

MINUTES
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2022, 3:15 P.M.

Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne brought the monthly meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. Members and guests participated in-person at the College of Law Event Hall and via video conference.

Members Present:

Armour-Gemmen, M.	Dickman, B.	Kearns, J.	Roberts, D.
Cottrell, L.	Dilcher, B.	Kent, A.	Rota, C.
Heady, M.	Downes, M.	Klein, A.	Ruseski, J.
Hodge, J.	Duenas Garcia, O.	LaRue, R.	Sabolsky, E.
Knuckles, T.	Dumitrescu, C.	Leary, B.	Samuels, H.
Morgan Paternostro, J.	Eades, D.	Leary, M.	Sherlock, L.
Woloshuk, J.	Elliott, E.	Leight, M.	Sizemore, J.
Ballard, D.	Elswick, D.	Li, B.	Smith, C.
Barghouthi, N.	Faber, T.	Lorenze, S.	Soccorsi, A.
Barnes, E.	Feaster, K.	Malarcher, J.	Sofka, S.
Battistella, L.	Fullen, M.	Martin, J.	Sokos, G.
Bhandari, R.	Gross, J.	Martucci, A.	Sowards, A.
Bianco, C.	Grushecky, S.	McGinnis, R.	Staniscia, S.
Bonner, D.	Haddox, J.	Miltenberger, M.	Stueckle, J.
Bresock, K.	Hamrick, A.	Momen, J.	Swager, L.
Bruyaka Collignon, O.	Hanif, A.	Moore, M.	Tack, F.
Carducci, H.	Hatipoglu, K.	Murphy, E.	Titolo, M.
Casey, A.	Hauser, D.	Myers, S.	Totzkay, D.
Celikbas, E.	Hedrick, J.	Nguyen, J.	Utzman, R.
Cook, A.	Hessl, A.	Nix, A.	Waggy, C.
Crichlow, R.	Hibbert, A.	Ogden, L.	Wayne, W.
Cui, P.	Hileman, S.	Olgers, F.	Williams, D.
Dahle, G.	Honaker, L.	Orr, E.	Woodberry, K.
Davari, A.	Huber, S.	Peckens, S.	Woods, S.
DeMarco, F.	Johnson, D.	Prinzo, L.	Wuest, T.
Dey, K.	Kale, U.	Reece, J.	Zeni, T.
Di Bartolomeo, L.	Katz, J.	Rinehart, L.	ter Haseborg, H.

Members Excused:

Cohen, S.	Hodge, J.	Morgan, J.
Heady, M.	Knuckles, T.	Woloshuk, J.

Members Absent:

Bernardes, E.	Evans, K.	Lupo, J.	Rogers, T.
Bolyard, J.	Floyd, K.	Marra, A.	Sakhuja, A.
Burke, R.	Graziani, G.	Mucino, V.	Shrader, C.
Cronin, A.	Grossman, D.	Murphy, T.	Sims, J.
Davis, D.	Harter, R.	Murray, A.	Stamatakis, M.
Dimachkie, Z.	Hines, S.	Olfert, I.	Valenti, M.
Dionne, C.	Holbein, M.	Petrone, A.	Watson, J.
Donley, D.	John, C.	Phillips, T.	Weislogel, A.
Ellis, E.	Kelly, K.	Reece, R.	
Ellison, M.	Law, K.	Renzelli, R.	

1. Chair Wayne presented the [Minutes](#) of the November 7, 2022 meeting of Faculty Senate for approval
Motion carried by unanimous consent
2. Report from Provost Maryanne Reed
 - a. Reminded the assembly that the vote on the draft Promotion and Tenure document was delayed until the January Faculty Senate meeting, allowing faculty 8 weeks to view the final draft
 - b. Beginning in January the University will extend the current “Modification of Duties” policy to graduate students for assistance
 - i. More information will be released in January
 - c. Provost Reed yielded the floor to Amber Brugnoli to address concern related to a new policy from the Office of Global Affairs that impacts recruitment of international scholars
 - i. For scholars on a J Visa, the intent is to begin bringing those individuals to the university in cohorts beginning in 2023
 - ii. This is to allow reasonable time for the variety of required tasks that must be completed before an individual is able to come to campus. At minimum, it takes 6-8 weeks to complete all required tasks
 - iii. This will also allow the Office of Global Affairs to pre-schedule appointments for social security, payroll, ID, and university onboarding
 - iv. The federal government requires the university to do cultural assimilation and onboarding activities – these tasks are difficult to schedule, complete, and track when individuals have highly varied arrivals
 - v. Brugnoli noted that they are very willing to cooperate with faculty that have concerns or special circumstances
 - d. Provost Reed reclaimed the floor
 - e. WVU is offering all instructors and teaching assistants the opportunity to pursue a Certificate in Effective College Instruction credential free of charge
 - i. Deadline to register for the spring courses is January 5th
 - f. Noted the stressful time for students and encouraged awareness on mental health support and resources for students, staff, and faculty available at mentalhealth.wvu.edu
 - i. The [Faculty and Staff Assistance Program](#) is confidential and available free of charge
 - g. A new president has been hired for West Virginia University Institute of Technology and will be announced within the next few days

Member: Would you be willing to say a few words about the current fiscal budget? We last got an update back in September and that things weren't particularly bad, but the recent news has not been good, especially considering recent cutbacks.

Reed: Absolutely. Essentially, we had a budget shortfall this year because of a decline in enrollment, one that we did not expect. That was partially due to retention, and also due to graduate a larger cohort of students. That has resulted in a budget shortfall for this year that we have managed or are managing by reducing colleges across the entire university. Colleges have been asked to carry a smaller portion of that, which we have already communicated to the

colleges. We aren't sure what the picture will look like next year. We know that we will continue to have a large graduating class or two, and we are working through larger graduating cohorts and smaller entering cohorts. This is why we have asked for budgets to be tightened, reducing unnecessary travel, reducing hospitality expenses, and to be careful about hiring. We are not calling it a hiring freeze, we are calling it a hiring frost, but we are trying to be careful about each position to ensure it is something that is absolutely necessary. We are trying to get through next year by being proactive so that we don't have to announce cost cuts at the start of the school year and reduce those impacts. That is what I can tell you. I wish there was better news, but we are still struggling with the enrollment issues. We need to be careful in anticipation that it could be a tough year.

3. Report from President E. Gordon Gee

- a. Budget changes described as anticipatory, and expressed confidence in the overall budget
 - i. Noted that there may be opportunities to gain additional funding in the next legislative session
- b. Wren Baker has been hired as the new athletic director
- c. The WVU Institute for Community and Rural Health has received a \$1 million grant to continue expanding an Opioid Response Program resources to rural communities across the state. The first grant lasted from 2019-2022, and we are entering the second phase of program
- d. WVU Public Education Collaborative and College of Applied Human Sciences have initiated an effort to combat pandemic-driven early learning loss, as many children have fallen a year or two behind expected learning goals
 - i. "Read with me Weirton" intervention program in 2021 resulted in literacy levels rising 1.5 grade levels
- e. "Building a Village" literacy program at Mary C. Snow Elementary in Charleston, which brings literacy activities to two large housing complexes that house many of the students

4. Report from Melissa Latimer, Associate Provost for Faculty Development and Culture, Tracy Morris, Associate Provost for Academic Personnel, and Chris Staples, Executive Director of Academic Personnel – Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - [Presentation Slide Deck](#)

- a. Final draft of the University Procedures document was posted on November 15, 2022
 - i. A "marked" version, showing changes and comments, and a "clean" version have been made available on the website
- b. Emphasis placed on support for tenure
 - i. Guidelines aim to create greater transparency and clarity within the guidelines
 - ii. All peer institutions have mechanisms for non-continuation of tenured faculty that do not meet minimum responsibilities
- c. Details regarding ratings, timeline, comparison to peers, recent changes, grievances, and discontinuation are noted within the linked slides
- d. If adopted at the January Faculty Senate meeting, Colleges and HSC schools must align their guidelines by May 11, 2023, to go live on July 1, 2023
- e. Department and division guidelines must then be completed by December 1, 2023, to go live July 1, 2024

- f. Once adopted, anyone newly hired or promoted will adhere to the new procedures
- g. Current faculty members who opt out of the updated procedures will have until the 2027-2028 cycle to seek promotion under the existing university procedures
 - i. That process still needs to be detailed
 - ii. Timeline created based on the normal 6-year probationary track

Member: For existing faculty, the new guidelines don't apply to us until 2028. Is that the same for the college and school documents as well?

Morris: With respect to the promotion cases, the annual evaluations will always follow the department unit's guidelines. So once those are complete for annual evaluations, you will have the criteria within your department or colleges. The promotion guidelines reflect the current guidelines until that time.

Member: Thank you so much for all the feedback. One concern I'm hearing most about is, what does this roll out look like at the HSC level, the school level, and the department level? I know you have given us some deadlines and dates, but it would be helpful to understand what that process looks like at those levels.

Morris: As soon as the guidelines are approved, we will be communicating with the deans about the deadline and encouraging them to begin discussions with faculty. We want to make sure that faculty are included. The level of detail that faculty are interested in will really happen at the department level, and I don't think that the departments have to wait until colleges are entirely done to begin having conversations. Faculty could be having conversations around what the criteria in the department what look like at any time, so there will be some overlapping timeframes regarding the college and department level processes.

Staples: If adopted, there would be key pieces we would be looking for at the college, school, or department level, to make sure that are aligned. That would be part of the communication process with the deans as well as the chairperson.

Morris: We do have a template and rating sheet to make sure that those are all addressed, and we will be sharing those with the deans and chairpersons if and when the document is approved. We will also encourage that all those points are shared with faculty

Member: Has there been any discussion about aligning the reviews regarding SEIs and how SEIs are taken into consideration? There is research on how SEIs tend to negatively impact people of color and women, so I was wondering how that all works. I know of at least a couple examples of a review committee's evaluation being changed by the department chair or dean because of negative SEI.

Staples: Yes, there is a reduction in focus on SEIs. Some form of student feedback will exist moving forward, which is tied to Board of Governor's rules. The Teaching and Assessment Committee is working on changes to the document to address some of the issues that you brought up, and that is in process now.

Member: So, the idea is to align what is happening in the Teaching and Assessment Committee with what is happening in the evaluation process for review of faculty?

Morris: Yes. Putting focus on portfolios rather than a single point like SEI.

Member: Mentioning the peer institutions, is that in any sort of report that the faculty could have access to?

Staples: I put that together on a couple slides that I can include with the slide deck, which we will post to the Academic Transformation page.

Member: In terms of tenure and your explanations for why this would not weaken tenure, and that because these things will be set at the department level: I'm still confused as to why an unsatisfactory rating can be given at above the department level.

Morris: This might be related to language, like when you say dean or chair. That is because we have units that aren't in a department, so the dean is effectively the chair.

Member: The wording in the sentence is levels in that section. To me the word level comes across as above the department.

Morris: The way it would function is that the first level of evaluation is at the department level, and that is the chair and the committee. A full professor might opt to only be reviewed by their chair and not the committee. If there was a concern around the faculty members performance, then the case would then be reviewed by the full committee before moving up to the college level. Are you saying that the language isn't clear, or you are concerned for when that happens?

Member: The word levels conveys that, say, a future dean would give an unsatisfactory rating regardless of what the chair and committee say, which creates concern for tenure and academic freedom.

Morris: The annual evaluation would never move up to a higher level unless there was a concern about the faculty member's performance and there are unsatisfactory or non-continuation votes. I know some of the concern around administrators, so I looked at the data on all situations where this is a split vote, and it is more likely for the negative recommendation to come from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and for the deans and chairs to extend the faculty member and give them an improvement period.

Member: Many faculty, especially those in the arts, creative arts, or sciences, are concerned about the current political environment and that there may be pressure from above in future years that doesn't presently exist. So I would appreciate if words like levels are extremely cleanly defined.

Morris: Thank you. I do want to make it clear that the annual evaluation process does not work at a higher level than would impose a rating. It must start at the unit level. Within our procedures it is not possible for a single administrator to affect the non-continuation of a faculty member. This is where it goes through multiple levels. Once it moves out of the department we have another committee at the college level, then we have the dean, and at the university level we have another group of faculty. From my perspective there are multiple safeguards to ensure that what you propose wouldn't happen.

Member: What do you envision the process for writing the documents at the college level to look like? In other words, you say you want faculty involvement, but are you going to police the process to ensure faculty involvement? Does it look like a min-version of this where a committee gets together at the unit levels and writes something and then presents it? To ensure that faculty are involved in writing those sorts of college level documents, what do you expect?

Morris: We are giving strong recommendations to our deans and chairs. To facilitate the process, I might try to clean up the language and give faculty something to work from, though the deans may operate differently. [yields the floor to Provost Reed]

Reed: Policing is not the word I would want to use in how we ensure that we see good behavior regarding these issues. We work closely with our dean colleagues and will be reviewing all documents to provide another check and balance in the process. If we see something that doesn't make sense, we will go back to the unit. It is in everyone's best interest that we have documents that are clear and transparent about what the process is. All I can say is that we will work very closely with the colleges and departments and will request additional information or changes where necessary.

Member: Assistant professors, in terms of the review process, my understanding is that they are evaluated every year. What do you envision as the levels of review for them?

Morris: The process would apply to all faculty, all levels, and all ranks.

Member: I appreciate the discussion on highly recommending and so on, but is there a way that we can have the language that faculty involvement is required at the college and department level? I think adding the word required would help with some of the angst that faculty have regarding that process.

Morris: Hearing this, I hope that faculty are communicating with their deans and chairs. We have heard a lot of these concerns and we are not always certain that the feedback is flowing to the person that it should be directed at, so I hope that is happening. I think it is easy for my to say, yes, it is required, though I would have to defer that over to Provost Reed as to whether that would be allowed. But I want to say that we are very happy to work with units and we will have our eyes and ears open to facilitate discussions and to hear if things are not rolling out the way we expect them to.

Member: I feel that communication and how things are communicated is the greatest difficulty in situations like this. That is why I mention using the word required, so that deans know that they need to have faculty engaged in this process. It shouldn't be like policing it and it shouldn't be a negative thing.

Morris: Understood, and I do want to reiterate that where the most detail will be and where items of greatest concern for faculty will be at the department level. You are your department and you have faculty meetings. That is where the conversations will be had for developing those guidelines.

Member: You mentioned that you had a lot of feedback from teaching assistant professors, specifically related to the use of external reviewers when going up for promotion, but you didn't talk about that. Has there been any movement in regard to getting rid of those reviewers, as that has been primarily what we have heard from teaching assistant professors? Could you give us some insight into those comments and your response?

Staples: From an external review standpoint, you are correct: as we move through the process, we have teaching assistant to teaching associate that would be impacted by the new procedures, as well as the librarian track. The other tracks that exist already have external review processes in place. Service track does it from instructor through professor, clinical has it from associate to professor. External reviewers do not need to all be from an R1 institution, two of the four can be from outside the unit but still internal to the university. The piece we want to keep in mind is the timing aspect. If these were to be adopted on January 9th, anyone who is currently within that teaching assistant rank could seek promotion under the old guidelines prior to the new guidelines being adopted. They would then be at the teaching associate process, which

requires the external reviewers to take place. I think it is fair from a standpoint that we need to encourage deans, as well as chairpersons, when we think about allowing and having those opportunities for teaching assistant professors to attend conferences and build networks when we start thinking about external reviews. The other piece of this like what Extension has had to do over time is, how they develop the list of external reviewers and how that is developed. We know that will take some work, both on our end as well as in the departments and colleges, to identify who are those individuals and who are those colleges that can help build out those lists. What those lists are built, the process will move very smoothly.

Member: It seems like we are putting the cart before the horse when it comes to changing the requirement for external reviewers to go for librarians or teaching assistant professor to associate professor. You want to put in a place of culture and network of support internal to the institution that will help assistant professors build those networks, gain travel funds, build the national reputation they need to have successful external reviews. Until we have that in place and until we have enough of a track record for people to build on, it seems premature to expect those external reviews before all the mechanisms are in place to help them with that. That is one of the biggest stumbling blocks for the group of teaching professors and overwhelming the feedback we got. People are really going to have a hard time getting to the expected destination until the culture has been built and the supports are there.

Morris: What you are expressed makes sense. From another perspective, service faculty already do this at all levels, teaching faculty moving from associate to full already do this, and we have been able to demonstrate that it has worked and is successful. As much as we can we would like to have parallel processes across all faculty, so right now this select group has a different set of procedures. [yields floor to Provost Reed]

Reed: I want to add that this is why we included the opt out clause. The reality is that you could have six years before you are under these new guidelines. I will also say that, from my own experience, I have seen teaching faculty that go to conferences and do network, and we are only asking for two reviewers that are external to the institution. So I do think the opt out clause does answer that, and that is up to six years where you can be building those networks.

Member: I think the opt out clause is helpful, but I think that part of the contrast between teaching faculty and service faculty is that service faculty normally have at a 10% research assignment, which enables them to do some sort of external facing work that teaching faculty do not tend to do. Yes, there are exceptions, but if you are in a unit that does not enable or support that, it will be very difficult to build that reputation. I do agree that we should all have the same expectations, but we should all have the same opportunities and support as well.

Reed: Understood. Clearly it is there from the associate to the full level, so I'd be curious how that happens.

Member: We have created a mentor program. When I went up for promotion to full professor it was extremely difficult to find external reviewers, and that experience has been shared by my colleagues.

Reed: I've been in the same position, and I hear what you are saying. We will try to make that process as smooth as possible

Member: Will the teaching area and the service area also have specific criteria for evaluation? Is it standard procedure for the workload document to be created from the P&T

document, or is it okay for the workload document to come before the final P&T document is even complete?

Morris: Yes, the criteria for all teaching, service, and research will need to be specified. There should be some correspondence between workload and guidelines. The workload documents are saying “what are the sorts of things that count for various percentages of effort.”

Member: Regarding the external reviewers with two being external and two able to be from WVU, does that apply to all cases or just teaching faculty?

Staples: Just non-tenure track from assistant to associate.

Member: Regarding parallel processes across all faculty. Regarding requiring external reviewers for teaching faculty, does that mean they will move towards tenure, since we are paralleling all processes?

Staples: The standpoint of tenure at this point of tenure, that is not currently available to us. We have approached it from a long-term contract perspective, being the 3-, 6-, and 9-year contracts depending on the rank of that non-tenure track professor.

Morris: I’d like to add that when a tenure track assistant professor goes up promotion, it is either up or out. If promotion is not successful in our other tracks, they typically continue and try again.

Reed: Expanding tenure is not necessarily something our Board of Governors is focused on right now. We have, unlike other institutions, offered these longer contracts and in this process, librarians could also be offered longer contracts. In terms of salary parity, we have been working towards that. Some colleges have made decisions when there have been funds available for pay raises, to focus intentionally on bringing up the non-tenure track faculty to higher salaries.

Member: In regard to moving away from SEIs and replacing them with a teaching portfolio or review of our teaching; that is administrative work, correct? How will that be accounted for? That is an administrative cost, essentially, so what are your thoughts on that?

Morris: The guidelines will require one evaluation. I suspect that most of your departments would consider your effort to evaluate your peer in your service assignments.

5. Report from Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne

- a. The vote on the revised P&T document is scheduled for the January 9, 2023 meeting
 - i. Faculty Senate cannot vote to amend the document itself
 - ii. The vote will be on a resolution to adopt the amended document. That resolution itself can be amended during the associated discussion
 - iii. Faculty Senate requests that, should you intend to amend that document, please provide us notice so that we can assist with that process and make the amendment and voting as smooth as possible
- b. We have received questions since the last salary increase about salary information and compo ration. Rebecca Myer from Talent and Culture noted that the compensation team has been working with ITS to make faculty member base salaries available.
 - i. If there is a market match or compo ratio, that will also be made available to the faculty member

- ii. This was not rolled out last year due to technical challenges, but it is anticipated to be available in the faculty portfolio portal early in the new year
 - c. Committee on Collaboration met with Evan Widders regarding how faculty can be more involved in recruiting and retention and available resources
For Information – [Resources for Mentoring and Advising Students](#)
 - d. Graduate faculty membership, rules, and policies efforts. Recently drafted guidelines have been shared with graduate program deans. The graduate council will be addressing changes and discussing the document at their January 12, 2023 meeting.
 - e. Faculty Senate will be asking all of our Senate Committee present at least once per semester. Corey Hunt will reach out to chairs to assist in getting that scheduled
6. Curriculum Committee Chair Lori Ogden presented the following items for approval:
For Approval – New Courses Report – [Annex I](#)
For Approval – Course Change Report – [Annex II](#)
For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Esports Management, Key: 1446)
For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Sport Leadership, Key: 1397)
Motion to approve all items carried by voice vote
7. General Education Foundations Committee chair Lisa DiBartolomeo reported that the committee is working on clearer guidelines to determine what does and does not count as a GEF course. Going forward we will be putting out more guidelines and a rubric for those that will be applying for GEF courses.
- a. Dean of Students Cory Ferris is hosting a student life fair on January 23, 2023, modeled after the study abroad fair. Tables from all units in student life will be present to help educate faculty, student, and staff, on all aspects of student life
8. Teaching and Assessment Committee did not have a report
9. Committee on Committee, Membership, and Constituencies did not have a report
10. Faculty Representative to State Government Eloise Elliott reported that there is a meeting with the Advisory Council of Faculty on December 15 and is finalizing the legislative agenda. She will report back to the Faculty Senate at the January meeting.
11. Board of Governors representative Stan Hileman reported on the November Board of Governors meeting:
- a. Institution received a clear financial audit for 2022
 - b. Approves acquisition of a new electronic research administration service
 - c. Received a budget and state allocation update
 - d. Approved changes to BOG rule 1.4
 - e. Received a presentation from Lis Martin, the staff Board of Governors Representative
 - f. The next meeting is scheduled for December 16, 2022
12. No new business

Chair Wayne adjourned the meeting at 4:42 p.m. to reconvene on January 9, 2023.

Corey Hunt
Faculty Senate Office Administrator