promotion or tenure committees to send any comments to Rick West.

3. Adjunct faculty – A concern was brought up about adjunct faculty who teach seven classes a year or so. We should value them more than we do.

4. No confidence vote for the president. - Several faculty members have contacted Linda with concerns about the Ethics charges and many other concerns regarding the president of WLU, requesting that Faculty Senate discuss this issue. Linda brought forward other items regarding this, including:

a. She has seen a staff no confidence document going to the emergency BOG Executive Committee meeting tomorrow.

b. She has been told that the student government is considering the same thing, but has not seen confirmation of this.

c. Chuck Jeswilkowski, the president of the Pittsburgh Alumni Chapter, has written a letter to the BOG that says they will not donate any more money to WLU while Robin Capehart is president.

Linda put the question to Senate of whether we should send a letter to the BOG, complete a survey of faculty members, or call a meeting. Senate discussed this issue at length. She also told the Senate that a no confidence vote involves a 2/3 majority vote, although it does not have to be a roll call vote, and expressed concerns about how this process should be conducted given that we have such a large amount of non-tenured faculty members. Faculty Senate agreed with Linda that each faculty member should speak to their constituents and takes an unofficial head count of what they feel we should do, and vote in Faculty Senate based on what the majority of their constituents would say.

**8. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and approved. The Senate adjourned at 6:21 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tracy Zang,

Faculty Senate Secretary

***3 Attachments:***

*1. Approved Student Course Evaluation Questions*

*2. Amended Policy 215 approved by Senate*

*3. February 17, 2015 sign-in sheet*

*Attachment #1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **(5)** | **Strongly Agree** | **(4)** | **Agree** | **(3)** | **Neutral** | **(2)** | **Disagree** | **(1)** | **Strongly Disagree** | **(N/A)** | **Not Applicable** |

1. The course materials (books, readings, resources, videos, etc.) supported course objectives.

2. The course requirements (attendance, readings, assignments, grading criteria, etc.) were clear.

3. The assessments (assignments, quizzes, papers, exams, projects, etc.) had clear grading criteria.

4. The instructor made use of a variety of learning activities that enhanced my understanding of course content.

5. The instructor’s teaching techniques enhanced my learning.

6. The pace at which material was covered was appropriate to my learning.

7. The rigor of this course was appropriate to other similar level courses.

8. The instructor presented the course in an organized manner.

9. The instructor shows respect and concern for all students.

10. The course challenged me to develop my abilities and skills for the subject matter.

11. As a result of this course, I know more about this course content than I did at the beginning of the term.

12. Given the opportunity, I would take another course offered by this instructor.

13. Overall the instructor was effective.

14. What can the instructor do to enhance this course? [open ended]

15. What did you like most about the course? [open ended]

*Attachment #2: Approved Policy 215*

Policy No. 215: Course Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy Number: 215 | Effective Date: 06/23/86 |
| Policy Title: Course Evaluation | Revised: 05/01/06, 07/01/10 |
| Approval Date: 06/23/86 | President’s Signature: |

Student evaluation of courses shall be utilized for faculty evaluation and for the improvement of instruction. Summaries of the completed evaluations will go directly to the faculty member concerned as well as the appropriate program director, department chair, college/school dean, and the Provost.

Data files of the student evaluation of courses will be maintained in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and as required by WLU Policy.

The following guidelines are to be followed by each instructor:

1. Set aside 15-20 minutes of a class period in the last three weeks of the semester for student course evaluation. Evaluations are to be conducted prior to final exam week.
2. Announce to the class that a portion of a class meeting during the last three weeks will be set aside for course evaluation. This announcement should be made far enough in advance that all students have reasonable advance knowledge of their opportunity to evaluate the course.
3. Ensure that students are provided with the information and instructions necessary to complete the course evaluation survey.
4. The instructor of the course being evaluated MUST NOT BE PRESENT WHILE STUDENTS ARE COMPLETING THE SURVEY beyond providing any necessary information and instructions at the beginning of the evaluation. An administrator, staff member or other faculty member may serve as a proctor.
5. Access to and instructions for course evaluations for 100% online courses will be provided to students through the learning management system.
6. Course evaluations for summer and other accelerated courses will be conducted during the last week of the session.

