

MINUTES  
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2022, 3:00 P.M.

Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne brought the monthly meeting of the WVU Faculty Senate to order at 3:01 p.m. Members and guests participated in person at the College of Law event hall and via teleconference.

**Members Present**

Armour-Gemmen, M.	Hedrick, J.	Prinzo, L.
Ballard, D.	Hibbert, A.	Rinehart, L.
Barghouthi, N.	Hileman, S.	Rota, C.
Barnes, E.	Hodge, J.	Ruseski, J.
Bianco, C.	Huber, S.	Sabolsky, E.
Bolyard, J.	Hunt, C.	Samuels, H.
Bonner, D.	Johnson, D.	Sherlock, L.
Bresock, K.	Katz, J.	Sims, J.
Bruyaka Collignon, O.	Kelly, K.	Sizemore, J.
Casey, A.	Kent, A.	Smith, C.
Celikbas, E.	Klein, A.	Soccorsi, A.
Cottrell, L.	Knuckles, T.	Sofka, S.
Crichlow, R.	LaRue, R.	Sokos, G.
Dahle, G.	Law, K.	Staniscia, S.
Davari, A.	Leary, B.	Stueckle, J.
DeMarco, F.	Leary, M.	Swager, L.
Dey, K.	Li, B.	Tack, F.
Di Bartolomeo, L.	Lupo, J.	Titolo, M.
Dickman, B.	Malarcher, J.	Totzkay, D.
Donley, D.	Marra, A.	Valenti, M.
Downes, M.	Martucci, A.	Watson, J.
Dumitrescu, C.	Moore, M.	Wayne, S.
Elliott, E.	Morgan Paternostro, J.	Weislogel, A.
Elswick, D.	Mucino, V.	Williams, D.
Fullen, M.	Murphy, E.	Woodberry, K.
Grushecky, S.	Nguyen, J.	Woods, S.
Haddox, J.	Nix, A.	Wuest, T.
Hamrick, A.	Ogden, L.	Zeni, T.
Hauser, D.	Orr, E.	ter Haseborg, H.
Heady, M.	Peckens, S.	

**Members Excused**

Bhandari, R.	Feaster, K.	Roberts, D.
Cohen, S.	Floyd, K.	Sowards, A.
Dilcher, B.	Kale, U.	Utzman, R.
Evans, K.	Lorenze, S.	Woloshuk, J.
Faber, T.	Miltnerberger, M.	

**Members Absent**

Battistella, L.	Gross, J.	Murphy, T.
Bernardes, E.	Grossman, D.	Murray, A.
Burke, R.	Hanif, A.	Myers, S.
Carducci, H.	Harter, R.	Olfert, I.
Cook, A.	Hatipoglu, K.	Olgers, F.
Cronin, A.	Hessl, A.	Petrone, A.
Cui, P.	Hines, S.	Phillips, T.
Davis, D.	Holbein, M.	Reece, J.
Dimachkie, Z.	Honaker, L.	Reece, R.
Dionne, C.	John, C.	Renzelli, R.
Duenas Garcia, O.	Kearns, J.	Rogers, T.
Eades, D.	Leight, M.	Sakhuja, A.
Ellis, E.	Martin, J.	Shrader, C.
Ellison, M.	McGinnis, R.	Stamatakis, M.
Graziani, G.	Momen, J.	Waggy, C.

## Guests Present

Reed, M.	Staples, C.	Widders, E.
Gee, E.	Morris, T.	Lofaso, A.
Shannon, R.	Gavin, M.	Wilson, M.
Slimak, L.	Beckley, T.	Fleming, S.
Latimer, M.	Brugnoli, A.	Hall, J.
Alsop, R.	Debastiani, A.	Martinelli, D.

### 1. Honorary Degrees

- a. Motion to enter executive session by Frankie Tack. Seconded.

Motion carried by voice vote

Faculty Senate entered executive session at 3:01 p.m., presided by Scott Wayne

Individuals Present:

Armour-Gemmen, M.	Hedrick, J.	Prinzo, L.
Ballard, D.	Hibbert, A.	Rinehart, L.
Barghouthi, N.	Hileman, S.	Rota, C.
Barnes, E.	Hodge, J.	Ruseski, J.
Bianco, C.	Huber, S.	Sabolsky, E.
Bolyard, J.	Hunt, C.	Samuels, H.
Bonner, D.	Johnson, D.	Sherlock, L.
Bresock, K.	Katz, J.	Sims, J.
Bruyaka Collignon, O.	Kelly, K.	Sizemore, J.
Casey, A.	Kent, A.	Smith, C.
Celikbas, E.	Klein, A.	Soccorsi, A.
Cottrell, L.	Knuckles, T.	Sofka, S.
Crichlow, R.	LaRue, R.	Sokos, G.
Dahle, G.	Law, K.	Staniscia, S.
Davari, A.	Leary, B.	Stueckle, J.
DeMarco, F.	Leary, M.	Swager, L.
Dey, K.	Li, B.	Tack, F.
Di Bartolomeo, L.	Lofaso, A.	ter Haseborg, H.
Dickman, B.	Lupo, J.	Titolo, M.
Donley, D.	Malarcher, J.	Totzkay, D.
Downes, M.	Marra, A.	Valenti, M.
Dumitrescu, C.	Martinelli, D.	Watson, J.
Elliott, E.	Martucci, A.	Wayne, S.
Elswick, D.	Moore, M.	Weislogel, A.
Fleming, S.	Morgan Paternostro, J.	Williams, D.
Fullen, M.	Mucino, V.	Wilson, M.
Grushecky, S.	Murphy, E.	Woodberry, K.
Haddox, J.	Nguyen, J.	Woods, S.
Hall, J.	Nix, A.	Wuest, T.
Hamrick, A.	Ogden, L.	Zeni, T.
Hauser, D.	Orr, E.	
Heady, M.	Peckens, S.	

Faculty Senate returned to open session at 3:23 p.m.

2. Chair Wayne presented the [Minutes](#) of the October 3, 2022, meeting of Faculty Senate for approval

Motion carried by unanimous consent

### 3. Faculty Senate Action on Honorary Degree Nominees

- a. Motion to approve the selected honorary degree candidates by F. Tack. Seconded

Motion carried by voice vote

4. President Gee had no report
5. Report from Provost Maryanne Reed
  - a. Academic transformation/fall priorities include a continued focus on student success retention, graduation, persistence. Data indicates that we lost around 130 more students than average during the pandemic. Despite this, four-year graduation rates have risen significantly
  - b. Eberly STEM instructional collaborative – Strategies on the 450 sections of introductory math and sciences courses taught each semester
    - i. When students don't succeed in these introductory courses, they have a greater likelihood of not being retained. As a result, the Office of the Provost is seeking structure that will elevate teaching, identify best practices and pedagogy, and identify intervention strategy
    - ii. Consideration of expanding a summer bridge program
    - iii. Provost will work with faculty across campus to better understand which STEM courses are needed for which majors.
    - iv. As a result, the Structure that will elevate the teaching
    - v. Identify best practices and pedagogy
    - vi. Identify intervention strategy
    - vii. Expanding summer bridge program
    - viii. Working with faculty across campus to better understand which stem courses are needed for which majors
  - c. Provost Office is aware of the mental health challenges facing students and is exploring safe and research-driven intervention strategies
  - d. Portfolio review process update – 2<sup>nd</sup> year
    - i. While some programs were discontinued, other programs are being reconfigured to be more attractive to students and more efficient (examples given of Foreign Language, Geology, and Geography)
  - e. Faculty are working together to develop new academic programs to attract students to the university, including Statler work toward Environmental Engineering and Midstream Engineering
  - f. Provost Reed yielded the floor to Robynn Shannon for updates on Creative Mini-Grants
    - i. Number and quality of submissions exceeded expectations
    - ii. 14 semi-finalists selected to submit a full proposal
    - iii. Semi-finalists were selected for being innovative, interdisciplinary, supporting land grant mission, attracting new students to the university, and/or designed to attract underserved and underrepresented student populations
    - iv. Rich mix of different academic areas, modalities, and students that they will serve
    - v. Branch campuses are included in the semi-finalists selected

- vi. The Office of the Provost will work with the proposals to design curriculum even if they are not selected for a grant
- g. Provost Reed reclaimed the floor — Noted that college and university workload documents are available online. Reminder that the university-wide workload document update was created with equity in mind, and that they will be working with departments to update their documents in the spring
- h. Office of the Provost working with TACO to develop the new faculty assessment/measurement tool (SEI)

Member: Where can we find the college and university workload documents?

Reed: Faculty.wvu.edu under policies

- 6. Report from Rob Alsop, Vice President for Strategic Initiative – Budget Model and Legislative Priorities – [Presentation Link](#)
  - a. July 1, 2023, is the scheduled effective date for the new budget, but there is an understanding that it will take a couple years to fully work out the details
  - b. Moving from an incremental model to a hybrid performance one
  - c. Each college will be able to see the details of how revenue is attributable
  - d. Colleges will be able to clearly see how they can best generate revenue, though they will assume the risk of new initiatives as well
  - e. If a college is in a deficit once we move to the new budget model, the institution will be able to re-allocate revenue to balance that unit's budget

Member: What is the percentage of the profits that colleges will be required to transfer to strategic investment?

Alsop: We don't have that answer yet – other schools that have implemented this model have transferred anywhere from 15 to 23 percent. At five years from implementation, most schools try to get to no more than 17-18 percent. Each school is different, it depends on how close your revenues and expenses are in the new model when going from the old model.

Member: Is breaking even an objective for colleges in the first year of the new model?

Alsop: Assuming the same enrollment, same net tuition, revenue, and expenses, the goal is to avoid re-allocating the strategic fund. If there is a drop in enrollment, then there won't be enough revenue to meet expenses and there will need to be some sort of re-allocation. The goal is to look at what colleges are responsible for what and consider what is fair and how the model can be tweaked so that we have an even bottom line. The goal is to use the strategic allocation to do that amongst the colleges and let the model work over time.

Member: Will raises be coming from central allocation or from the colleges?

Answer: We are still working this out from a governance perspective. At the beginning of the year the Board of Governors and leadership of the university will look at enrollment trends, tuition increases, if we will receive state appropriations, and if we will have sufficient

revenues to provide a pay raise. When we do that, we will take the labor roster from the provost and add in enough for what we think the new pull will be. This information will be given to colleges with information that their labor roster is going to increase in cost by whatever the amount is moving forward. It isn't an issue of the fund, it is based on building budgets based on anticipated pay raises associated with other budget items.

Member: There has been a lot of talk about possibly not allowing graduate tuition waivers on coursework and the like. How will this affect our R1 status moving forward, as graduate students are critical to our work as an institution?

Alsop: We know that it is critical to provide graduate waivers for what we do as an institution and there is not a commitment to change that. What I can tell you is that we, as an institution, grant a lot of graduate waivers, and we need to be very thoughtful about our revenues and expenses. We are taking a look to see whether it makes sense to continue the amount of waivers that we currently award, and I think we are aligned on that from a leadership perspective. How we can allocate those waivers in the new model is something we are still discussing. There are two questions: how do we account for graduate waivers when allocating revenues and expenses, and what does an institution of our size need from graduate waivers? We are trying to thoughtfully look at those two issues as a team.

Member: Regarding the Extension Service – the revenue we generate, particularly in continuing education, generates tuition money but the students are not degree seeking. Does that fall into the same budget model or is it different?

Alsop: Extension has been deemed to be a support unit of the institution. Part of the revenue that Extension generates will be allocated back to it as part of the support unit moving forward. Units like the University Libraries and Extension fall on the academic support side of the institution as opposed to the revenue generating side for the budget. Some revenues go to offset facilities expenses before it is allocated to the colleges. Extension is a bit of a hybrid case in terms of revenues and expenses.

Member: Does that put a limit on the potential growth for that college?

Alsop: I think no. What I think will happen is that, during the course of the fall semester, the dean will put together an expense budget and what their expected revenues are, and then will bring that budget to the provost. Through discussions with the Board and Dean's Council, they will make a determination as to what we need to expand from an Extension perspective. So that may mean the academic support unit goes up and the colleges must bear the expense from that perspective, and that will be where the opportunity for growth as well as the strategic money come into plan

Member: You had the word base before the 80-20 revenue split. Can you talk about what you mean by that and how online will be funded differently from face to face, or generate revenue differently?

Alsop: I will need to get back to you on that. I think all online tuition is based on the 80-20 split and there is nothing else but let me confirm that. I believe the word base does not need to be there to be honest.

Member: Based on this budget model, is the Beckley campus going to be considered one college, like the colleges on the main campus, or will the two colleges on the Beckley campus be separate?

Alsop: I believe it will be treated as one campus with the allocation of revenues and expenses, and then the college itself will be able to take from that and decide what it wants to do.

Member: You had mentioned the FNA and indirect rates. Will that be more discretionary? You mentioned some parameters, could you share a little information about that? It is very important for outreach work.

Alsop: As opposed to taking a certain portion of that indirect fund and sending it to research, one hundred percent of the grant dollars will be sent to the colleges. Then there will be an expense from research that goes there. We are not at a point where we have all those guard rails, and it is something we will be talking about in the coming weeks and months. None of the researchers need to do anything differently from an Extension perspective or service perspective, as it relates to what is charged to a grant or what is not. There will be guidance coming forward as we work through this over the next several months.

Member: You said each college will be responsible for its own expenses. Is it possible for colleges to give raises to their faculty, and other colleges to not give raises to their faculty?

Alsop: I don't think we have specifically answered that question, but I don't think that would be the case. The institution will determine for the next year whether we're going to have raise pools, and everybody will have the opportunity to participate in that as we move forward. Where that may come in is if College A has extra money and College B does not, the prevention pool will be used to make sure that we have the ability for every college and all of our faculty, based on market and merit, to have an increase.

Member: Where does Honors fit into the new budget?

Alsop: They are support units.

Member: If expense per student exceeds revenue per student for a unit, would that require a change within that unit? There seems to be a limit in terms of options to address the expense at the unit level.

Alsop: I think that is one of the most fundamental reasons why the OneWVU fee, the strategic fee, is so important. Not every college is going to have revenues in excess of expenses, and we will make conscious decisions in those cases. There are programs that generate greater revenue, and we can take some of that and reallocate it. That isn't to say that programs with low enrollment for faculty won't be reviewing in the Academic Transformation process, and a decision made about the future of that program. But there are instances where we know that we are not going to generate enough revenue to cover the expenses of a particular

program, and we intend as a service to the State and our students to continue that through subsidy or whatever you want to call it.

Member: What I think I'm really trying to ask is about finding the break even point between expense per student and revenue. It seems like finding that balance is going to be critical.

Alsop: That is why we are saying that we will need a couple years to figure this all out using the model. There will be some unintended consequences that we will try to fix, and we won't get it perfect. Hopefully we can make everything clearer for colleges.

- f. Legislative Session update
  - i. Hoping to protect appropriations, otherwise monitoring what is proposed and lobbying for what is best for the institution
  - ii. The Higher Education Policy Commission has submitted an appropriation request for the next year that is the same that we had this year, along with an extra \$100 million worth of deferred maintenance for all higher education
    1. WVU usually gets somewhere between 35 and 45 percent of that
  - iii. Significant interest in legislature over the state tax structure and what it will look like. It is anticipated that discussion on taxes will fill most of the legislative session
7. Report from Melissa Latimer, Associate Provost for Faculty Development and Culture, and Chris Staples, Executive Director of Academic Personnel – Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
  - a. 25 Town Halls have been completed with one additional Town Hall with the Faculty Welfare Committee scheduled for November 16<sup>th</sup>
  - b. Comment period ends on Friday November 11<sup>th</sup>
    - i. 50 comments to date, mostly focusing on non-continuation, external reviews, and rating criteria
    - ii. Summary of comments included:
      1. Felt that the language was directed toward removing tenure
      2. Concern or confused over the steps for the non-continuation process
      3. Criteria and proposed higher standards for promotion from assistant to associate
      4. External reviews and the added associated workload
  - c. Recent Changes
    - i. Document draft released earlier than planned
    - ii. Two proposed drafts released
    - iii. Extended comment period
    - iv. All documents have been made available
    - v. Removed reference to mandatory post-tenure review that would occur every 5 years

- vi. Modified the new external review process to make it more equitable for library, clinical, and regional faculty
  - 1. Increased where those external reviewers could come from
  - 2. Teaching, clinical work, library, etc., might be better suited for external reviewers from places other than R1 institutions.
  - 3. Two of the four reviewers may come from WVU, but they must be outside of the individuals academic area
- vii. Removed some of the legal language to improve the flow of the document
- viii. Highlighted within the document where the ratings come from and what it takes to receive an unsatisfactory rating
- ix. Section 2.b – specifications regarding ratings and why they may be awarded, with clarification on unsatisfactory
- x. Deleted sentences that discuss receiving unsatisfactory ratings in two or more areas
  - 1. Language changed from must to may in non-continuation statements
- xi. Page 8 – removed clause on university code of conduct

Member: Is it accurate that a dean may give you an unsatisfactory even if your chair does not?

Morris: This is why we have multiple levels of review, to correct those type of inconsistencies. But they would need to be consistent with the criteria that the academic unit has established. There must be feedback and recommendations for continuation or non-continuation at each level. There is a possibility at each level for a recommendation to be made or not, but I feel that these guidelines have more safeguards compared to the current document.

Member: You have decided not to do the post-tenure review, which most flagships do. Usually that is where these issues would be dealt with on a five or six-year basis. Is there a reason why we have the two- or three-year timeframe in the document?

Morris: My hope was that the additional language around what it took to get an unsatisfactory, having the feedback, and declining performance demonstrated. There has been a lot of discussion about how long this process is from our peers. We are right in the center – some of them are longer, some of them are shorter.

Member: Would the Provost's Office recommend the same openness to the colleges that has been displayed in this process?

Morris: We do hope that faculty are communicating within their college about how you would like this next step of the process to play out.

- 8. Report from Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne
  - a. Thanks to those that donated blood at the blood drive
  - b. Process for voting on the Promotion and Tenure document at the December meeting
    - i. Agenda will include a resolution with a vote to approve the document
    - ii. Will be debated at the meeting



- iii. Resolution is subject to being amended, the document is not
  - c. Qualtrics ballot will be distributed after the debate has ended
    - i. An option to provide comments will be allowed
- 9. Curriculum Committee Chair Lori Ogden presented five items for approval and one item for information:
  - For Approval – New Courses Report – [Annex I](#)
  - For Approval – Course Changes Report – [Annex II](#)
  - For Approval – Program Change (Program Code: ERCHSP\_BS\_OL: Early Childhood Special Education, Key: 1214)
  - For Approval – Program Change (Program Code: WT\_ELTRN\_ENG: Electronic Engineering Technology, Key: 829)
  - For Approval – Program Change (Program Code: WT\_INDS\_TECH: Industrial Technology, Key: 830)
  - Motion carried by voice vote

For Information – Proposed Timeline for Program Changes – [Annex III](#)
- 10. General Education Foundations Committee Chair Lisa Di Bartolomeo presented an item for approval:
  - For Approval – GEF Actions – [Annex IV](#)
  - Motion carried by voice vote
- 11. Teaching and Assessment Committee Chair Diana Davis was absent and had no report
- 12. Committee on Committee Chair Lesley Cottrell presented an item for approval:
  - For Approval – Committee Appointments – [Annex V](#)
  - Motion carried by voice vote
- 13. Report from Faculty Representative to State Government Eloise Elliott
  - a. 19 of 20 members representing all state colleges and universities present at the Advisory Council of Faculty Retreat in October
  - b. Group serves in an advisory capacity to the HEPC and the WV legislature
  - c. Heard a report from the HEPC and their perspective of legislative issues that could arise
  - d. Developing a report on the issues that we will be addressing as the ACF, which will be shared at the next meeting
- 14. Board of Governors representative Stan Hileman had no report and noted that the next Board of Governors meeting is on November 11, 2022.
- 15. New Business

- a. Motion for Faculty Senate to resolve to delay any proposed vote on the Revised Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure until the spring semester made by S. Staniscia. Seconded.

Member: Could Melissa [Latimer] or Tracy [Morris] speak on how this might impact the process?

Latimer: Assuming this was voted on in January, and assuming it was a positive vote in support, it would reduce the time that a college would have to get their documents in line, which would reduce the time that a department would have to get their documents in line.

Member: Why should we delay, and what is the purpose [for the delay]?

Staniscia: Many faculty consider the amount of time allowed for discussing the document has been too limited.

Wayne: This is regarding the document being released mid-semester, correct?

Staniscia: Correct

Member: We would receive the document the week before the vote, which seems like very little time to gather feedback from constituents

Staples: As we are working through the comments and we make changes, we will upload that to the website as soon as possible. The five days requirement to have the document to Senate is tied to Faculty Sente procedure.

Wayne: So you are making changes to the document as they go out, Correct? And the most recent change was this past Thursday, correct/

Latimer: Correct

Member: Per parliamentary procedure, shouldn't the Faculty Senate have the opportunity to discuss important matters at one meeting before voting on them at the following meeting?

Wayne: Per the parliamentarian, that would be a matter of preference, not necessarily parliamentary procedure. We could make a motion to that effect after addressing the motion on the floor.

No further discussion

Voice vote contested and moved to a show of hands

Motion fails with 17 in favor and 45 opposed

16. Motion to adjourn by member. Seconded.

Motion carried by unanimous consent

Chair Wayne adjourned the meeting of Faculty Senate at 5:13 p.m. to reconvene on December 5, 2022.

Corey Hunt  
Faculty Senate Office Administrator