**Minutes from the WVSU Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting**

**from Friday, November 18, 2016, in Hamblin Hall**

**Present:** R. Ford, Chair; R. Baker, Vice-Chair; T. Alderman, Secretary; B. Ladner, ACF

 Representative; J. Pietruszynski, At-Large

**Absent:** R. Harris, At-Large; T. Guetloff, BOG Representative

**1**. The minutes from the meeting on October 28, 2016, were amended at number 7 to clarify

 that the procedures and policies for administering student evaluations of faculty is the

 purview of the Faculty Senate’s Faculty Personnel Committee.

**2**. Dr. Ford asked if there has been any progress on the idea of an administrative drop of

 students not attending class. Do we want to keep pushing? Dr. Baker noted that the

 Catalog’s language would have to be changed to allow for this. And we have to decide if

 we mean students who miss the first *day* or the first *week* of classes, without an acceptable

 alibi. It was agreed that we shall continue to pursue this issue.

**3**. Regarding the status of Faculty Senate Committees,

 Faculty Research and Development: Dr. Pietruszynski has e-mailed the committee members

 to see who is chair and has not received a reply.

 Cultural Activities and Educational Assemblies: University Relations needs to appoint

 someone as a representative. Has the description in the Constitution/By-

 Laws/Handbook been revised to reflect the changes previously made in the Senate?

 Teacher Education: it still needs a representative elected by students in the Education Dept.

 The Land Grant Office has not responded to requests for clarification on its representatives.

Dr. Ford noted that the Graduate Studies Council is not a Faculty Senate Committee, just advisory to the Provost, analogous to the Senate, but without the independent status that the Senate has. Dr. Baker asked if we want the GSC to be affiliated with the Senate. Dr. Ford said it does need a higher status. Dr. Baker also asked about the status of faculty teaching graduate classes: is this a plum to be awarded or withdrawn by the administration? That is not a good policy.

**4**. There was some discussion about the policy of hiring faculty with tenure status.

**5**. There was some discussion of whether the Faculty Personnel Committee should create a

 draft of how to run the student evaluation of faculty, or we should we create a draft and let

 them edit it. We agree to create the draft . Then we discussed whether the reverse side the

 forms were being tabulated or analyzed. The Executive Committee noted that I.T. should

 run the individual labels for envelopes. Drs. Seyedmonir and Waugh have been working

 on a revision of the forms. A liaison with Dr. Dr, Chair of FPC, needs to be clear. We

 moved to have an official Task Force on student evaluations from the Faculty Senate be

 appointed, with a date for reporting the Senate on its recommendations.

**6**. Regarding the mold or mildew in Keith Hall, Dr. Ford said the President sent a report on

 Nov. 17, 2016.

**7**. Dr. Ford reported that Dr. Vaughan has questioned the administrative evaluation form for

 faculty in place this fall semester. Vaughan believes that each College should determine the

 criteria for evaluating research and to distinguish between evaluation for merit (for which

 there has been no funding for years) and retention/tenure/promotion.
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**8**. Dr. Ford pursued the issue of tuition breaks for dependants of faculty and staff, suggesting

 a survey to find out how much it would cost, whether it would be for one class or for a full

 schedule, whether we would/should require a certain G.P.A., and if it should apply to

 tuition (*vs*. fees) only. Dr. Pietruszynski volunteered to see if “Survey Monkey” can be

 used to poll the faculty/staff on this issue.

**9**. Dr. Pietruszynski mentioned rumors about General Education freshman experience courses,

 and the President’s idea that these courses should cover the University’s history and

 structure as well as College-related material.

**10**. On the issue of Early Enrollment in high schools, Dr. Ford noted that these include courses

 that introduce majors, and that department chairs are required to approve hiring and

 conduct some monitoring activities. But several issues have arisen: are these chairs

 actually observing classrooms in various schools? Are the teachers in the high schools

 qualified and do their course replicate the ones at WVSU? Is their relevant data (e.g.,

 résumés, syllabi) being submitted in a timely manner? Nathan Gainer is currently in

 charge of this program.

**11**. An issue of “variable” faculty loads was introduced by Dr. Ladner. She reported that the

 Provost is suggesting that faculty not conducting active research (or with some other
 “deficit”) be ordered to teach five courses. A post-tenure review would be one way to

 determine the “deficits” or “poor workers.” The course relief for faculty doing research

 could be offset somehow by adjunct salaries. It is important, she continued, that this be

 separate from the PEER Program (Promoting Educational Excellence [through] Research).

 Perhaps a two-tier system regarding service vs. research could be used to amend current

 methods of evaluation regarding this loaded suggestion. Later in the meeting, it was

 noted by Dr. Baker that this could be an issue of job descriptions and different kinds of

 appointments for different kinds of professors and different faculty evaluations. Could

 this policy be flexible, he wondered, if a professor does research for two years and then

 stops?

**12**. Dr. Ford asked if anyone can receive a sabbatical anymore. This is opposed to being

 granted leave of absence.

**13**. The Faculty Senate meeting is set of Friday, December 2, 2016. Aside from the regular

 reports, the agenda will include issues of faculty load and the possible two-tier system,

 PEER grants and grants from Faculty Research and Development, and extra service in lieu

 of research, and Dr. Vaughan’s question about College-based criteria on faculty evaluation

 by the administration.

**14**. The General Faculty Meeting is set for Wednesday, December 7, 2016, again addressing Dr.

 Vaughan’s question regarding College-based criteria for administrative evaluation of

 faculty, tuition breaks for dependants of faculty and staff, and a suggestion from the

 Provost about “competency-based” education, which Dr. Ford will ask the Provost about

 in the meantime.

Respectfully submitted by

**T. Alderman**, Secretary of the Faculty Senate