

## Minutes

### Faculty Senate Meeting December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Ferrell Hall 308 1:30 p.m.

- I. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order by Senate vice-chair, Dr. Rob Harris at 1:30 p.m.
- II. **Reading and Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of the last meeting were approved
- III. **Reading and Approval of Agenda:** The meeting Agenda was approved
- IV. **Reports:**
  - a. **PRESIDENT** – Dr. Hemphill had several issues of good news to report to the senate. He began by informing the senate that the university was able to refinance its existing bonds at a lower rate. Because of this, the school was able to generate \$6M with the same debt service previously held. \$5.5M will go directly back into campus projects. These projects include 1.) \$3M into finishing the work on Fleming Hall (there has been a strict “no change” order on current construction to keep the project on time and within budget. 2.) Updating the school’s technology structure. The goal is to have a technology infrastructure that will be more modern, including a 100% wi-fi campus and smart classrooms. 3.) Updating classrooms on campus. A list of needed updates will be compiled by Feb 1<sup>st</sup> and classrooms will be updated on a priority basis “until the money is gone.” Concluding the first part of his report, Dr. Hemphill fielded the following questions:
    - i. Questions: Is the money going to be released from HEPC for library services? Dr. Hemphill requested the library consult him as soon as the meeting was over so he could see exactly where the money is.
    - ii. Who will determine classroom set-up plans? The deans
    - iii. How much of the bond revenue will go towards planned athletic facility? Fleming is good to go, the new complex won’t have money from the bonds, instead, money for that project is being raised by other means.

Dr. Hemphill’s second shared issue was the movement towards “Outcome Based Funding.” The original intent was to award the funds in addition to a school’s base funding, but that idea changed. He is currently working with the other Presidents of WV Universities to come up with a model that does not unfairly take or redistribute money from any institution. He asked that the Faculty Senate allow the presidents to work through the issue before any action is taken.

The faculty was also informed that approval has moved forward for construction of a new residence hall. Overall, Dr. Hemphill wanted to reassure the faculty that there was no overall feeling of “gloom and doom.” Instead, he reiterated that although we are not where we need to be, we should be feeling good about where we are and we can achieve where we need to be by continuing to do what we are doing.

- b. **PROVOST / VP of ACADEMIC AFFAIRS.** Unable to attend the meeting, Dr. Byers submitted a written report (available on-line).
- c. **EPC** – Dr. Mike Anderson presented the EPC report to the Senate (available on-line). All actions taken by the EPC were accepted by the senate without discussion.
- d. **BOARD OF GOVERNORS (BOG).** The Board of Governors report by Dr. Tom Guetzloff is available on-line. Dr. Guetzloff discussed the latest board meetings, highlighting recent important items. In institutional advancement it was reported that several million dollars of “ask” money was currently on the table. Academic Policies reported that a 2+2 nursing program with Southern CC was moving along with an possible implementation date of Jan 2014. The MPA (Master’s in Public Administration) was also approved and may start sooner than Jan 2014 . Recruitment and Retention numbers were up and a new F.A. Director had been hired and began on Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>.

Overall, Guetzloff reported that the board was pleased with the current direction of the school.

- e. **ACF** – There were no important action items brought forth by the AFC, however, a full report available on line
- f. **FACULY SCHOLARSHIP** – Rebecca Connor, chair, began her report (fully available on-line) by thanking Drs. Ford and Ruhnke for the work and effort that went into creating an unrestricted account in order to be able to draw money from to give directly to the students. She was happy to announce that for the first time, every college had given an award to students. The importance of continuing to give donations (to either the restricted or unrestricted account) was important as this is the only opportunity for the faculty to give scholarship money directly to the students.

#### V. New Business:

- a. **Review and Revision of the Faculty Handbook/Constitution and By-laws - formation of an *ad hoc* committee**

The senate discussed a need for a review and possible revision of the Faculty Handbook / Constitution and By-laws. The Faculty Exec had discussed the matter and asked if an ad hoc committee should be formed or if the existing committees were sufficient. There was much discussion over how exact vs. interpretative the language of these documents should be as well as the possibility of making them sound like one coherently written artifact. Other issues such as who was “in charge” of each document, who would suggest the changes, who should approve the changes, etc (most with no direct answer) came up. It was concluded that the matter should go back to the Faculty Executive Committee for a more formalized plan to be brought up at a later meeting.

**b. EPC, Faculty Personnel and General Education – posting of rules and regulations for course proposals**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee had been asked by several members of the faculty and administration if the rules and regulations for the EPC, GE, and FPC could be made more transparent so everyone would understand what is expected, when decisions were going to be made, and what the results of the decisions were. All members present agreed that these were important to the successful workings of a university. Dr. Pietruszynski, as GE Coordinator, announced that as soon as the new web-site was up, all of the requested information would be posted and updated regularly.

**c. Requirements for participating in graduation ceremonies - Issue of spring ceremonies for a student 3-6 hours short**

A request had come from the VPAA / Provost office for the Faculty Senate to discuss the schools policy of a "clean" graduation. Traditionally, students who "walked" during graduation had to have fulfilled ALL obligations to the university (both academically and financially). The senate discussed if this was a necessary policy, some stating that it was nice to see that we had this standard, others argued that such a policy was not needed as a student with 3 credit hours left could make up those hours (especially during summer session) and, therefore should be allowed to walk. It was noted that a change this policy would also mean a change (for the better) in the appeals process as the current process does not allow those wishing to graduate to appeal a grade after they have been cleared for graduation. It could also encourage more students to finish major degree requirements as opposed to switching to a Regents degree so they could graduate. No "official" action was taken and the consensus was to allow the VPAA / Provost office to come up with policy language.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT** There being no further business or announcements, **a motion to adjourn the general faculty meeting. Motion carried.** Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Pietruszynski, Secretary  
Faculty Senate