Minutes from the WVSU Faculty Senate Meeting on Friday, November 3rd, 2017 Hamblin Hall Auditorium, 1:30 pm

Attendance:

Senators: A&H – J. Barnes-Pietruszynski (vice-chair), T. Kiddie; BSS- F Hailou, 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. B. Ladner moved and R. Baker seconded to approve the minutes from Oct. 6th. The motion carried by voice votes.
- 2. B. Ladner moved and R. Baker seconded to approve the agenda. The motion carried by voice vote.
- 3. Chair remarks: R. Ford said that he relies on our help and assistance so do not be afraid to speak up.
- 4. Provost Remarks: K. Jayasuriya appointed a member for the Program Review Committee - Katie McDilda. Mentoring program: it is not going really well. He has two mentees who he meets with regularly. They have met 3 times – but the other person he has not seen yet. There were some problems with finding and making contact with the students who have signed up for the program. There are some successes – but it is close to 50% or less. He would love to hear faculty ideas about how to improve the program. The biggest problem is students not coming to us or being able to be contacted. M. Ray – was able to make contact with one mentee – but the student wanted a chemistry professor to advise her for courses. M. Ray told her to go to her advisor for that – but that she was there for anything else, and the student was not very interested in that. She said that we connect with students we have in our classes with and that may be a better relationship. K. Jayasuriya said that this program specifically is to stop students from dropping out. He said that we need to have a discussion about how to approach students and what to tell them. T. Conaway asked what programs we have in place to interact with the mentees. Jayasuriya said we do not have formal arrangement for that. We formed a mentors group and paired them with mentees. His hope was to bring them together at a bigger event but things are not heading that way. B. Ladner suggested an event at the beginning of the

year – not just social – but with academic content that may help faculty make connections with students. There should be some structure to that relationship especially at the beginning. M. Ray said that there should be a bonding of student and faculty – say if the student was in the same area of study that may help. Jayasuriya said that students were paired by colleges – so there should be a bonding there. He said that he got enough faculty but President Jenkins said that it should not just be faculty and so he expanded it which may be what happened here. B. Ladner said we should do events by college. R. Baker said that if this is focused on at risk students they may be uncomfortable in talking with faculty in their major so we should open it up so students are not just with faculty in their major. T. Conway mentioned the faculty should see what the social interests are for the student in the University culture. R. Wallace said we did have students matched in FYE and so there was some contact. Frank Vaughn mentioned events should maybe be once a month – an academic program or aspect of college and maybe students would be more connected and interested in coming. R. Ford said that with 50% maybe we should look at the program as "half full" – as a place to work on the program, not get rid of it.

5. President's remarks: President Jenkins discussed the exit interview for students leaving the University. Not many people know we have an exit interview process – if people do not know we have it it does not work. People need to know that we have this process – a last ditch effort to have a touch point to students who are considering leaving. There are also some other aspects – we need to also look to see if they are asking if their transcripts or health records to be sent somewhere. Students do not always want to admit that they are transferring. IRB: we are revamping our IRB program, looking to make sure we have a comprehensive and robust IRB here. If any of us are contacted for research purposes it needs to be vetted by our IRB as well. He said we need to beef up and complete our IRB webpage. It should have forms and process and meetings times etc. Feedback and suggestions from the faculty are very welcome for that process. R. Ford asked about the time frame. Jenkins said that we are looking at doing it fast. R. Baker asked about who is in charge of the website – would it be the committee? Jenkins said that the committee is in charge of the content – but tech folks are in charge of creating the websites. Jenkins said that we are behind on the process so we need to catch up to make sure that we do not hurt our academic credibility, but he feels good about building on what we have. G. Hankins said that after looking at the PEER Grants they have seen some requests for human subjects and for other types of IRB approval (like plants etc) and safety concerns in some research. So the IRB covers other things as well. M. Ray said that this is a very important and legitimate issue for research and publication. The students will get to know more and more about it if and when they go through IRB training. R. Ford said that according to the handbook the Senate is supposed to collect names for the IRB committee. The executive committee passed along some names but that list needs to go through the Senate to be approved before being given to the President. R. Ford ran through the names and asked the Senate if they would like to suggest more names. Jenkins asked that if Faculty would like to suggest names send them to R. Ford or if you would not like to be on the list then send that information to R. Ford. So we can expedite and move forward on this. Ford also asked about the animal care and if that would fall under the IRB committee or something else. Jenkins said that we would look at that as it comes and add people as needed (for example a veterinarian) and we can look outside of

the faculty. Do we think this may be in place next semester? Jenkins said he and R. Ford are looking and working on that to see what model would work well for us. He is confident that we can get this up by the time we get back in January. M. Ray pointed out that some grant research is on hold because we do not have IRB or approval. Dean Williams said that her college passed a resolution to address this. Jenkins said that we are on this and want it done quickly, thoroughly, and correct. Money at WVSU - Jenkins said our finances work like the bell curve. We start on very fragile margins but as we start to get financial aid and state appropriations in it goes up. At the end of the semester it becomes very fragile again. And it starts again the next semester. We have to build our cash on hand – we pay out – every two weeks \$745,000 we pay this out in payroll. So if enrollment and payment is not on time that is lost profit and makes it more difficult to meet those bills (utilities and bond payments etc). So everything impacts everything else. We have to get our cash reserves up more than 16 days. T. Conaway asked how we can raise revenue. Jenkins said we have to figure out ways to raise revenue and cut spending. He said that we have made some changes in how p-cards are used. This has been very successful. Adjustments have been made on spending caps etc. We also have to increase our enrollment. We have to do more than just replace the students that we graduate – we need more students and we need to retain the ones we have. We also have to turn more part time students into full time students. We also want to increase transfer students. T. Guetzloff asked if we can see what and how we spend during the year. It spikes historically at the beginning and the end of the fiscal year and we end up holding in the middle. He wants to know how we can change that tradition and history. He said we have to create revolving accounts as we go through the year. We have to make sure we manage our money better.

- 6. WVSU Athletic Committee: A. Settle: last year the athletic committee was asked to speak to the Senate once a semester. The committee met Sept. 26th – the main purpose of the committee is to make sure WVSU meets compliance with athletes. A few things discussed in the meeting: this semester there are more of the grade reports for the athletes. The purpose of this is for retention and attendance for the student athletes. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski asked about online students and how difficult it is to complete progress reports for them. Settle discussed using something like Faculty referral where faculty can do everything online and also give feedback – which may be a bit easier. That is an idea that the committee is working on for the future. Settle reiterated the policy is that the athletes must complete exams/assignments before missing class for travel days. The policy is that students must contact the Faculty to work out the issue before the travel time. He asked the Athletic Director about plans to address budget shortfall. They do have plans to generate revenue for athletic programs. Settle shared some ideas about spreading out scholarship money and looking at sports that could fall into that arrangement. The answer is yes they are looking at things like this. He said that there are a lot of sports that can generate revenue like this.
- 7. Dr. Underdue Murph VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs: was asked to come and share some first impressions and opportunities to implement collaboratively

with enrollment. One of the challenges that has been ongoing in the office of admission is staff turn-over. With staff turnover you are losing institutional knowledge and talent. She will be working on filling some of these positions – recruitment and processing for example. These are things that require improvement. Another aspect is improving and utilizing technology that is not being used effectively. She comes from a philosophy of implementing and utilizing data driven analytics-right now it is happening in a fragmented way. If we use the data – predictive analytics – it will better help us better work toward recruitment and retention. For example – sharing information between admissions and financial aide. Integration of this data will better help us predict enrollment. This data should also be shared with faculty – so we can better outreach and prepare for management for things like open houses for admission. Data integration can very much help with recruitment. Another question: how can we work closely with faculty for admission and recruitment? Often outreach for help from faculty comes at the last minute – needs to be better planned with a comprehensive enrollment management plan. One of these plans is to be more proactive in recruitment – for example using current students as an asset for recruitment. When they can connect with their peers it gives the institution more credibility and excitement. Another aspect is retention – keeping students here. She has been doing walk-abouts on campus to better assess what is going on – and meeting with students. Another aspect is wall space that can be used for marketing – getting students to take pride in being students that can carry over when they become alumni. There is a lot to do – but they have been able to prioritize what needs to be done immediately, specifically that is recruitment and enrollment. One example is stop-outs. Look at students who have stopped registering – see how and why they left. We can try to reintroduce them to the campus and to faculty to help collaboration in recruiting student back on to campus. T. Conaway asked – did the university just hire a director of data? Murph said for the position they held interviews but decided to go back to repost the position. We need data analytics to predict and help with recruitment to get an enrollment management plan – so we can understand the profile of the student we should be recruiting so that we know they will succeed and graduate. O. Banks asked what kinds of conversations she has had with faculty. She has had casual conversations but is working on getting to college and department meetings to speak with more faculty. M. Ray asked about data analytics – specifically about stop out students – making contact with students to bring them back to finish their degree. Where she can connect with the faculty is these students – who may know how and why students have stopped coming. She suggests getting in touch with faculty who have worked with those students who may be a conduit to those students. These personal touches also matter a lot with students. Murph said that some of the data we can look at are juniors and seniors who have exhausted financial aid and have stopped coming. We may have scholarship money to help entice those students. T. Guetzloff asked about enrollment management software – where are we finding another program? Murph talked about taking and giving recommendations for this.

8. Standing Committee Reports: B. Ladner has a written report. R. Baker motioned to accept the report, O. Banks seconded. Report was accepted by voice vote.

- 9. BOG: F. Vaughn- the board has met once Sept. 14th. He did email materials that he was provided with. He has been assigned to the academic policy committee and the budget committee. He feels having a faculty face on the budget meeting is a good thing. Subjects that came up in the meeting budget is a very big concern. Presidential review is another big concern since the President's contract is up at the end of the fiscal year. A few program intent-to plans were approved civil engineering and a masters degree in computer science. He said if anyone would like him to attend college or department meetings to discuss BOG let him know. K. McDilda moved to accept the report, O. Banks seconded the report was accepted by voice vote.
- 10. . EPC M. Fultz could not be here but left a document that the committee approved about a change in pre –requisite. Ford asked if we should table this until everyone has seen this. R. Ford will send this out to all members of the Senate to take up at the next meeting.

11. Old Business:

- Student evaluations: the committee was going to continue to look at the policy for student evaluations. We will look at the process when it is written up for the next meeting.

12. New Business

- The executive committee came up with some ideas to make the meeting run more efficiently. R. Ford asked what people thought about the ideas that the executive committee came up with. M. Ray said maybe add that every person gets to only ask two questions. R. Ford and F. Vaughn thought that this may shut down discussion. There was a discussion about how to bring discussion back to the point and avoid bickering or long discussions that are not productive. R. Ford recommended going back to Roberts Rule's to limit discussion and call to order. R. Ford went over the recommendations. He asked for thoughts about these recommendations and/or additions. R. Baker said that he would suggest that we look at the prescriptions of how the reports are written. J. Pietruszynski came up with a form for this which we can use for these reports. T. Kiddie set up a google drive for these reports – so that everyone can read these and prepare comments etc. This could also be used as a repository for minutes for standing committees as well. We need to make sure that all committees use this drive for minutes and to keep track of who is on what committee, attendance, and meetings. All committee chairs and executive committee members have access to those drives. T. Guetzloff moved and O. Banks seconded accepting the recommendation. Motion passed by voice vote.
- General Faculty meeting: Tuesday Dec. 5th at 2pm Wednesday will be the back up date/time. We will ask Music and Art at what times juries are.