

WCU FACULTY SENATE MEETING		Date: October 20, 2011	
		Time: 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	
		Location: FHG Library Room 613	
Facilitator:	Julian Onderdonk, President	Type of meeting:	Scheduled Monthly Meeting
Note Taker:	Van Stiefel for Tanya Morgan, Recording Secretary	Misc.	
Attendees:	<p>Members: Brown, Eleanor; Ghetie, Dora; Stiefel, Van; Pierlott, Matthew; Staruch, Liz; Li, Huimin (Amy); Metz, Stacie; Sharpe, Heather; Schugar, Heather R; Haggard, Cynthia; Means, Jennifer; Verden, Claire; Murphy, Corinne; Kenney, Gerardina L.; Cressler, Walt; DeHope, Eli; Shivde, Geeta; Leonard, Robin Caldwell; Nitica, Viorel; Dobrzelewski, Jean-Christophe; Onderdonk, Julian H.;</p> <p>Proxies: Gagne, Marc for Sanz-Sanchez, Israel; Staruch, Liz for Kelly, Leonard; Li, Huimin (Amy) for Kara, Orhan; Karpinski, Christine for Gilboy, Mary Beth AND Heinerichs, Scott; Guerriero, Tara for Alessandria, Tina; Siefried, Tom for Morgan, Tanya</p> <p>Absent: Bill, Debra; Cooke, Lynne; Kolasinski, Kurt; Lawton, Bessie Lee; Nadolny, Larysa; Smith, Paul K; Winterton, Sally</p> <p>Debra</p> <p>Guest: Sandu, Bhim ;</p>		
Please read:	Minutes		
Please bring:	Agenda		
AGENDA ITEMS			
Topic	Discussion		Action
✓ <u>Welcome to Senators, Proxies and Guests</u> (Senate President)			
✓ Announcements/Business (Senate President)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approval of minutes from 9/16/11 meeting 		
✓ By-Laws Revision Presentation (Van Stiefel, Chair, Membership and By-Laws Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Van Stiefel, presented draft of By Laws revision comparing/contrasting draft with current By Laws. Details of presentation are available to Senators on D2L. <u>Discussion re: articles:</u> ○ Article II: Discussion on “Senate will submit recommendations and proposals to the University Administration...” portion. Is procedure adequate, changeable according to CBA? Some like the idea of having people who deny our request coming to report to us first, before we go to the President. Eli DeHope: draft doesn’t necessarily have to be reviewed by APSCUF but we shouldn’t be split w/APSCUF. Julian Onderdonk: thought procedure might not be practical to follow this in all cases. Jen Means: thinks President should have to respond directly to our requests. Marc Gagne: when someone like Middle States reviews us, they expect someone to be taking responsibility for governance. Senate plays a smaller role than perhaps we could. Maybe we should clarify relationship with APSCUF. 		<p>Presentation materials posted on D2L. Discussion board organized by Article provided for feedback from Senate</p> <p>Members will be asked to review the By-Laws revision between the Nov and Dec meeting</p> <p>The By-Laws revision will be discussed at the Dec meeting.</p>

	<p>Eli DeHope: reiterated that our role is to focus on campus climate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Article IV: Julian Onderdonk: clarified why we're proposing changing responsibilities of committees and chairs—namely because committees must meet outside of Senate in order to get things done, and records help us to maintain continuity and track our work and progress. ○ Article V: Julian Onderdonk: clarified why we're proposing changes with regard to requiring that Senators get designated proxies, etc—consistent with CAPC and other policies about attendance—meant to ensure that Senators are actually contributing to Senate work. ○ Article VII: Lisa Milhous and Marc Gagne: clarified that right now, faculty from across campus vote on constituency-specific seats, even though the faculty elected will not represent them specifically. A question was raised about whether this means more senior (and thus, more easily recognized by people across campus) people are more likely to be elected. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Academic Planning Advisory Committee (Geeta Shivde) ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Committee was initially charged with staging a 3-wk "input process" compiling information about the health of univ. depts. This involves looking at data from from departments, from the center for Institutional Research, etc. ○ Committee is to consider/critique metrics (student credit hours, diverse communities, 3-year averages, five-year trends etc. as well as "qualitative information" given by individual department. ○ Committee gave feedback on overall timeline. ○ "Final decisions" made by February. Discussion addressed vagueness of what "final decisions" actually means. ○ President assures committee that he has "no preconceived notions of how to make cuts;" indeed, he wonders whether "some [smaller] dept's need additional support?" ○ President says that low enrollment will be a consideration along with cyclical trends, but such metrics are not the only criteria. ○ It is generally hoped is that qualitative measures are not necessarily compiled to defend [under-performing] departments from a quantitative standpoint. ○ The overall project is considered "different from program review," though such reviews might request similar data. ○ After first set of info from departments, APAC will re-convene to consider new data. ○ Committee made "first step" of acquiring data from departments. Also attaining dept. feedback: why are numbers low? Are more resources necessary? ○ Discussion addressed the fact that there was some degree of surprise from Strategic Planning Committee about mission of APAC. How will findings affect strategic plan? Strategic Planning concerns "who are our students going to be?" Are the projects compatible? 	<p>Geeta Shivde will provide updates</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ APSCUF (Lisa Millhouse, local APSCUF president) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ APSCUF local leadership presented on various concerns: ○ APSCUF local leadership is confident about 	

	<p>collaboration effective <u>collaboration</u> with Senate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Retrenchment Concerns</u>: why does President keep retrenchment letter active if other PASSCHE members (less fiscally secure) have rescinded? One possible reason: Governor may not come through with promised budget; therefore, keep WCU needs retrenchment letter in affect as a “worst case” precaution. ○ Yet IUP is in worse financial shape, and no retrenching has taken place? ○ <u>Political concerns</u>: In February Gov. will ask for more cuts. APSCUF going to Harrisburg in March “No students have written that tuitions are a problem” a Senator is quoted as saying. ○ <u>Negotiations over new contract</u> ○ Negotiations seem to be going “OK,” though they have not gotten very far. Milhous believes the hired professional negotiator (for APSCUF) is very good. Only recently has a new guy representing the state become involved, While an early offer from the state was outright rejected; clearly, it was merely an opening gambit. Since both new negotiators have become more active, nearly every meeting has arrived at something useful “agreed upon.” ○ Healthy U is probably not going away, though the consequences for “not complying” remain undefined. 	
✓ Strategic Plan (Eli DeHope)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eli DeHope announced that “Internal/external stakeholders will get a survey” re: new Strategic Plan.” ○ Strategic planning concerns every area of the university: academics, facilities, foundation, etc. ○ Survey will help determine future questions posed to various stakeholders, such as: “Do we expand, sustainability, etc.?” 	
✓ Campus Climate Liaisons (Senate President)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LGBTQ (Eli DeHope) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has embarked on a fact-finding mission about transgendered students. How are they doing according to housing, health, bathrooms, etc.? Does the campus need to be educated on how to treat such students in the classroom? ○ University Forum (Gerardina Martin) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The deadline for the \$30,000 earmarked by the President last Spring for climate initiatives has passed, and the grant committee will announce awards soon. A similar amount has been allocated for this coming year, so look for the University Forum RFP in the Spring semester or contact Gerardina Martin, Learning Assistance and Resource Center, at gmartin@wcupa.edu for more information. 	
✓ Committees		
✓ Committee Work	Committees met and will submit mid-year reports to the recording secretary after the 12/2/11 meeting.	

NEXT MEETING

Day and Time:	Friday, December 2, 2011 2:00 – 4:00 pm
----------------------	--

Topics:	
----------------	--

Please read/bring:	Faculty Senate Agenda
---------------------------	-----------------------