

MINUTES  
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2023, 3:15 P.M.

Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne brought the monthly meeting to order at 3:16 p.m. Members and guests participated in person at the College of Law event hall and via video conference.

Members Present:

Armour-Gemmen, M.	Haddox, J.	Orr, E.
Ballard, D.	Hamrick, A.	Phillips, T.
Barghouthi, N.	Hanif, A.	Prinzo, L.
Barnes, E.	Hatipoglu, K.	Reece, R.
Battistella, L.	Hauser, D.	Rinehart, L.
Bhandari, R.	Heady, M.	Roberts, D.
Bianco, C.	Hedrick, J.	Rogers, T.
Bolyard, J.	Hibbert, A.	Rota, C.
Bonner, D.	Hileman, S.	Sabolsky, E.
Bresock, K.	Hodge, J.	Samuels, H.
Bruyaka Collignon, O.	Honaker, L.	Sims, J.
Carducci, H.	Huber, S.	Sizemore, J.
Casey, A.	John, C.	Smith, C.
Celikbas, E.	Johnson, D.	Soccorsi, A.
Cohen, S.	Kale, U.	Sofka, S.
Cook, A.	Katz, J.	Sokos, G.
Cottrell, L.	Kearns, J.	Sowards, A.
Crichlow, R.	Kelly, K.	Staniscia, S.
Cui, P.	Kent, A.	Stueckle, J.
Dahle, G.	LaRue, R.	Swager, L.
Davari, A.	Leary, B.	Szklarz, G.
Davis, D.	Leary, M.	Tack, F.
DeMarco, F.	Leight, M.	Titolo, M.
Di Bartolomeo, L.	Lupo, J.	Totzkay, D.
Dickman, B.	Malarcher, J.	Utzman, R.
Dionne, C.	Marra, A.	Vaddamani, V.
Donley, D.	Martin, J.	Valenti, M.
Dumitrescu, C.	Martucci, A.	Watson, J.
Elliott, E.	McGinnis, R.	Wayne, W.
Elswick, D.	Miltenberger, M.	Weislogel, A.
Evans, K.	Momen, J.	Williams, D.
Faber, T.	Moore, M.	Woloshuk, J.
Feaster, K.	Mucino, V.	Woodberry, K.
Floyd, K.	Murphy, E.	Woods, S.
Fullen, M.	Myers, S.	Wuest, T.
Gross, J.	Nix, A.	Zeni, T.
Grushecky, S.	Ogden, L.	ter Haseborg, H.

Members Excused:

Dey, K.	Knuckles, T.	Ruseski, J.
Ellis, E.	Li, B.	Sherlock, L.
Graziani, G.		Waggy, C.

## Members Absent:

Bernardes, E.  
Burke, R.  
Cronin, A.  
Dilcher, B.  
Dimachkie, Z.  
Downes, M.  
Duenas Garcia, O.  
Eades, D.  
Ellison, M.  
Grossman, D.  
Hessl, A.  
Hines, S.  
Holbein, M.  
Klein, A.  
Law, K.  
Lorenze, S.  
Morgan Paternostro, J.  
Murphy, T.  
Murray, A.  
Nguyen, J.  
Olfert, I.  
Olgers, F.  
Peckens, S.  
Petroni, A.  
Reece, J.  
Renzelli, R.  
Sakhuja, A.  
Shrader, C.  
Stamatakis, M.

1. Chair Wayne presented the [Minutes](#) of the December 5, 2022, Faculty Senate Meeting for approval.  
Motion to approve carried by unanimous consent
2. Provost Maryanne Reed reported on the following:
  - a. 184 faculty are going up for tenure or promotion decisions this semester
  - b. Entering year three of the Academic Transformation program, areas of focus will be displayed on the associated website in the near future
    - a. Focus on student success and strategies for persistence and graduation rates
    - b. \$1 million from the Maier Foundation to create a completion grant program for students close to graduation, which will hopefully go to between 200-500 students
  - c. REACH program designed to support students that are particularly vulnerable to dropping out of college
  - d. Consideration of expanding parts of term to see if abbreviated terms like the winter term should be expanded
    - a. Considering a three week August term prior to the start of the fall semester
  - e. Career Services – exploring offerings to increase student job and internship placement
    - a. Audit of career services programs, both centralized and within colleges

- f. Expansion of WVU Online for targeted programs and audiences
- g. 100 students were awarded \$50,000 worth of scholarships for faculty-led study abroad trips this spring
  - a. The deadline for summer travel scholarships is April 1

**Member:** During the winter session, a faculty member noted that students were having IT troubles and were not able to receive support due to the related offices being closed.

**Reed:** I can't speak on that but I will look into it.

3. Report from Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne

- h. [University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Panel](#)
- i. Executive Committee voted to discontinue the COVID-19 syllabus policy at the December 12, 2022 meeting
- j. January 23<sup>rd</sup> Student Life fair from 11-2 in the Mountainlair ballrooms
- k. A Petition for University Assembly to vote on the Promotion & Tenure document met the 5% threshold determined by the constitution
  - a. As such, a special meeting of the University Assembly will be called to make a decision on the revised university procedures

4. Curriculum Committee Report (Lori Ogden)

For Approval – New Courses Report – [Annex I](#)

For Approval – Course Change Report – [Annex II](#)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Energy Technology, Key:1455)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Engineering Management and Entrepreneurship, Key:1454)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Engineering Technology, Key:1442)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Industrial Engineering Technology, Key:1453)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Mechanical Engineering Technology, Key:1452)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Multi-Disciplinary Engineering Technology, Key:1456)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Nonprofit Management, Key:1473)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Professional Writing & Editing, Key:1448)

For Approval – New Program (Program Code: NEW-TBD: Scientific and Technical Writing, Key:1450)

**Member:** The PLS courses on the new courses report are lacking in content and distinguishing characteristics. I'm not sure if these courses should be tabled until more content is developed, but it should be addressed.

**Ogden:** I can share that our approval process requires two reviewers to examine the course and submit feedback. We look at the CIM entries and we do require a reference syllabus. That reference syllabus is for curriculum review and not distribution of students. Based on the reference syllabus, we did feel that these courses did meet our requirements to move forward.

**Slimak:** To address the other issues, we have been discussing within the committee the role of syllabi in CIM and how they related to proposals. We need to find a balance between providing enough information to the Curriculum Committee without giving excess work to department chairs and the Curriculum Committee itself.

**Member:** When I go through this process, they are very detail orientated, and these courses are just shells. The process doesn't seem comparable to my experience.

**Member:** The feedback we have heard is on two points: a lot of people have been spending a lot of time on syllabi to provide a high level of detail. It isn't clear why some syllabi should be given special status. This is a new program, so there won't be departmental review. There isn't clarity about who will teach these classes or what the classes are supposed to be. It seems like we should pause this program until more of this information can be provided.

**Slimak:** The Curriculum Committee's process includes a pre-conversation about competition and redundancy. We had that conversation with the dean's office in Eberly and Chambers, as there is some overlap. Chambers leadership see them as distinctive enough to not cause conflict. As for the syllabus, there is a list online of what we require for submissions to be approved through the Curriculum Committee. If you are experiencing what you feel are different degrees in your department or college, then that is a conversation for those places.

**Member:** I believe that part of the problem may be that the person submitting these courses for approval in the college is also the individual that approved of these courses.

**Wayne:** I need a specific motion if we are to take action.

**Member:** I would like to yield the floor to Chris Plein from Eberly. He is not a senator, but he has been involved with this program's development.

**Cline:** This is a new major and, as a result, it is building from elements that already exist with the liberal arts aspects of our college. These syllabi that have been proposed have not been created by only an associate dean, but with input by several individuals on a committee during the lengthy time that this program was being developed. This is obviously a work in progress, and the syllabi will continue to be developed.

**Ogden:** These courses have been with the Curriculum Committee for around three months. We have spent hours discussing them, hosted the initiators to attend a meeting to answer questions, and reviewed all associated details.

Motion to remove the Public Service and Leadership courses from the New Courses report, to be considered when the program has been approved by the Curriculum Committee (D. Hauser). Seconded.

Courses removed by amendment: PSL 110, PSL 210, PSL 300, PSL 310, PSL 320, PSL 411

Motion carried with 58 in favor and 19

Motion to approve all remaining items.

Motion carried with 79 in favor and none opposed

5. General Education Foundations Committee chair Lisa DiBartolomeo had no report
6. Teaching and Assessment Committee chair Diana Davis had no report
7. Committee on Committees, Constituencies, and Membership Chair Lesley Cottrell presented an item for approval:

For Approval – Committee Appointments – [Annex III](#)

Motion to approve carried by unanimous consent

8. Faculty Representative to State Government Eloise Elliot reported on the upcoming legislative session and the items likely to be addressed:
- i. Restructuring of PEIA with likely premium increase
  - ii. Restructuring of Health and Human Services
  - iii. Tax reform likely involving personal property tax
  - iv. Addressing mental health and substance abuse issues
  - v. Economic development strategies
  - vi. Teacher aides in all k-12 schools to improve math and reading scores
  - vii. Possibly campus carry and critical race theory

**Member:** Do you have any further information on the restructuring of Health and Human Services?

**Elliott:** Right now they are talking about restructuring it into three different units, but I don't have any more detail. That has been a discussion among legislators and I was informed it would be a top issue.

9. Board of Governors representative Stan Hileman reported on the December 16<sup>th</sup> Board meeting
- b. Clear audit report on the research core
  - c. Next meetings are February 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>

10. For Approval - Resolution to Approve [University Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure – Annex IV](#)

Motion to refer the agenda item to the pending meeting of University Assembly (D. Hauser). Seconded.

**Wayne:** This would table this motion for Faculty Senate, though it could be brought back to Senate if the assembly does not meet quorum, or if it does not come to a decision.

**Member:** What would be the situation if quorum is not met at the meeting? Is the percent needed for approval fixed, what is the percent needed for approval?

**Wayne:** The body cannot take any action without quorum being met, which is described in the constitution. If quorum is not met, then we will have the Executive Committee place it back on the agenda for Faculty Senate. The vote needed to approve is simple majority.

**Member:** I would like to express concern over the representation of units that are affected differently by this document. Can the percent vote needed be debated or amended, or is it fixed?

**Wayne:** That can not be amended.

**Member:** I would request that it is made clear that it would come back to Senate if quorum was not met and that a simple majority must be met to pass.

**Member:** The effect of this vote would be to pass the promotion and tenure document, correct? As in, it cannot be overruled by the provost or other administrators.

**Wayne:** The result would be for faculty senate to approve the document. Faculty Senate and the University Assembly are advisory bodies and cannot override an action from the Provost. The Office of the Provost has indicated that they plan to work with Faculty Senate regardless of the outcome.

**Member:** Is the vote anonymous and who will be reading the results?

**Wayne:** It will be anonymous and identifying information will not be shared. Corey Hunt and I will be the only individuals that will view the full voting results.

Motion carried with 73 in favor and 9 opposed.

11. For Approval – Resolution on the Process the Process for Developing College-Level P&T Documents – [Annex V](#)

Motion to table this item until the University Assembly or Faculty Senate have acted on the resolution to approve the revised University Procedures document (D. Hauser). Seconded.

Motion carried with 87 and 1 opposed

12. New Business

a. S. Crichlow: The Board of Governors rule change at the end of last academic year mostly seemed to impact faculty in the College of Law faculty. How do our BoG representatives handle situations that impact small populations of faculty?

**Martucci:** For this issue, Stephanie Taylor came and spoke to the School of Law directly addressing questions and concerns on rule change and how it might impact faculty. The specific dialogue was intentional as most of the questions and comments were coming from that college. Based on the feedback we received from faculty, we felt that the concerns had been properly addressed and that further action wasn't required.

**Hileman:** The vast majority of items addressed at the board level is global, impacting the entire university. It is rare that we experience issues that are only relevant to a small percentage of faculty.

Faculty Senate Chair Scott Wayne adjourned the meeting at 4:13 p.m. to reconvene on Monday, February 13, 2023.

Corey Hunt  
Faculty Senate Office Administrator