## **WCU FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**Date:** February 3, 2012

**Time**: 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**Location:** FHG Library Room 613

Facilitator:	Julian Onderdonk, President	Type of meeting:	Scheduled Monthly Meeting
Note Taker:	Tanya Gatenby, Recording Secretary	Misc.	

Members Present: designated by an X

Alessandria, Tina	X	Means, Jennifer	X
Bill, Debra	Absent	Metz, Stacie	X
Brown, Eleanor	X	Gatenby, Tanya	X
Cooke, Lynne	Absent	Murphy, Corinne	Proxy, Tara Guerriero
Cressler, Walter	X	Nadolny, Larysa	X
DeHope, Eli	X	Nitica, Viorel	X
Dobrzelewski, J. C.	Absent	Onderdonk, Julian	X
Ghetie, Dora	Absent	Pierlott, Matthew	X
Gilboy, Mary Beth	X	Sanz-Sanchez, Israel	Proxy, Scott Parsell
Haggard, Cynthia	X	Schugar, Heather	X
Heinerichs, Scott	X	Sharpe, Heather	Χ
Kara, Orhan	X	Shivde, Geeta	X
Kelly, Leonard	X	Smith, Paul K.	X
Martin, Gerardina	X	Staruch, Liz	Proxy, L. Kelley
Kolasinski, Kurt	X	Stiefel, Van	X
Lawton, Bessie Lee	X	Verden, Claire	X
Leonard, Robin	X	Winterton, Sally	X
Li, Huimin (Amy)	Proxy, Karen Cohen (??)		
	Michael W. Pettis,	Student Gov't	X
	Kristen Crossney, Planning	Guest, Geography and	X

## **AGENDA ITEMS**

**Attendees:** 

Торіс	Discussion	Action
<ul><li>✓ Welcome (Senate President)</li></ul>	Senators, Proxies, and Guests	

✓ Senate Business (Senate President)	Minutes of the 12/3/11 meeting approved	
Provost's Annual Visit (Dr. Lamwers)	Dr. Lamwers gave a presentation about the Academic Plan, which itself grew out of the University's Strategic Plan. She described the data-collecting process and the opportunities faculty have had (qualitative department reports, response to quantitative department reports) to contribute to the discussion. Concerns were raised about who will be making the final decisions and the timetable, concerns that Dr. Lamwers answered. She concluded by welcoming further discussions as the process continues.	
Feedback on Roberta Snow's (Strategic Plan Steering Committee) Strategic Plan (compiled at 12/2/11 Senate meeting)	Discussion focused on larger, PASSHE concerns:     PASSHE system comes with a great deal of costs (overhead). Individual campuses need flexibility. Have we come to a point where we no longer need PASSHE input? There has been talk among presidents about privatization, but no plan A comment addressing this might be an appropriate addition to the Strategic Plan	
Campus Climate Reports (Senate Liaisons) and other announcements	<ul> <li>No climate reports this meeting</li> <li>Strategic Plan: Eli DeHope presented a short update:         <ul> <li>Efforts are being made to determine the best way to utilize the Strategic Plan data, in particular a way group themes so that academic education is prioritized. Other categories include education for success, sustainability, engagement, and diversity and maybe enrichment (arts and culture) under engagement. The data will be much more meaningful at the time of next month's Faculty Senate meeting</li> </ul> </li> <li>Paul Morgan provided flyers as a reminder of the sustainability presentations scheduled on Thursday, Feb 9 and the workshop on Friday, Feb 10.</li> <li>Mark Good provided a flyer as a reminder of the discussion to address "making diverse people feel comfortable in the classroom" and how as teachers we could mediate this</li> </ul>	
✓ Academic Plan Discussion (Senate President)	<ul> <li>The Senate thought a formal response should be developed as a response to the Provost's visit.</li> <li>Time did not allow for many issues of interest to be discussed</li> <li>A Letter would seek to itemize some of the current concerns on campus</li> <li>The reasons for the emergence of the Academic Plan were reviewed: that the last time a strategic plan was formed there was no discussion about academics. The Provost wanted the inclusion of the academic plan because she was at the initial meetings when the strategic plan was first formed and felt that it was important to include the academic plan in the process. There has been some tension because of the current budgetary issues.</li> <li>One Senator asked about the objectives and the model that is being used. He felt if we prepare students to be successful in their lives after WCU and they are successful, then we have succeeded and we could attract more students. Looking at this, the model would include how we are teaching, the quality, and the current</li> </ul>	A motion was approved to send a letter to the Provost as a follow up to her Faculty Senate visit. A week will be given in order to provide comments and then the letter will be sent out for a vote. Matt Pierlott suggested that this be done through the discussion board in D2L and Van Stiefel indicated he could to this.

	marketplace.	
	Other questions that were posed:	
	<ul> <li>Could University of Phoenix be a good business model for WCU?</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Is WCU a business that needs a better business model or do we deliver a better academic model?</li> </ul>	
	• It was observed that the Provost is seeking flexibility in where the university is going to grow and where the future faculty lines will be allocated. Eliminating programs and departments is a very difficult thing. The flexibility might be included in where WCU is projected to be in 7-8 years from now. The threat to programs and departments may not be now, but might exist in the future. The ultimate challenge might be how the university would implement an actual strategic plan. WCU's structure may make this difficult to do. We may need to think about how engaged we want to be in that vision.	
	<ul> <li>The feeling was that the letter should be an idealistic document looking at the university's vision, values, civility, and comprehensiveness—core values that need to be upheld, or at least voiced, even despite the hard economic times an budgetary constraints. There is also the point that the faculty's voice must be heard about these issues if only to ensure a full conversation. For these reasons, it was felt that the letter, once approved, should be sent to all faculty. Julian responded that he could send it out as part of the usual Senate update.</li> </ul>	
✓ By-Laws Revision (Senate President)	The draft document was posted on the Senate website over Winter Break for all-faculty comment. Feedback from the entire faculty included:	Motion approved to include these additions
	<ul> <li>Suggestion to include academic freedom and the senate's basic focus to be in contact with the Board of Governors and the Chancellor.</li> </ul>	Consider inviting Jen to the next Faculty Senate meeting or
	<ul> <li>Another suggestion was: should temporary faculty be enfranchised, since 34% of faculty are temps and do not have Faculty Senate representation?</li> </ul>	ask her to share information with Julian.
	Both measures were discussed and viewed approvingly.     Possibly Jen Bacon, chair of APSCUF Temporary Faculty     Issues, could serve as a liaison or Jen could appoint two     temporary faculty members	
✓ Presentation on Workplace Civility, "Time to be Nice" (Jen Bunk, Psychology)	<ul> <li>Among the important issues Jen raised were: 1) What is Workplace Incivility? 2) The costs of incivility to any institution are high and addressing the issues is cost-effective. 3) An overview of recent research, include Jen's own. 4) What an organization can do institute civility measures and interventions. 5) Strategies to teaching civility as part of the culture</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Senate feedback was very positive. This information is very valuable and should go to Deans and administration so that civility issues and how to institute them might spread throughout the campus culture.</li> </ul>	
✓ Committees	There was no time for committees given the full agenda. Committee chairs will be asked to report at the March meeting.	

NEXT MEETING		
Day and Time:	Thursday, March 8, 2012 3:00 – 5:00 pm	
Topics:	Dr. Rui Li, Executive director of Distance Education     By-Laws revision/ratification     Senate Committees and Chair Reports	