

# Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Monday October 8, 2018

3:30-5:00 pm – Clinton Hall 126

**Senators Present:** Ahmed, Babnich, Bailey, Barut, Bolin, Bray, Brown, Bryant, Buerge, Bukonda, Carlson, Castro, Celestin, Clawson, Decker, Dowling, English, Granada, Hakansson, Hill, Hull, Jameson, Jarman, Lockard, Markova, Moody, Nicks, Price, Pulaski, Schwartz, Small, Smith, Smith-Campbell, Solomey, Sternfeld-Dunn, Tamtam, Walker, Yildirim, Zewde.

**Excused:** Moore-Jansen, Muthitacharoen.

**Absent:** He, Jeffres, Showstack, Suzuki, Weheba, Yao.

[Attendance 2018-2019](#)

## Summary of Action

- **Approved nominations from rules committee for vacant senate positions on senate and Faculty Affairs Committee.**

Agenda Item	Notes/Discussion/Process	Outcome/Action/Completed
Calling the Meeting to Order	3:30 pm	
Informal Statements and Proposals		
Approval of Minutes	<a href="#">Sept. 24<sup>th</sup></a>	
President's Report		
Committee Reports		
Rules: Jeff Jarman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Jeff Noble (Sport Management) as replacement Senator for Frank Rokosz.</li><li>2. Laura Zellers (Accounting) for Faculty Affairs</li><li>3. Raina Rutti (Management) for Library</li></ol>	MSC
Fac. Affairs: Deepak Gupta:	<a href="#">First Reading: Modification IV of WSU Policy 3.06</a> Consensual Relationships – Concerns were raised about the phrase “over a student”. Questions arose about whether the changes represented an expansion in the policy. Concerns raised about whether this directly addresses the issue of power differentials. Senators felt there needed to be more clarification in cases where there isn’t a clear power differential. It was explained that the intent was to clarify the policy and evaluate scope. A question was asked about hiring - if somebody on a hiring committee has been involved with a candidate. Concerns were raised about the absence of the explicit mentions of student-faculty relationships and where they are forbidden or allowed.	
Old Business		

Academic Integrity	Any recommendations for additional information related to the policy? Information sessions were attended by about 28 participants. Meetings were perceived as helpful and more meetings were requested and/or video training (recorded discussion). Orientation meetings for different colleges could also be useful.	Informational mtgs. Oct. 4-5
New Business		
Provost/Academic Affairs Update	Provost Rick Muma	
Deliberation topic KBOR Faculty Review/Workload	<p>Thought Questions (<a href="#">Policy 4.12; 4.13</a>)</p> <p>Rick gave a presentation of the new Academic Affairs Priorities for 2018-19. Discussed shared governance, strategic enrollment, evaluation and reward structure and innovative academic offerings for students including certificates and badges. Last year approved the largest number of badges to date. Specific attention was paid to evaluating new reward structures based on faculty strengths and providing separate paths for faculty who are better at teaching or research. KBOR is interested in promoting funded research and trying to increase the level of external funding. Issues/concerns with our current faculty review/workload system?</p> <p>Rick talked about the lack of flexibility in current policy for allowing faculty to get credit for things like teaching and service on par with research accomplishments. Mentioned that this would be a good place to implement the uniscope model.</p> <p><b>Briefly discussed the draft of the chemistry department’s proposed policy</b> for scaled teaching loads based on research activity.</p> <p><b>Issues with equity across departments.</b> – it was stated that there shouldn’t be a one-size-fits-all model.</p> <p>C: In small departments it may not be possible for anybody at all to take a teaching reduction due to course demands.</p> <p>C: How do we avoid developing a faculty hierarchy?</p> <p><b>What is workload? What does % mean? 40/40/20?</b> <b>What is your “role statement?”</b></p> <p>A clearly articulated and updated role statement that can change from year to year will be necessary if roles are going to be changing.</p>	

	<p>Concern raised about how faculty are evaluated by outside reviewers that are primarily concerned with research accomplishments if we are allowing faculty to advance by mainly teaching.</p> <p>Department T&amp;P documents will need to change to accommodate any changes in teaching/research evaluation models.</p> <p>Some discussion revolved around do pure teaching faculty remain engaged with the state of the art in their field.</p> <p><b>How can we play to faculty strengths and the University’s needs (increased research funding; expert educators?)</b>  <b>Can we incentivize faculty strengths?</b>  Discussed the trap where faculty members could be producing more credit hours, but be paid less than somebody who is bringing in large research grants. What are the incentives for promotion to someone who is carrying a large teaching load?  Would it be possible to give teaching relief to individuals who have generated a large amount of credit hours?</p> <p>The issue of the impact on tenure track came up several times.</p> <p>More teaching; less research/scholarship or more research/scholarship less teaching?  What does a “record of research/scholarship” mean?  Betty is chairing this committee – send additional thoughts and comments to her. Rick will be presenting our progress to the regents on November 7.</p>	
As May Arise	None	

Meeting Adjourned: 4:51 pm

**Next Senate Meeting: Oct. 22<sup>nd</sup>**, 3:30-5:00 pm, Clinton Hall Room 126

Save the Date: Shared Faculty, UP, and USS **Senate meeting Oct. 29<sup>th</sup>**: 3:30 to 5 pm:  
Speakers **President Bardo**; Foundation Pres. E. King; United Way Presentation