

**Minutes from the WVSU Faculty Senate Meeting on Friday, December 1, 2017
Hamblin Hall Auditorium, 1:30 pm**

Attendance:

Senators: A&H – J. Barnes-Pietruszynski (vice-chair), T. Kiddie; BSS-Mehdi, M. Ray; LC – D. Wells (historian), M. Casey; NSM – R. Baker, R. Ford (chair); PS – K. McDilda, Oree Banks; ACF – B. Ladner; BOG – F. Vaughn; Parliamentarian – J. Magan

Ex-Officio: Provost – K. Jayasuriya; President – A. Jenkins

Executive At-Large: T. Guetzloff

Deans/Interim Deans: R. Wallace (A&H), D. Williams (BSS), Naveed Zaman

Faculty Guests: Aaron Settle (WVSU athletic Committee)

Student Government: President: T. Conaway

1. M. Fultz moved and J. Barnes-Pietruszynski seconded to approve the agenda. The motion carried by voice vote.
2. B. Ladner moved and M. Ray seconded to approve the minutes from Nov 3. The motion carried by voice vote.
3. Chair remarks: R. Ford reminded the senate that committee chairs need to send reports by the Wed. before Faculty Exec. meets. H also announced chair elections in the spring for Social Work and Criminal Justice. He was informed the Chemistry and Math departments will also be having chair elections in the spring.
4. ACF Report. Regarding the comments in newspapers by a former president of WLU, recently appointed as ‘counsel’ to the WV Senate Committee on Finance, M. Fultz asked what innovative thinking he was suggesting regarding competition for students in higher ed. She mentioned online programs, but didn’t have much to share. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski moved and Oree Banks 2nd to accept report. The motion carried by voice vote.
5. BOG Report. F. Vaughan reported that the GOG had not met since Sept., but financial issues facing the University are huge. Katherine Dooley, newly appointed to the BOG, has an impressive resume. There is a special committee on policy review organized by the BOG chair looking at a post-tenure review change. After 2 years of getting marginal in 1 of the 3 areas, the faculty member must submit a report for improvement. Since it addresses faculty, it would go through the Board’s EPC. B. Ladner had no concern about quality control, but many were hired prior to the rigorous research emphasis and face new metrics. Time, money, and library are all real limitations faculty face in research support. B. Ladner said that, whatever the standard, it shouldn’t be, “Can anyone do this,” but, “Do they possess the qualities we should keep.” T. Geutzloff asked N. Zaman if you have to be satisfactory in all areas. This is the standard for tenure and promotion, which hasn’t changed. There is no absolute guarantee that it would disqualify one from not getting it. There is only one evaluative tool, which is a problem for the variety of loads and configurations for those deemed “faculty” (i.e. teaching for landgrant individuals, faculty without research). This will be a big change. N. Zaman suggested we, as faculty, present a post-tenure review process for their consideration. The Board should also be made aware of the current policies and

potential legal challenges, etc. There is a subcommittee meeting on this issue at 8:30 in the morning on Friday, Dec. 8. We can hear where they're coming from, and then voice our opinions. T. Geutzloff reminds that program review is supposed to be doing this evaluation. F. Vaughan will distribute dates of upcoming meetings related to this issue. M. Seyedmonir moved and B. Ladner 2nd to create a task force to prepare a faculty-written policy. R. Ford reminded us of the pressure the BOG face from the public, some of whom believe tenured faculty to little work. B. Ladner suggested it behooves us to support the principle. Volunteers to begin the process: M. Fultz, B. Ladner (to look for committee members), M. Seyedmonir, J Pietruszynski, Dirk. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski moved and M. Ray seconded to accept BOG report. Motion carried by voice vote.

6. EPC Report. M. Fultz missed the Nov. meeting, so shared the one change from October to the prerequisites for BA 320. He informed the senate that all changes for 2018–19 catalog have to be in by February's EPC meeting.

7. Changes to online and distance learning policy. It was asked how faculty committee reports get into T. Kidde's online repository. He said the chairs have access, Exec. Committee has access, and they can send them to him, as well. T. Kidde outlined the following changes to the policy. 1) The policy now includes Web 50 and Web 80 classes to improve quality control. Findings were that some Web 50 had very little or no content. The online component should demonstrate what is being done each week. Students need to know the schedule. There should be an online presence, with a clear definition of what is meant to be done in class and what is done online. The total experience of the student should still be 48 hours. The policy dictates structural issues, not course content. The Quality Design Rubric replaces Learning House. Core standards must all be passed. Web 50 is now subject to these standards. Web 50's intent is to meet 50/50. Some professors frontload with face-to-face, but the intent is to meet once a week throughout the semester. At any rate, it should be the same workload each week, as if in face. 2) New requirement for all teachers to take a training course once each year to keep them aware of pedagogy, software, etc. It would be free to the faculty. 3) Make sure all courses are ADA compliant. Helps with multiple modalities as well as needs of disabled students. The center will create these adaptations. 4) The new proctoring requirement is in response to testing windows currently set with mostly weekend hours or only have 24-hour window. The policy is now to have them open for 7 days. This is to address those students who are only available during the week, or only available on the weekend. There needs to be a weekend in there. R. Ford asked about opening up a final exam too soon. The faculty wasn't fully convinced of there being a policy other than you can't have your final at an unassigned time during finals week. 5) The final policy change is in response to student complaints/questions about their classes being dropped because they can't see them when Learning House opens the courses. The new policy requires courses to build from the master course and have it open one week before the semester begins. B. Ladner moves M. Ray 2nd. The motion carried by voice vote.

7. Student evaluations – The faculty senate exec. committee recommended a fully online process to tighten security. R. Ford asked T. Kidde if Learning House would charge for only doing the one online evaluation. T. Kidde said yes. It costs \$7 to add a new student. The top number to do this would be \$14,000. Google forms could work, but how do you distribute this? T. Geutzloff strongly supported this, even with the expense, due to the labor already involved, the expense of the paper forms, and the recognition of handwriting and potential retaliation. B. Ladner moved and Mehdi 2nds that we move to fully online evaluations for the spring 2018 and fall 2018 semesters. R. Wallace asked if this would skew the data toward the

negative, given those upset are the most likely to respond. In response, it was stated that you could take class time to do this, with students using their cell phones or professors taking them to a computer lab. Online would solve the concern about the current requirement of having a different faculty administer your evaluations. The window is weeks 12-15. B. Ladner and F. Vaughan thought one week would be a better window. Could faculty choose when to open them? T. Kidde says that's not possible. M. Fultz suggested we do a pilot program of a select number of courses. The voice vote carried 8-2. T. Kidde asked why R. Wallace thinks the online would be worse. M. Ray confirmed Tom Kidde's track record of online evaluations. R. Wallace felt like students and faculty should have a choice, we shouldn't legislate. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said that online students are more prone to fill out an online form compared with face-to-face. M. Seyedmonir wondered what percentage would be acceptable? Also, given that the process should be multifaceted, the issues we would face here would only be a small issue. R. Wallace thinks people should be able to choose, not be told. D. Wells said that, given students' comfortability with online, this will help with their participation. B. Ladner moved and R. Baker seconded we require online evaluations for web-tags and give the option of online evaluations to faculty without web tags. M. Fultz is worried about skewed data if he offers it to certain classes but not others. He reasserted that we should do a comparative between two nearly identical courses. B. Ladner suggested that having an online evaluation time in class, but others expressed that eating into class time is a problem. The motion failed 4-7.

8. The faculty evaluative instrument will be presented in February by the task force.

9. The Executive Committee requested a Title III spending report from R&D. The president's response was that he is reviewing this now as its funding is his responsibility. B. Ladner moved that we request a detailed written report that includes how decisions are made regarding its distribution, an in-person report to the senate, and a set of federal guidelines for its disbursement. Tom amended the motion to add an executive summary of the audit for the past 3 years, and Barbara agreed to the amendment. Jessica seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

10. R. Baker moved and B. Ladner seconded that the University hire or appoint a Chemical Hygiene Officer with appropriate certification and training, and that the CHO be provided a budget with necessary funding. B. Ladner amended to have this individual report directly to the President. T. Geutzloff confirmed we are in violation about this. The motion carried by voice vote.

11. Agenda for General Faculty Meeting. M. Casey stated that the Boy Scouts would like to come talk to the faculty about the University of Scouting event that brings 600 youth to campus. The faculty will inform the faculty of the student evaluation motion, suggesting this is an evaluative period by design. R. Baker suggested we invite ideas for its implementation. B. Ladner suggested we tell them we will provide more information. D. Wells reminded the senate that the paper is on the way out, online is our future, and this is a way to get ahead of it.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.