

Senators present: Linda Cowan, Lihua Chen, Craig Crow, James Crumbacher, Maurice T. Lockridge, Judy Stechly, Aaron Huffman, Richard West, Christopher Barrick, Brian Fencel, Ryan McCullough, Sarah Davis, Shannon Halicki, Dominique Hoche, Corey Reigel, Sheli Bernstein-Goff, Regina Jones, Kate Tennant, Bonnie Porter, Hollie Buchanan, Jon Serra, Tracy Zang, Matthew Zdilla.

Absent members: Ken Sexten, Darrin Cox, Sylvia Hawranick-Senften, Fuhua Chen

Honored Guests & Ex Officio: Robin Capehart, (*President*), Brian Crawford, (*Provost*), James Clark, (*Chief Information Officer*).

Absent: Frank Noble (*BOG Representative*), Sylvia Hawranick Senften (*ACF Representative*)

Senate was called to order by the Senate Chair Linda Cowan at 3:00 pm.

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes for October 15, 2013. Minutes were unanimously approved.

Honored Guests:

President:

The president discussed the financial status of WLU and detailed some of the things they are looking at in the budget process such as how the budget is developed, institutional scholarships are financed and at strategies going forward. The current situation is that we have a flat enrollment and declining appropriations. We met with legislators and got info out to campus communities to get some relief as regard to state appropriation cuts. New programs have broadened the base of enrollment, but the process of approval is a long one. They continue to investigate, ask questions and contact legislators about some of the current issues such as Senate Bill 330 and the possible impact it will have on our ability to retain and attract new faculty in the future. He requested that we contact our legislators. Sylvia Hawranick-Senften has a list with e-mail addresses and telephone numbers. He also discussed institutional scholarships and discounting. Current discounting is about 13% for the various scholarship students at WLU. They will be conducting a study on this issue. We wish to attract a higher quality student. Focus 20/20 initiatives are now loading onto web site for all to see. A question was asked about whether there had been cap on Elbin scholars and housing waivers. He answered no, however, there has been a cap on Promise scholarships. Also remember that a housing waiver not really a loss for university. The dorms are paid for, so some of the dorm fees go towards other activities on campus. If you put one more student in class, eventually that will have an effect on money available as we will need to hire new professors or faculty. Right now our focus is on new housing areas for sophomore, junior and senior students.

Provost: *Brian Crawford, Provost*

Re: A quick update on strategic planning. That group is now in phase two which is information gathering from stakeholder groups. We will include this information into our planning for the five-year master plan. The hope was that we would have info about our calendar and events online, the Office of University Planning does have a web page, but not everything is online as yet. Information is basic right now. The annual planning and budgeting process is proceeding as per Administrative Procedure #10. If you have not been involved in a meeting or at a meeting in your department, and it has not yet been discussed, you need to ask questions in your department. They should have discussed this with everyone, as we want everyone involved.

ACF Representative: *Sylvia Hawranick-Senften. (Absent)*

BOG Representative: *Frank Noble (absent)*

Guest: Jim Clark (*Chief Information Officer*):

Jim presented a brief overview of where WLU stands in terms of IT capability. Inbound we have a 100 Mbit circuit. The capacity is theoretically unlimited but it is a 1-gigabit capacity circuit. That is what we are buying. All of the buildings have one-gigabit fiber optics connectivity capability distributed throughout the building. For the new construction at Campbell Hall we will have a 10-gigabit fiber optic connectivity capacity.

With in the buildings themselves, we have data switches. There are a variety of switches of 100-megabit throughput speed distributed throughout the building. The only exceptions to that are Shaw and Campbell Hall that have greater capacity. The capacity of the academic world at WLU is 100-megabits is demonstrated by the front desk controlled teacher station at about 100-megabit connection. He suspects most of us are using wireless. Academic buildings are using a WiFi legacy set-up that is about 8-10 years old that have a 55-megabit access. New WiFi areas are located in Shaw Hall, Main Hall, the Library, and the new Campbell Hall which are at 300-megabits.

The Internet Service Provider has done extensive readings on network. 50% of the network usage is video streaming. You Tube, Netflix and other cloud services are used for academic purposes. 20% of the network usage is audio streaming including Spotify and slew of streaming services. 15% of network usage is Web streaming involving Web sites and Web searches. 10% of network usage activity is in social media. The remaining network usage includes the administrative applications at less than 5%. This administrative capacity is used for applications such as Sakai, Banner, Gmail, Google apps, etc. There is a very high demand for video applications. He showed a chart of one-month period of activity for the circuit. From Oct. 18th through Nov. 18th we had a maximum peak of 70 megabits of total usage. We prefer to run the network at about 50% not 70%. Prime time usage is from 10:00 am to 3:00 pm and is the maximum usage period. Then you get a 20-megabit average after that time.

Jim included a campus map. The north campus from Main Hall is well connected and supplied with all new WiFi access points and bandwidth. Shaw Hall has the best of all now and Campbell will have even better access and connectivity. If you are south of the Student Union, left of ASRC, in College Hall, Hall of Fine Arts, Shotwell, etc., that entire section of campus is 100-megabit and has the old legacy WiFi points. Currently we have a 100-megabit circuit at \$34,000 dollars/year to get that circuit into campus. To double this to 200-megabits we would need a project to make it happen because we don't have switching available. He is putting together a package to increase this network to 1-gigabit. It will be about \$450,000 in capital or \$84,000/year for five years. Or if you divided the \$450,000 by 2,800 students it would be \$17.50/semester. This would get us to the level that a small research community university level should be. Without adequate WiFi, our teaching, learning and educational purposes are impaired. A question was asked about staffing and tech staff to assist faculty. He has network administrator, plus other servers that they maintain for other purposes, such as Blackboard type, Sakai. Phil Kent does everything as far as keeping the classroom technology such as lightbulbs, projectors, and technology. They also have Toni Massa on quasai loan from college of business and Grayden Henry for maintenance of the student laptop program.

His plan is to have someone posted in Campbell Hall to handle the ramp up and change in technology as well as lots of new technology such as the Dentrax matrix, etc. He would like to get training in for faculty members on the new technology we are going to use in the classroom. If the building comes live

in January, then locks, cameras, etc. must be taken care of, and they must assign people to facilitate ramping up Campbell Hall. The more time you have to ramp up the better, less surprises, etc. right now the date is your date – January for when classes start.

A concern about graduate program online courses was voiced. He says this is a separate group and to contact Ann Rose. From his standpoint, online students who are in other locations are not using WLU bandwidth. When went into digitization, we observed that students are the biggest users of bandwidth. The dorms have about a 1-gigabit bandwidth that is separate from the academic and administrative network. You could have every student on a Netflix movie and have no problem. We tried using the same network as the students in 2008 and had it crash. He thinks a reasonable university approach would be to augment bandwidth in a serious way, understanding that budget concerns are big. Some projects must go forward, and technology and augmenting the technical support function is important. They have observed that online courses in summer always seem to fill up. That is an element of serving the community and your region. It is a matter of looking at the people you have and having flexibility of moving people about where they need to be.

A question was asked about competing resources for faculty. The current strategy is to budget technology on a department level where there is no buying power. So every 11 years we get a new computer. Students are learning on certain versions of software that faculty can't run. Jim's response was that the situation is not hopeless. He would prefer to use a 5-year cycle at a minimum for technology. Some colleges seem to have money year in and year out for some reason. Other colleges do not. Computer replacement money is squeezed so tightly that it would serve university well to have a basic 5-year replacement cycle. So equipment would be somewhat contemporary and will keep us current and create less problems for us all. He plans to propose that the university take this in stages. He is not certain that laptop computers serve the needs of faculty. They are bought for a purpose and are not high-end machines. It is not due to a lack of recognition of problem and some of you are working on newer machines you purchased yourself.

Another question was asked about the feasibility and success measures of student laptop program. Jim replied that they have this week a direct query to students about this issue. In the past, many universities had this program. It was an iceberg: the laptop sitting at top of water and underneath it was a belief that the device would transform our classrooms. This was true if all the elements were in place such as WiFi and faculty buy-in. The program has invested quite a bit of money to get devices into the hands of students based on the theory that students uses devices in the classroom and collaboratively in the instructional world to make things happen. He's seen maybe 6 laptops and the rest smartphones, this year. They are finding ways to use smart phones that were not possible even 3 years ago for the enhancement of education.

He cannot guarantee that even the majority of freshmen are using the 220 iPads and 220 laptops provided are being used. He sees a lot of students using iPads. They are also looking at Adobe Cloud software for Arts and Communication folks. We made a change last year for the iPad, and will probably go closer to iPad for this year. He would like a sense from the faculty as to what and how these are being used.

A question was asked about transfer students who do not receive laptops. Jim replied that when the program started in 2008, they knew that by not renewing cleaning contract they paid for laptop program. When you charge for technology, they enact a fee and charge students, and then all sorts of technology

follows. Folks will need to look at the future because they are trying to put a plan in place. Transfer students might help enrollment and retention.

ACF Report: *(Sylvia Hawranick-Senften- absent)* The ACF Report was sent out October 19, 2013 to Faculty Senators.

Committee Reports

Academic Policies and Procedures: *(Jim Crumbacher)*

Thanks to Jim Clark and Becky McCullough. They've been very helpful in coming to Faculty Senate. Judy Carney, the former chair of Academic Policies and Procedures forwarded the newly expanded Emergency Response manual to him. It is about 26 pages with additional room charts, and directions for any number of emergencies such as shootings, etc. This needs to be looked at by Sal and his group next.

Finance Committee Report: *(Darrin Cox, Chair) absent*

Personnel and Policies Committee: *(Dominique Hoche, Chair)*

The committee is working on Policy 261 and 217.

Student Advising Committee: *(Tracy Zang, Chair)*

Student Advising Committee: Chair Committee members: Abu Ma'afala, Serkan Catma, Brianne Poilek, Tammie Beagle, Scott Hanna, and Matt Zdilla. Our committee is currently waiting to hear from Scott Cook as to when he will be available to meet with the committee. We expect that to be in the next week or so. Please send any concerns about student advising to one of the committee members or to tracy.zang@westliberty.edu.

Social Committee: *(Chris Barrick)*

The Faculty Lounge furniture has been acquired and the lounge opened up this week. There are a couple of dining tables, a sofa, a flat screen TV and cable, microwave, etc. We expect an e-mail from Mary Ann Edwards in the next day or two. This will be a nice place for adjunct faculty if they don't have a place or for lunch, or to have a cup of coffee or informal meeting. It will be open from 8:00 am-8:00 pm. A faculty social hour will be held tomorrow evening at Liberty Tavern 5:30-7 pm tomorrow leading up to the opening of Spring Awakening at the theater. Tickets are for sale at \$7.00.

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

The Green Committee's next meeting will be tomorrow, Wednesday, November 20th at noon in Library Room 17. Dave Thomas, the committee chair forwarded the following report to Faculty Senate. The Green Committee was approved for the REAP recycling grant for \$24,760.00 through the WVDEP. They are also considering a logo design for the GIC from submissions by Vega Design, a project of Jim Haizlett's graphic design class. The voluntary recycling program in conjunction with WATCH is continuing. Lastly, they are beginning to plan for the second annual WLU Environmental Education Day on 23 April 2014.

Announcements:

1. Last week Linda went to a long afternoon meeting for the University Planning Council. Lots of information came out of that and there will be more to come on that. The president asked her with short notice for Faculty Senate to attend a luncheon last Wednesday. They only had a couple of days to put together the presentation, and she had singing commitments for Veterans Day. Thank you to Corey,

Shannon and Chris who were able to attend. There were legislators there also. With more notice they could have had handouts and planned something better. She felt that the meeting and Senate Bill 330 issues would have been better addressed as the only topic of the meeting instead of including other issues at the same time. The student government officers were also present. Sylvia represented us well with the ACF handouts that you received first meeting. So the legislators present did hear about SB 330.

2. **3:30 pm** will be meeting time next semester because of schedule changes.

3. We had talked about Dr. McCullough coming in to Senate to talk about the results of Focus 20/20, but decided that his report would go out electronically today instead. He is still willing to come discuss it with Senate if you have any questions after looking at the documents. Please take a look at his data.

Action Items:

1. Apportionment:

Action item: A motion was made that the 2014-2016 Faculty Senate apportionment be based upon 15% percent of the total number of undergraduate faculty, and that this change be consistently reflected per clarification of our Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws. Motion seconded.

<http://westliberty.edu/faculty-senate/constitution-and-by-laws/>

Linda received votes via e-mail from Fuhua Chen, Matt Zdilla, Kate Tennant and Jon Serra for a 20% apportionment. Other e-mail votes for 15% were from Chris Barrick, Aaron Huffman, Sarah Davis, Darrin Cox, Rick West. A question was asked about the rationale for the reapportionment.

Ryan McCullough brought up a point of order issue. Discuss the specific motion and then do the by-laws discussion after motion has passed. The motion was restated and discussion ensued regarding adding graduate representation for the PA Program that is necessary for accreditation and Rick West serving as graduate representative for Education. Linda emphasized that the motion is for the Senate apportionment to be based on undergraduate faculty only. Every 2 years the Senate entirely changes over. As we move forward to graduate programs, it became clear that because accrediting bodies want to see evidence that graduate programs are involved in the culture and in decisions of Faculty Senate. There is some talk of instituting a Graduate Council, but we only have two programs. What we have done is gleaned Regina for the PA program and used the fourth health science slot as graduate slot since it was never filled due to health science clinical responsibilities precluding consistent attendance. Linda specified that we base our representation on undergraduate faculty representation for now, thinking that we would continue without a graduate council at least through March of this year. The vote on the motion was six opposed, with no abstentions and remaining senators voted yes. The motion passed.

A question was asked if we should have a policy including language that there will be a graduate council eventually. Linda answered that we would have to address that issue when the graduate council is formed. Linda requested Holly to work up an action item.

2. BOG Policy 51: Textbook affordability

BOG Policy 51 involves the sale of textbooks by faculty members. Linda recommends that we have Frank bring this issue up at the next BOG meeting and requested a motion that detailed the change to the policy that faculty who brought this issue up would like to see. Dominique moved that the sentence highlighted in yellow below be struck from the policy. The motion was seconded.

Policy 51:

“Prohibit any employee of the Board from receiving any payment, loan, subscription, advance, deposit or money, service benefit or thing of value, present or promised, as an inducement for requiring students to purchase a specific textbook or supplemental course materials. Provided, however, that an employee may receive royalties or other compensation for such sales that include the employee’s own writing or work. An employee may also receive free sample copies, instructor’s copies and instructional materials but may not resell those items.”

Discussion centered on whether this is something we are asking Frank to vote on and if this is a point of order question. Since Frank is elected by faculty-at-large, can we ask him to vote on this? Linda replied that Faculty Senate would like Frank to take this to the BOG, so we need to vote on the issue first. Another question was whether this bans the book salesmen entirely from campus. A faculty member stated that she has received approximately 50-70 books this spring.

Brian Crawford commented that we do not have a gated campus. It is obvious that this has been happening the whole time because people did not know about this. Linda asked Brian whether we want to strike this out of the policy so that you can do what you want to do with this. A question was asked about what the policy is elsewhere. Ryan responded that he can’t answer the question directly, but it does say on most instructor copies that you are not to resell them. They give you a decal that you use to ship back to publisher. A concern is violating copyright law. Brian stated that the policy came out of textbook portability from HEPC. He guesses that other schools in the state have adopted a similar policy that prohibits faculty from selling books. This is worth investigating. The Next BOG meeting is scheduled for December 11th or 17th. This is our last meeting before then. It would be appropriate to do something before December.

Ryan brought up the issue of whether it would be a poor reflection on the faculty to ask to have this stricken? Would it reflect bad will and nefarious intentions on part of faculty? It seems like a negative and does it violate copyright laws or ethical code? The books are not bought with institutional funds, but are given to faculty based on their position at this institution. It was stated that some faculty members are trying to protect a perk as opposed to this as a functional way of dealing with the marketplace. These are texts that they never asked for, are not adopted textbooks and companies send items to them blindly. So this is not an opportunity for profiteering, just something that occurs. This is an explanation for this policy change and if acceptable could the BOG remove the offending sentence? A concern was expressed about ethics and professionalism as well as the legal issue of the university telling us what to do with personal property. Discussion was closed. A motion was made to amend the proposition with the explanation Corey said.

A motion was proposed to amend the motion by asking Frank to combine the two, and get a clarification with the view that they remove the offending sentence. Nine senate members voted for the motion, five were opposed and six abstained. The motion did not pass. The original motion to strike the sentence “*An employee may also receive free sample copies, instructor’s copies and instructional materials but may not resell those items.*” from BOG Policy 51 had been made and seconded. Senate votes for the original motion were twelve for, four opposed, and six abstentions. The motion passed.

Faculty Forum: Maurice read HEPC 2.3.1.4 involving requirements for employees. The policy states that faculty cannot profit from adopting a textbook and was created in the spring of 2010. It is not clear about other unsolicited textbooks given to faculty. In some areas they are not given textbooks often, so

please clarify that the faculty are talking about samples from the textbook fairy, not requested desk copies, etc. A comment was made that if this is taken from HEPC then Frank should get an answer from Bob saying that we must abide by HEPC rules. Linda stated she will be very clear to Frank as to what the textbook situation is, such as unsolicited textbooks/books. Brain commented that Title 133- Series 51 is from HEPC policy. Linda will read the policy and will send an e-mail out updating this as to whether the specific language is in there. We do not want to send this to BOG if it is from HEPC.

Rick made a request to talk about Faculty Senate seats for the graduate programs. Linda has received requests from Dr. Camden and Dr. Kriesberg as well. She deferred this issue to Brian because she does not know what the requirements are. Brian stated that they are planning on how to move forward in this area and will be discussing it a lot in the next year or so. We will be voting on this in March, and will look for something in January that we can vote on that pleases all the accrediting bodies, etc.

A motion was made to adjourn and seconded. Senate adjourned at 4: 45pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tracy A. Zang,
Senate Secretary