

Senators present: Linda Cowan, Lihua Chen, Maurice T. Lockridge, , Ken Sexten, Richard West, Aaron Huffman Christopher Barrick, Ryan McCullough, Sarah Davis, Shannon Halicki, Dominique Hoche, Darrin Cox, Sylvia Hawranick-Senften, Corey Reigel, Bonnie Porter, Kate Tennant, Tracy Zang, Hollie Buchanan, Fuhua Chen, Jon Serra, Matthew Zdilla.

Absent members: Craig Crow James Crumbacher, Brian Fencl, Sheli Bernstein-Goff Judy Stechly, Brian Fencl, Sarah Davis

Honored Guests & Ex Officio: Brian Crawford, (*Provost*), Sylvia Hawranick Senften (*ACF Representative*), Jeremy Larance, (*Chair of the General Studies Committee*), Stefanie Hooper, (*VP of Finance*.)

Absent: Robin Capehart, (*President*), Frank Noble (*BOG Representative*),

Senate was called to order by the Senate Chair Linda Cowan at 3:32 pm.

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made and seconded to amend the minutes with a name change and also the description for Policy 245 as far as the description of merit vs. longevity for March 18, 2014. Minutes as amended were approved with two abstentions.

Honored Guests: Joe Scarpaci

President: (absent) The President will speak at the upcoming General Faculty meeting and did not want to repeat the content.

Provost: (Brian Crawford) The Provost announced that he would be speaking at the upcoming General Faculty meeting and did not see any need to repeat the same things.

ACF Representative: (*Sylvia-Hawranick-Senften*)
Sylvia will be presenting at tomorrow's BOG meeting. She will be attending an ACF meeting at Fairmont to put together the agenda for the ACF Retreat this summer. She has been given two concerns to take with her. One is on the state's grievance procedures and the other is on intellectual property.

BOG Representative: *Frank Noble (absent) No report, BOG meeting is tomorrow at 4:00 pm in Shaw Hall Conference Room.*

Committee Reports

Academic Policies and Procedures: (*Jim Crumbacher*) *absent, no report.*

Finance Committee Report: (*Darrin Cox, Chair*)
Nothing to report other than his committee is continuing to work on Policy 245.

Personnel and Policies Committee: (*Dominique Hoche, Chair*) No report

Student Advising Committee: (*Tracy Zang, Chair*)
The student advising committee held the Advising Workshop for New Faculty on April 1, 2014. Thanks to all the committee members and presenters who worked hard putting this together. Tammy Beagle

presented as did Tammy McClain and also Enrollment Services and the Learning and Student Development Center. We had nine participants out of fourteen new faculty members and the workshop was very well received. The survey we discussed would need to be run through the IRB and will be delayed until next semester.

Social Committee: *Chris Barrick, Chair*

The committee met before Spring Break to plan events and also had a nice turnout for the Nailer's hockey game on April 4th, which we think would be great to do next year also. Just this morning we had a coffee hour at Campbell Hall with the President's Office. We originally had a social hour scheduled in conjunction with a Concert Series event which was cancelled so we moved the social hour to a social hour next Thursday the 24th at Liberty Tavern at 6 pm just before the Jazz Ensemble from 5:30-7:00 pm. We also have another social hour planned for the last day of classes.

Green Committee: *Dave Thomas, Chair – (Report forwarded to Faculty Senate Secretary.*

1) The partnership between the GIC and the SC (Sustainability Council) has been agreed to from both sides now. 2) The budget modification for the REAP Grant has been approved, and now we have \$9,937 more dollars to put toward the purchase of recycling bins, bringing the total to \$21, 873. 3) We have seventeen participants for WLUEED 2. Riesbeck's has donated 500 reusable totes (valued at \$531) and twenty-five cardboard recycling containers. Kroger has donated two \$25 gift certificates, and I need your ideas on how to use these--purchase something, give as door-prizes, etc. And the president's office is donating refreshments--probably similar to last year's menu. What I do need is to have as many of you as possible to volunteer for an hour or two on Wednesday, 23 April between 10:00 and 2:00 pm. Last year, several of us ran around gathering up power-cords, extension cords, tripods, staplers, etc. as were needed by our participants. If you can come before ten when the groups are setting up, this would also be helpful. Let me know of your thoughts and concerns.

Announcements: Linda announced that there is a General Faculty meeting on April 30th at 12:00 pm. Also, next Tuesday there will be a general faculty meeting on the policies 216, 217 and 245 for comments. This will be at 3:30 pm in room 202 Arnett Hall.

Change in Agenda Order: Ryan made a motion to amend the agenda to move the action items up and change the Agenda order to Policy 211, Senate By-laws, and then policies 245, 216, and 217 in order to keep the quorum. Several Senators and the Provost have to leave which will cause a loss of quorum. The motion to re-order the Senate Agenda as noted above was seconded and approved.

Action Items: *(Moved to before committee meetings due to potential loss of quorum.)*

1. *Policy 211: Research Integrity Policy: (presented by Matt Zdilla)* The Research Integrity Policy is here before Senate because of requirements from the federal regulations that our current policy does not meet. If we do not approve this policy, Joe Horzempa's research grant will be refused. Discussion of this policy ensued. Some concern was expressed that the policy had not been sent through the Research of Human Subjects committee. The Provost commented that the policy must be in place by a certain date in order for WLU to qualify for research grants, and that is why they need this Research Integrity Policy approved now. We have two choices; to either table it and let the Provost move on it over us, or approve the policy and go from there.

Questions were asked about whether the Human Subject Committee was a recommending body for this policy. A member of the Human Subject committee expressed disappointed that it was not shared with the Human Subjects Committee. Discussion ensued as to whether this was a replacement of Policy 211 or a supplement. This is a replacement of our current policy. Matt brought up the point that this policy is similar to WVU's policy and the changes are needed to maintain the current grant funding. He recommended that we approve the policy to keep funding, and then if we desire changes we can amend the policy next semester. A motion was made to end discussion and seconded. A motion was made to approve Policy 211 The motion passed with thirteen votes for, three against, and three abstentions.

2. *By-laws amendment.* Chris Barrick made the suggestion that since the Faculty Senate Chair is not a voting member of Senate, but only a tie breaker, the department that has the Chair loses a vote. He suggests that we amend the by-laws with a section that gives the department who has a sitting chair an additional senator with the following wording:

“Since the Senate Chair is a non- voting member, the department from whom the chair comes from should elect an additional senator.”

A motion was made to add this wording to the WLU Senate by-laws. The motion passed. Discussion ensued with the idea that the Chair has significant influence and that this type of by-law is a common way to run a senate. A suggestion was made that it would be a simpler solution to just alter the document so that the Chair can vote. Chris emphasized that the Music Department represents two very different disciplines, and that the one department does not get a say because the Chair has no vote. A suggestion was made that the Senate Chair elected by the whole faculty. Darrin Cox called the question, and the motion to call the question passed. The amendment to the Senate by-laws was voted upon and did not pass with sixteen votes against, one in favor and three abstentions.

3. Policy 245 (presented by Brian Crawford, Provost)

Linda took all suggestions previously made regarding this policy (and the remaining policies 216 & 217), and then met with Provost. He took all the faculty suggestions and made some changes to the documents. Today, we're taking the opportunity to approve all of the suggestions/comments made by the Senate and general faculty in an official process on the record. These were sent out today and should be in your e-mail in-box. The purpose of the remaining action items on these policies today is to approve the comments and suggestions sent to the Provost in order to have them in the written record.

Provost presented all the changes throughout the document. It originally said: “include all 12 classes.” He went to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission web site in terms of pay, there are actually seven categories. It has been changed to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability. The other change to 245 came from human resources and replaced the chief financial officer and human resources said that that should be changed to the Provost, and the President agreed so it is tentatively typed in here. That is it for comments from faculty on this policy. One comment was in regard to 10% going to 20% but that was deemed not feasible, so we did not include it. Some discussion of an internal equity committee ensued. A suggestion was made that the faculty salary review committee deal with equity issues that do not fit into the typical internal equity committee issues. A question was raised on the merit/equity issue. –Will that break down for the 52/48 on merit and equity, if were to get 1% raise that break down 52/48 will be adhered to. Provost said that was his understanding. This year the governor promised all state employees a raise, but did not fund it.

Ryan raised a question about the next pay raise. Is it possible that the next pa raise might not be done with the 52/48 breakdown. The Provost responded that he hopes that it does meet the 52/48 breakdown, but it will come from president via guidance of HEPC.

A suggestion was made about the necessity of keeping the phrasing of “and the Director of IR & A” in the document since the director of IR & A is not involved in this anymore. This was put in when the director of IR & A was in charge of this, and we can strike that phrase. A motion was made to strike the phrase “and the director of IR & A.” The motion to add the comment to strike the phrase “and the director of IR & A” passed with three abstentions and one opposed.

A motion was made to approve the two comments above for Dr. Crawford to take forward under advisement in Policy 245. The motion was seconded and passed.

Policy 216

a. The Provost went through all of the changes recommended by Faculty Senate from the general faculty meeting. On the first comment, “keep the faculty committee and the appointment with tenure section”: he agrees and inserted the faculty committee into that step. So there is a recommendation that goes from the department chair, through the dean, to the provost, and a faculty committee is appointed to make a further recommendation. Relevant disciplines, and the committee then reviews the credentials.

b. “*Grandfather clause*” He did not make the changes here because he felt the word *consultation* was important. The issue is that we want there to be consultation between the faculty member and the director of departments or dean. He wasn’t sure how to word this and would like to leave the comment and take draft to the Dean’s Council, and then president.

c. *Strike the phrase “Program needs”* The Provost does not agree this is pejorative, but he looked at HEPC Policy 133, Series 9, Section 9.2. It says ‘In making tenure decisions, careful consideration shall be given to the mission, vision, needs of the institution, enrollment patterns, staffing needs of the institution, current and projected mission of each department division, the specific academic competence of the faculty member, preservation of opportunities for infusion of new talent. The institution shall be mindful of the dangers of losing internal flexibility, and institutional accountability of the institution to the state as a result of an overly tenured faculty.’ So we must put the needs of the program pretty high up in consideration. The Provost offered to use the HEPC wording instead of the current ‘program needs’. A motion was made to ‘Refer back to HEPC 133 Series 9 wording instead of program needs.’ The motion was made and seconded, motion passed. A suggestion was also made to insert a hyperlink to HEPC Policy 133 Series 9. All agreed.

d. *Take out all references to professional conduct in both 216 and 217. (Page 5.3. A-4 – Faculty would no longer be allowed to submit professional support letters.)* The Provost agrees and will remove the professional conduct references in both 216 and 217. The comment will remain, as a recommendation from Faculty Senate. They will be taking up Policy 214 ‘annual evaluation next fall, and will address it then. Some discussion ensued regarding the statement of professional ethics currently in the Preamble to the Faculty Senate By-laws.

e. “*Non WLU External reviewer*” The Provost thinks that there are some misconceptions about these new college committees. These are to include everyone in the college who is up for promotion that year. There will be one promotion committee for each college. Two weeks ago we talked about the possibility

of the faculty member having an external reviewer from outside their committee, to include a non-WLU external reviewer if necessary. The suggestion was made to add clarification that it is a non-WLU external reviewer. Ryan expressed a concern that this would be an unfunded mandate. A motion was made to include the comment “a non-WLU external reviewer” to the promotion committee. The motion passed with eleven in favor, one opposed, and five abstentions. Following the vote, it was brought up that the phrase should be more specific and read “Allow a Non-West Liberty University external reviewer to their committee.” A new vote was called for, and a motion was made and passed to add the phrasing, “Allow a Non West Liberty University external reviewer” to their committee. The motion passed with eleven in favor, five abstentions and one opposed.

f. A suggestion was made to include the phrasing ‘*a practitioner in their discipline*’ to the last sentence on page 4, because we have professional practitioners on this campus. The Provost stated that the language specifically states teaching and professional practice activity but he did add “*and/or professional practice*” to acknowledge that comment.

g. *Change the wording of the process of significant activity selection to go back to the previous method of having all three as an option*, instead of jumping through so many hoops to select service. Faculty suggested leaving the selection of service versus professional activity as the more heavily weighted category, as implied by the current phrasing of “*significant teaching and significant professional activity and substantial service*” This implies that service is less important and it is not clear that each area can be equal. A comment was made that in part ‘D’ on page 5 of Policy 216 that when you are hired it will be established if you are here to teach or do research.

h. Concerns on the method of selection of the committee being left completely up to the dean were discussed. A suggestion was made to remove the statement ‘The deans shall make the appointments to the committee, and the committee shall be elected by faculty.’

i. “*Faculty will elect the tenure committee.*” and “*Only tenured faculty serve on a tenure committee.*” A discussion was held regarding tenured faculty on tenure committees vs. non-tenured faculty. The big concern was that for a non-tenured faculty member who votes on a tenure committee there might be a problem in the future when the non-tenured faculty member is up for tenure. Rick West brought up concerns regarding requiring tenured faculty only on his department committee because they only have two tenured faculty members in his department. A faculty member brought up WVU’s policy and other universities that do not allow non-tenured faculty members to serve on tenure committees. The candidate has the option of selecting people in his or her field that are tenured. Darrin read the WVU policy on tenure; they do committees at a department, college, and then university levels. The method of selection of the five members is left to program unit, etc., but the director may not be on the committee, and the majority of those voting on tenure, must be tenured. A comment was made that our numbers of tenured faculty are unusually low. A motion was made to include phrasing in italics at the beginning of this paragraph. The vote was fourteen in favor, three abstentions, and none opposed.

Faculty Forum:

A discussion was held regarding a special Senate meeting of Faculty Senate to review all of this next week when we actually have had a chance to read the amended policies. Darrin read the By-laws section about calling a special session. A special session may be called by the Chair of the Senate with 48 hours notice in writing (e-mail).

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The Senate adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tracy A. Zang,
Senate Secretary