

Minutes from the WVSU Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting  
Friday, September 29, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. in Hamblin Hall 002

**Attendance:** Chair, Rich Ford; Vice-Chair, Jessica Barnes-Pietruszynski; Secretary, Dirk Johnson; AL Rep., Jeff Pietruszynski; AL Rep., Tom Geutzloff; Historian, Deborah Wells; BOG Rep., Frank Vaughn, ACF Rep., Barbara Ladner (telephone); Guest, Barbara Liedl

Meeting called to order 12:05 p.m.

1. R. Ford asked if all were in favor of approving the minutes. All were in favor.
2. B. Liedl was invited to discuss the need for a policy regarding awarding tenure to tenure-track research appointments within land grant. Padma Nimmakayala and she are tenured. Sanje is a tenure-track 3<sup>rd</sup> year research professor of extension who also teaches, and thus receives limited teacher evaluations. Admeer Hass was offered tenure track, but hasn't been teaching or turning in paperwork for annual evaluation. Carmen Damare is a term appointment through EPSCOR funding. Even if not going up for promotion, she should be evaluated to have a record for her as a young professional, as should all future term faculty appointments. Padma and Barbara were granted tenure without going through the faculty process, but Barbara didn't agree with this procedure and complained about the lack of process at the time, as it set a bad precedent. Given that there are all types now, a comprehensive policy would be best. Frank said there are other faculty beside Land Grant with divided responsibilities, but these faculty are still required to follow the faculty process without exceptions being made. He felt we should work on an entire policy to address these circumstances. T. Guetzloff suggested we wrap Land Grant into the University, rather than having them as an appendage. The make-up of a committee charged with writing this policy was discussed. Barbara Liedl, Promotion and Tenure, Mike Pennington, and call others as needed.
3. B. Liedl said that IRB is desperately needed, and not just for science. Indirect money also needs transparency because we could be in big trouble given for note following the negotiated contracts. A research council met for a year in 2011-12.
4. D. Wells stated there's a money payment issue. Once signatures are all on the PO's, we should not be waiting to pay these. She has seen this happen lately, leaving faculty in an awkward position with vendors they have forged relationships with.
6. The Provost has appointed a committee to work on the early enrollment issues. We will leave this committee to look for solutions and evaluate their conclusions. We expect good things will come from this group of faculty.
7. Legislative event. The more legislators the merrier. There is a doodle poll out for the time. Classified staff want a mid-day event. Location: the Della Taylor Brown Art Gallery was suggested.



8. Standing Committees list: There are a few details still to nail down. There are only two committees still needing a chair: Academic Appeals and Faculty Scholarship. Professional studies needs to appoint one person to a committee. Students members still need to be added.

9. Tom Kiddee has agreed to create a shell repository for committee work. R. Ford will follow up.

10. J. Pietruszynski asked the Exec. Committee to consider allowing at-large executive board members to vote in faculty senate, since they are elected. ACF and BOG, also elected at-large can, and this would bring consistency. Jessica volunteered to write an explanation of the issue. It was tabled until the next meeting.

11. R. Ford asked if the parliamentarian was voted by the general faculty to be an ex officio member of the Constitution and Bylaws committee. Consulting the minutes, D. Johnson confirmed this took place. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski confirmed this.

13. R. Ford asked if the Faculty Handbook is a faculty document, an administrative document, or both? When administrators make changes, should they run this by the faculty? Who can approve changes now? Office hours is a good example. 5 hours of office hours was a faculty senate decision, and it made it in the handbook. If the provost wants it to be 10 later on, do we approve that? Maybe two documents would help with what the faculty controls and what the administration controls being in two different documents. D. Wells suggests we focus cleaning up the Constitution and Bylaws first, and in a few months we can tackle this. R. Ford would like a motion in the senate suggesting it's a co-document. B. Ladner says that any changes should at least be presented to the senate.

14. R. Ford said we would like to make progress on the bookstore's policy of using secondary vendors that causes problems with access to materials the faculty are requesting. Should we invite Mark Akers to the Oct. 6 Faculty Senate meeting? If so, we should present him with prep. questions he could expect so he can be prepared.

15. R. Ford said there is an IRB committee, but they haven't met for 3 years or so. Let's rejuvenate their work and update the committee. IACUC is also needed. J. Pietruszynski moved, F. Vaughan seconded that IRB become a standing committee of the senate, with IACUC being a subcommittee with the addition of a Veterinarian. T. Guetzloff moves, F. Vaughan seconds to appoint a committee for this academic year at the next faculty meeting.

16. R. Ford asks if the paycheck issue still out there? Melvin and 2 reps came to faculty senate, but there might be questions out there amongst other faculty. J. Pietruszynski suggests a business faculty member present a summary at the general faculty meeting.

17. R. Ford asks if deans should retaining faculty status in respect to faculty senate work. When Barbara was appointed by C. Byers, her faculty status was suspended.