

**West Chester University of PA  
Faculty Senate  
2010-2011  
Thursday March 3, 2011 Full Assembly Minutes**

**Members Present: *designated by an X***

Alessandria, Tina	<i>Proxy, Tara Guerriero</i>	Li, Huimin (Amy)	<i>Proxy, Orhan Kara</i>
Bill, Debra	<i>Absent</i>	Means, Jennifer	<i>Absent</i>
Brown, Eleanor	<i>Proxy, Carolyn Sealfon</i>	Metz, Stacie	X
Cooke, Lynne	X	Morgan, Tanya	<i>Proxy, Stacie Metz</i>
Cressler, Walter	X	Murphy, Corinne	<i>Proxy, Dan Forbes</i>
DeHope, Eli	X	Nadolny, Larysa	X
Dobrzelewski, J. C.	<i>Proxy, Van Stiefel</i>	Nitica, Viorel	X
Garthwait, Clayton	X	Norris, Bruce	<i>Proxy Tom Seified</i>
Ghetie, Dora	<i>Absent</i>	Onderdonk, Julian	X
Gilboy, Mary Beth	<i>Proxy, Dave Delgado</i>	Pierlott, Matthew	X
Haggard, Cynthia	X	Sanz-Sanchez, Israel	X
Halko, Gabrielle	<i>Proxy, Robin Cleonard</i>	Sharpe, Heather	<i>Proxy, Cate Crosby</i>
Heinerichs, Scott	X	Shivde, Geeta	X
Hutton, Jane	X	Smith, Paul K.	X
Kara, Orhan	X	Staruch, Liz	<i>Proxy, Lynne Cooke</i>
Kelly, Leonard	<i>Absent</i>	Stiefel, Van	X
Lawton, Bessie Lee	X	Verden, Claire	<i>Proxy, Carolyn Sealfon</i>
Leonard, Robin	X	Winterton, Sally	<i>Proxy, Cynthia Haggard</i>
	Mark Cerofeci, Student Gov't		X

## Welcome and Introduction of Proxies

- Senate President Julian Onderdonk welcomed all in attendance and introduced proxies. Additional guests not giving presentations included:  
Jordan Schugar, Dept. of English  
Don Barr, Dean of Health Sciences  
Dr. Gerry Hertel, Dept. of Biology. Guest for Quality of Research Presentation

## “Quality of Research Day” Presentations

### ***Survey on Qualitative Research at WCU***

Stacie Metz, Dept. of Health

While quantitative analysis often involves statistical/mathematical approaches to evaluating answers to pre-determined questions/tests, *qualitative* analysis evaluates language gleaned from:

- Open-ended questions
- Case studies
- In-depth interviews
- Focus group responses, etc.

Rather than numbers the data evaluated tends to be language based, such as

- Themes
- Qualities
- Topics
- Patterned responses to framework questions

Existing software exists for qualitative methods

- Examples include: NVivo, Atlas, Ethnograph
- Is such software used extensively at WCU?
- Software is expensive, some researchers surveyed use copies purchased individually
- No dept./college has a site license
- Should departments and/or colleges purchase site licenses?

Survey determined that of the 56 respondents (at present) only 6 presently use such software

- 68% presently evaluate data by hand
- 73% are somewhat or very likely to use such software if it were available
- 55% stated that lack of such software inhibited/determined research methods
- Junior or mid-career faculty most likely to state that lack/cost of software has inhibited their research
- NVivo seemed the preferred choice of respondents

Question/answer discussion addressed the following:

- How much is a site license?
- While purchasing individual copies may prove less expensive, site licenses make software available to students and classrooms.
- Could Tech Fee or Educational Services support such licenses?
- Would it be wise to have a company demonstrate software in order to determine interest among scholars and teachers?

## ***Institutional Review Board/ Human Subjects Committee***

Paul Smith, Dept. of Kinesiology

- Health and Human Services Federal Guidelines inform WCU guidelines for research involving human subjects
- The Human Subjects Committee at WCU reviews applications for such research. Federal law requires these applications. Funding organizations and professional conferences, etc., often require documentation of compliance.
- Institutional Review Board website has guidelines
- Relevant research must reflect compliance to guidelines in stated research methods.
- Application must be submitted to them
- Resources are available on the WCU site:  
[https://d2l.wcupa.edu/d2l/common/navBar/externalLink.d2l?ou=6605&k=c\\_5221](https://d2l.wcupa.edu/d2l/common/navBar/externalLink.d2l?ou=6605&k=c_5221)

The application must address the following:

- Must be formatted in word, downloadable, and revisable.
- Must provide a complete checklist
- Must provide relevant project information including the following:
  - Defined populations, certain specific documents are necessary for specific populations
  - Summary of hypothesis and methods
  - Selection methods
  - Informed consent procedures
  - Methods for confidentiality
  - The existence of placebos in research
  - Overall risk/benefit assessment

Q/A discussion addressed the topic of student research: professor is responsible for adherence to the guidelines, but no formal application is required. Collaborations with researchers outside the university also require documents from both institutions. The turnaround for the process: does it take 2-3 weeks (or longer)? Some senators suggested the application process took longer.

- Convert to pdf and submit to reviewers
- Receive reviewer's report/evaluations, etc.
- Attain NIH approval certificate, necessary signatures, etc.

## ***Academic Year Model (AYM) Report***

Jen Bacon, Dept. of English and Co-Chair AYM Committee

- Task force created to review AYM in 2009.
- Initially developed as an internal (academic affairs) budget tool, the model now serves as the funding mechanism for staffing the academic programs of the university.

- Address/redress “myths” that the AYM determines a large percentage of the budget; it does not affect budget as much as it determines class size, temporary hire, and fund distribution-related decisions, most notably AWA.
- Generalized faculty-to-student ratios among the PASSHE 14 were set to create benchmarks that once “seemed reasonable” but which have crept up between 1998-2004 from 1:24 to 1:26.7.
- Nevertheless, WCU’s overall ratio of 18.5 remains fourth smallest ratio among PASSHE schools.
- Report is complete and available on Shared Vision Site (<http://www.wcupa.edu/sharedvision/taskgroups/aymTaskGroupCharge.asp>)
- Recommendations include revising the AYM “instrument” to address pedagogical concerns. It has seemed that while pressing budget issues might result in a given class-size increase, there were never mechanisms in place to *lower* a class size target once an adjustment had been made. How could such a “tool” be consistently integrated with the present AYM metric? How can non-dollar constraints be worked into it? How might such rules/constraints be formulated? Work on modifications to the AYM begins this summer.
- In general, the AYM seems an appropriate model for the present “distributed leadership” structure for university-wide fund allocation. At this point, radical changes to the AYM are not being recommended. Nevertheless, questions were raised as to whether such “benchmarks” are applied equally to other aspects of the university (facilities, administration, staffing, etc.), and does the AYM truly represent a “benchmark” that prioritizes academic affairs?

### ***Departmental and College Research Productivity and Institutional Support***

Dr. Marc Gagne, Dept. of Geology and Astronomy

- Standard 10 of the Middle State Self-Study acknowledges the existence of current instruments in place at the college level to promote faculty development through locally administered faculty development grants, summer research stipends, and AWA.
- Standard 10 acknowledges the role of the Office of Sponsored Research (OSR) to facilitate research by assisting faculty in identifying relevant funding resources and grant opportunities, as well as assisting in grant writing and preparation. OSR also oversees Faculty Development Committee (FDC) grants.
- The study refers to special efforts made by the president to “provide reassigned time to successful support pursuit of external funding.”
- Despite these efforts, the Campus Climate Survey suggests that less than half of the faculty is satisfied with present level of research support.
- WCU ranks lowest of PASSHE 14 in the ratio of Federal research dollars granted per student FTE.
- Some analysis undertaken by Working Group 6 (responsible for compiling and writing Standard 10) could not be included in the final version of the Self-Study. Some of this information, including the differences in funding amounts from college to college, was included in Gagne’s presentation. Of particular interest

was a Table acknowledging the actual number of journal articles, books, and presentations, etc. by faculty across all WCU departments.

- Gagne's presentation and ensuing discussion focused on some fundamental questions: Can the university take steps to improve faculty development opportunities? Are "faculty development" and "research productivity" actually the same goal? Has the emphasis on supporting research with direct ties to classroom content had a positive or negative effect on research quality in terms of outside funding? Is the monetary amount of grants received from Federal sources an adequate measure of faculty productivity for WCU?

### ***Report from APSCUF***

Cliff Johnston, Dept. of Mathematics and local WCU President of APSCUF

- Update on CBA: While negotiations have not yet occurred, the method for negotiating has changed. Negotiating Committee (NC) cannot approve outright. NC must be unanimous in its acceptance of contract before submitting to membership.
- APSCUF has hired a professional negotiator for the NC. Team also includes faculty with a variety of appropriate skills.
- We do not yet know the hired negotiator for the State, nor have we heard the Governor's budget.
- Retrenchment concerns at Kutztown and Mansfield. APSCUF is wondering how did the "process fail?" Why did retrenchment happen? Reasons given for a recent layoff of a 20-year veteran teacher were vague or inconsistent.
- Concerning contract: Johnston reminded senators of the present law that whatever contract is in place stays in effect unless a strike or lockout occurs. So, we may not have a contract this summer, and therefore, the present contract will remain in effect for the next academic year. Johnston suggested that this was a likely (and perhaps preferred) scenario.
- Johnston reminded senators that APSCUF requires off-campus contact info.

### **Additional Business**

- The Faculty Senate agreed that a letter in support of the collective-bargaining rights of state workers in Wisconsin and Ohio would be drafted by the Senate Executive Committee. Letter will be submitted via email for Faculty Senate approval. After 24 hours of voting, the Senate will send the letter out.
- Final Committee reports will be presented and submitted at the last Senate meeting of the year on 4/15.

Respectfully submitted,  
Van Stiefel  
At-Large Member, Executive Committee  
AY 2010/2011