

Faculty Senate Meeting Notes September 19, 2017

Jeff Pfister, our recording secretary, is at a conference and is unavailable to take minutes. Faculty Senate Chair asked Melinda Kreisberg to act as recording secretary for the meeting.

Approval of minutes: Bob Gall asked that his presence at the previous meeting be reflected in the minutes.

Guests:

Dr. Greiner: Semester started positively. Feedback from students has been positive. Budget – we ended the year with a balanced budget. Currently we are tracking on target for this fiscal year. We are having the difficulty that everyone is assuming that since student numbers are up, we have more revenue available. We've been getting a lot of requests, but first we need to take care of many things that have been neglected so extra money is going to those. The tech project is completed. On-going projects include the performance contract, the fire pit, and lighting upgrades. Two companies are on campus looking at water and energy efficiency to place bids for the performance contract. The bid must include guaranteed savings. Those savings actually pay for the efficiency upgrades. The bids are expected in November, project work should begin in the spring. Not certain when it will be complete, but will probably take a year. The fire pit will be located in Alumni Park outside Main Hall. A rendering is at the location.

Students are happy with Boyd and the upgrades. This type of move might be a positive for recruitment and retention. Dr. Greiner asked for input on Shotwell. He does not like to have closed buildings on campus, but we need to know what should Shotwell become and how much that will cost to plan.

We are still in the comment period for policy 34 (ends this weekend). Background for the policy is that Dr. Greiner participated in ethics training in WV when he took the presidency. Nepotism predominated in that training. The WV Ethics Commission says we must be in compliance with state laws on ethics. Diana Harto was also present to address questions and concerns on the policy. Greiner stated we could have married couples but they should not be in direct supervisory line of one another. Harto stated that all policies were going to be reviewed by outside attorney (not the attorney general). Nepotism is one of the policies that was already slated for review. She went on to say that many people think there are no nepotism problems at WLU but there have been and she & Greiner know of these.

They then asked for questions. Chair Serra clarified for the Senate that the policy draft they received in the Faculty Senate agenda was the first draft not the current second working draft. The newer one has removed students entering the university as that is not hiring. Harto added comments will be collected through this week and they are making revisions. They went on to say that current employees who are spouses will not be terminated; existing relationships are just that, existing. The goal is to protect the institution.

Jim Haizlett: Family members in same office/department are still present. Diana Harto: that can have a negative impact on the workplace. Dr. Greiner added that if the spouse is the best qualified then they will alter the supervisory conditions.

Linda Cowan: I have an accompanist (staff position) where there are no supervisory, etc conditions/conflicts. This policy will not allow me to hire her. Harto: You would have to open the position for public hire and if that person is the most qualified, then you could hire. Cowan: Adjuncts? Harto: Same idea, needs to be open to the public and most qualified hired. Cowan: But if family applies, the policy says you won't even be able to see that application, so we won't even be able to interview them if they are the most qualified. HR would pull it. Greiner said we do not want marginally qualified people, only the best qualified.

Darrin Cox: Grandfathering as adjuncts – for those who have already been adjuncting and doing a good job; these people have already shown a positive impact at WLU. Harto: but what if we opened the job publicly and got better qualified applicants? Cox: We usually reward good employees/adjuncts by rehiring. Here we cannot do that. Greiner: But is the spouse in direct report? Cox: NO. Greiner: Flexibility is there given the exceptions, but the Dean, etc must make the case. Harto: We want to open the pool versus selecting people we just know. No grandfathering for temporary employees.

Jim Haizlett: No relatives of the BOG can be employed, but what about a granddaughter who is in school at WLU? She's been granted work study with the library. That clause has been deleted. Harto: BOG should not dictate who we hire; Greiner: I've talked to the Board member.

Linda Cowan: Bullet 2.10 in first draft, now p. 3 1st full paragraph – concern that we will not even see all the applications if a relationship exists, so how would we know if relative is the most qualified? Greiner/Harto: That should be revised. Cowan: Can we see the revised version before it goes to the BOG for a vote? Greiner: we are expecting it soon. Harto: the original intent was to find out if applicants are relatives of WLU employees, then determine where would the applicant be employed? Cowan: yes, but that would kick out the application if in the same area before we could see it and determine if they are the most qualified applicant.

Aaron Huffman: I have the old draft not this new one, so if same office or department whether direct or indirect (in terms of supervisory line)? Original have college in parentheses. Crawford: much broader meaning to department. Harto: could we have an example? Aaron: Employees in Teacher Ed and AT – they are in same college, but do not work together. [Other examples brought up: Halicki's, Robinson's (and with Robinson there's a cost savings as he does not take benefits)].

Aaron: Different administration come in, they could interpret differently and be applied as they wish rather than how the current administration might intend for this policy to work. Does the Ethics Commission understand this? Harto: Have to understand policy includes staff as well.

Darrin Cox: Current staff and faculty as it stands would be affected. Harto: Existing relationships clause will cover. No plans to make changes or rearrangements unless ethical problem. Harper: Acceptable alternative arrangements? That's not satisfactory. Harto: Only if issue will something be addressed.

Other comments: Adjuncts are a big issue. Very arbitrary for those people as administration changes. Is there a process for when we say this person is the best or do we have to do this every semester? Do we have to advertise repeatedly once we identify and hire an adjunct for a semester? Answer: Yes, when we receive a requisition for an adjunct, we have to put them in every time.

Policy 34 up for approval at BOG meeting, Oct 4. Do we need to do it at that meeting? Why can't the revisions be put out for comment? We should have 30d to comment on all these revisions prior to a BOG vote.

Lines on becoming spouses when in same department – one moved or fired; Greiner/Harto said that will be revised.

Landlord/lease/living in house but not related = immediate family member: Greiner says not in State Code and they are following the State definition of family including spouse, in-laws, etc. Went on to state faculty leasing to students concept should be removed in revised policy.

Greiner: All of your comments have been very helpful, I have said the same – the policy reads as punitive and needs to change. It just needs consistency with the WV Ethics Act.

Theunis van Aardt: I could see where if one student in your class lives with or pays rent, then what if that student makes an A and another charges that that student only got an A because they are paying rent?

Aulick: Then we need a grievance policy to address that concern rather than one that says you can't do it.

Greiner: I will speak with the BOG chair. Harto: Will make sure all pieces recommended are there. We will send a link to Jon for the WV Ethics Act.

Dr. Crawford: 2% pay raise calculations will be done same as last year. We have \$126,000 available for raises and 111 faculty are eligible. >50% of the available money will go toward merit (~52%) based on last year's evaluation and the rest goes toward equity determined by current salary and national median for that rank. 83 of the 111 had high merit. Everyone will get a letter in October with the actual raise listed. Question: Do staff have a merit process? Not yet. Harto: Spring is when we will start the process for staff. Crawford: System is intended to reward those with high merit and who are farthest away from the median salaries.

P&T process changes: We've already held meetings for the applicants for tenure and promotion. Meetings for reviewers scheduled for later this week. Basic structure is the same, but changes in how files are arranged and viewed have occurred. You no longer have to go to the Provost's Office to view the files. Everything will be on google drive. The drive is locked so that you cannot download or print or share files. There are no transcripts and some old forms like the data sheets have been removed. Any background checks from time of hire are also not present. If training is needed on using google drive, Liz Richter will provide.

Changes proposed to tenure and promotion policies were finalized and the President signed them. Staffel: the version before the approved one was mostly approved by Senate, so why were additional changes made without coming back to Senate for additional concerns before sending on to President Greined for signage? Senate got no feedback as to what the issues were with the version we approved. Crawford: I heard that inputs were not equal (Gall interjected that was false) and had concerns come in directly. Staffel: I would like interaction for those changes, share those if they should come through, we need to be a part of it as these policies affect faculty. Crawford: Policy on changing policies doesn't address that and how can we even get policies changed if we never move forward? Staffel: even if policy delayed, we need to be able to give feedback. Cowan: Why not bring in concerns as part of the discussion? Crawford: I want to be cautious on having concerns hear. Staffel: Not disputing that changes might not have been needed, but just that they should have been shared prior to President signing. Crawford: Explained that President only approves changes; Provost takes comments, makes a summary for President and revisions based on that summary/comments, then gives policy to President for approval. We would need to add an additional step to the process that allows final revisions to be reviewed. Cox: Shared governance is an issue as our vote doesn't seem to count for anything if what we put in is ignored or changed with no discussion. What "teeth" does Senate have? As advisory board, can we rewrite our constitution to change that? Serra: Paragraph in policy 123 has no feedback loop, so maybe that policy needs amended. [Crawford?] If shift in shared governance, that would have to go to board. Staffel: Would you care to say why you made the recommendations you did? You can wait until the next meeting when you can be prepared to discuss.

Dr. Senften: ACF representative

Bottom of the agenda has the ACF initiatives for this year that need to be approved by each institution. Specifically look at WV Legislature 3rd bullet: restore funding for faculty and student programs that will be eliminated on July 1, 2018 per HB 2315. Currently each institution pays 1.5% to go into a "pot" to support all institutions. Pot is HERA = \$5.3 million. President's Council may not want that restored as it frees up money at the institution but ACF wants it back. (What types of programming affected?) HERA funds FACDIS, Great Teachers Seminar, WVNET, Student Success Summit, SGA training, DegreeWorks, College Access Campaign, and others. Senator Mann was unaware that this was in the bill he approved. Where does the money from WLU go – to both HEPC and CTCC. So why do they need this money if they get their own budget? Similar to us, issues are underfunded at state level so Universities pitch in. President Greiner was asked if he had an opinion on this – he used example of WVNET. If that service goes away, we will have to find a service ourselves and the cost would be much higher than our contributions. WV is not an ideal budget situation and we always have to play catch-up.

ACF requests Faculty Senate vote to accept initiatives. Corey Reigel made the motion, Peter Staffel seconded the motion to approve initiatives. Discussion was already complete. Vote: in favor = 16; Opposed = 0; Abstain = 1.

Jim Haizlett: BOG representative

Policy 34 went from 1 page to 10 pages. He will be at the BOG Executive Committee meeting tomorrow and will recommend an extension; there is enough question about the policy to warrant. Serra: DO we rescind the Action Item or make a motion on Pol 34? The parliamentarian was queried and the motion was to table the Action Item on Pol 34.

Comments on policies do go to BOG before meetings; individual comments may not have weight of Senate as we are representing the faculty. Jim asked for information from Senate if final revision available.

Melinda Kreisberg: HLC Accreditation Liaison Officer

Linnea Stenson our staff liaison at the HLC will be on campus Oct 4 to kick off the reaffirmation year. The site visit for reaffirmation (our 10y accreditation cycle) will be March 26 & 27, 2018. Drafts of the document representing WLU will be coming out for comments this semester. We are word limited, but evidence supporting WLU's efforts is appreciated. We must meet all 5 Criteria for Accreditation and multiple core components and sub-components for reaffirmation. We can meet some 'with concern' – that will require additional reporting of progress. We cannot earn a "not met" from the peer reviewers – that will mean probation or sanction. We are not perfect and the HLC does not expect perfect. We are supposed to identify strengths and weaknesses and say how we are addressing those weaknesses, plus provide evidence supporting what we say we are doing. Our staff liaison, Linnea, will pick our peer review team (probably 4 members) based on the parameters of our campus and any concerns from the last visit or since the last visit. I would expect a finance person and an assessment person as part of the team. All of the criteria and review are based on what supports the student and student learning. Questions? Will we prepare for what the reviewers might ask us? Answer: Yes. In the spring we will start doing that preparation. We will talk about what to expect and prepare for that. Above all we need to be honest. What should we expect from meeting with Linnea? Answer: She will give a short presentation and answer questions about the process and expectations.

Chad Kuhns: GSAC Chair

Chad will be giving a regular report to faculty Senate on GSAC.

The function of GSAC is to (1) review general education courses. That process began in 2015. Since then ~23-24 courses have been reviewed and given feedback. We are trying to do a 5-y rotation of courses for review. This fall 10 courses will be reviewed; those courses will be announced to chairs/program directors this Friday. GSAC will hold information sessions on course review to prepare for the process. Past reviews are posted on the GSAC webpage through the IR&A page.

Function 2: Hear and make recommendations on changes to General Education. Our focus is on can the course be assessed consistent with General Education outcomes.

Function 3: Evaluate integration at the program level – i.e. how well are General Education outcomes integrated at the programmatic level. Each program will identify a capstone or close to end of study course; in the spring, those courses will submit assessment of General Education outcomes.

Please give us feedback and thoughts. While we focus on assessment, we are interested in the philosophical questions of General Education.

Greg Chase: Director MBA

Rescinds the MBA: Accounting action item as Senate approval is not needed (not a new program).

Aaron Harper: Academic Policies

No report; no meeting yet.

We do have ombudsmen: Betsy Wright is faculty ombudsman. No money was spent on grievances last year, so ombudsman process might be working.

Darrin Cox: Finance

Faculty Salary Review meeting at the end of the year. WLU faculty (Assistant and Associate Professor) are paid rather well compared to others in the state of WV (rank of professor is the worst in comparison). Calculation is by average salary versus median salary. Raise distribution: 111 eligible. 50 of these make 20% below the median. 15 are above and 46 are at 1-20% below the median. Of those 20% or more below the median, 33 also earned high merit. Those people should be more of the focus for raises. The staff have an internal equity policy, so maybe faculty need one as well. To put in for the equity policy, you have to write the President unless you fall into a certain group who is underpaid. Since we can determine those lowest paid but earning high merit, maybe faculty are best situated to give more weight to dedicating more of the raise money to those individuals.

WVU has a post-promotion review. Since no real raises can occur once you become a full professor, you could go through a review every five years after reaching that rank. If you have no unsatisfactory reviews and every review is good or high, then you could get raise. Would give incentive and helps with the salary gap. Currently the rank of Professor falls the furthest behind the fastest. Greiner agreed, while Assistant and Associate Professor rank are good, the rank of Professor is not good on equity. President Greiner is against capping salaries. Cox: Reiterated that maybe we could get an internal equity policy like the staff.

Comments: Zdilla – equity and merit, is merit a good differential considering it can be earned at different tiers. Maybe we should just look at equity? Cox – since we can cross-reference and determine overlap. So low equity + high performance. Sylvia – how determine calculation? Lots of variables. Cox: Arts & Comm make 124% of comparables; professor rank at 98%; Liberal Arts assistant prof at 86% associate prof at 96% and professor at 76%. Question: can that info be shared? No names.

Jon Serra: Personnel Policy Committee

Linda Cowan is stepping down as chair. This committee was re-established in April 2015. Do we want to keep the committee? It is a busy committee, but it is not required by the by-laws. Zdilla: If busy, why would we want to drop the committee? Serra: Well we would just get ad hoc committees as things crop

up instead of a standing committee. Harper: Is there anything that needs dealt with now? Serra: Not aware of anything. Harper: What is Linda's opinion? Linda: I suggested ad hoc originally since we dealt with so much. The call for ad hoc goes out to all faculty so they could freely volunteer and had more productivity. The ad hoc seemed to work better. Serra: I chaired an ad hoc committee before. There was even a call for the chair position of the committee. Zdilla: how do policies get to these committees? Answer: Faculty Senate as a whole or Exec Committee decides or chair of senate can charge a committee. Ryan Koenig: Can we get rid of it and bring it back later if needed? Sylvia: discussions on shared governance and engagement of administration, ethical behavior – if we say we don't need a standing personnel committee then what message are we sending? That we don't care? Darrin Cox: Can we split the difference and do sub-committees as needed? Serra: We will keep but who wants to Chair? Darrin Cox: motion to table

Sylvia: Second

IN favor of tabling: unanimous

Forum

Linda Cowan: We get a day off in May 2018 for elections that falls right in our finals week. I talked to Brian Crawford and President's Cabinet was not considering a Saturday finals day due to John McCullough saying they tried it before and it didn't work well. Serra: Make a committee to address conflict. Darrin nominated Peter Staffel. Peter said he would be on the committee but couldn't chair due to other obligations. Linda suggested taking up the issue in Exec Committee and appointing a Chair. Would be a fact finding committee in conjunction with the Provost's and President's Offices. Theunis van Aardt volunteered to chair the committee.

Emeritus Faculty call – let Jon Serra know.

Meeting Schedule for Fall 2017: Faculty Senate Chair, Jon Serra, has a conflict with HLC peer review training and the October 2017 Senate meeting. Options – October has 5 Tuesdays so we could push back one or go ahead as scheduled. Suggested let stand and the Vice Chair can run. November meeting is the day before Thanksgiving break. Change? No decision, to be addressed in October.

Linda Cowan – voice mail. Not all faculty have voice mail currently. Was told if they don't have a new phone or voice mail, they either must get now or the program will have to pay \$280 later to get them a fancy phone. Is this true? We need an update. Exec Committee will address and talk to IT.

Zdilla: We need a centralized calendar for policies out for comment, meetings, etc. That might limit the number of emails. Serra: Google calendar can do that, but who would oversee? Could easily get overloaded with postings. Darrin: Identify which committees should be on and those for general faculty to see. Zdilla agreed to be Chair of Calendar Committee.

Chad Kuhns: New at GSAC, but have had conversations that general studies needs oversight. Is there something Senate can do to help? Asked to clarify oversight? Chad: is General Education is a program, then it needs something like a program director, dean, etc. academic oversight. Should this go through

the Provost's Office? Most likely scenario is a program director who is a faculty member. We need a mechanism to 'defend/protect' general education. Linda: Having a faculty member just chair GSAC is tough as they do not have authority. Serra: Sounds beyond committee of Senate – perhaps work in conjunction with Greiner and Crawford.

Greg Chase moved to adjourn the meeting.

Jon Serra seconded (?)

6:13pm adjourned.



Meeting Attendance

College of Arts & Comm.	Initials
Michael Aulick	MA
Linda Cowan	LC
Brian Fencil	BF
Jeff Pfister (Secretary)	
Alt:	
College of Business	Initials
Gregory Chase	GC
James Crumbacher	
Alt: Dave Wright	
College of Education	Initials
David Hanna	DH
Hannah Harnar	HH
Aaron Huffman	AH
Ryan Koenig	RK
College of Liberal Arts	Initials
Darrin Cox	DC
Robert Gall	RG
Aaron Harper	AH
Corey Reigel (Vice-Chair)	CR
Peter Staffel	PS
Alt: Dominique Hoche	

College of Sciences	Initials
Theunis van Aardt	TV
Vacant	
Fuhua Chen	FC
Chad Kuhns	CK
Jon Serra (Chair)	JS
Matthew Zdilla	MZ
Alt: Stephanie Meredith	
ACF Representative	Initials
Sylvia Hawranick-Senften	SH
Parliamentarian	Initials
Robert Gall	RG
Invited Guests:	
BOG Representative	
James Haizlett	JH
Melinda Kreisberg	MK
Diana Harto	dh
Guests:	Initials

