**Minutes from the WVSU General Faculty Meeting on Wednesday, December 6, 2017**

**Wallace Hall Auditorium, 2:00 p.m.**

1. R. Ford called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

2. T. Rhunke moved and Mike Fultz 2nd the approval of the minutes from the August 8th General Faculty Meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

3. R. Ford requested additions to the agenda. It was request that we hear from Frank Vaughan about the Board of Governors’ plans for a post-tenure faculty review process. T. Runke moved and Kathy Harper 2nd the approval of the agenda as amended. The motion carried by voice vote.

4. Rich Ford requested that faculty senate committee chairs submit written reports the Wed. before the faculty executive committee meeting to help with faculty senate meeting efficiency. Tom Kidde explained that he has created an online document repository for these reports.

5. Safety. There is an active shooter drill planned for spring. The priority for safety is to make improvements quickly, but done right. M. Fultz asked about the University’s plans for the hiring or assigning of a Chemical Hygiene Officer. The last R. Ford heard, the president was going to talk with K. Jayasuriya about potential faculty who could fill this role. K. Jayasuriya said that discussion with the president hadn’t taken place yet. Mel Charlton-Smith introduced herself as the new chemical lab manager. She took the job with an interest in helping the University come into legal compliance, which is the role of a Chemical Hygiene Officer.

3. Michael Casey introduced Carl Sullivan, a district representative of the Boy Scouts of America Buckskin Council. C. Sullivan explained the University of Scouting event. The Buckskin council serves 33 counties in Ohio, KY, VA, but mostly southern WV. They do adult training for volunteers at the University of Scouting, but it is mostly for the boy scouts who come for the merit badge college to complete the requirements of a couple of merit badges while they are there. Merit badges provide focused study in a potential career fields or areas of potential study in the future. In the first year the U. of S was at WVSU, there were a number of faculty members who served as merit badge counselors. This year’s U of S. is Sat., March 10. Rhonda Brogan sent out an email with badges that they are planning to offer. This is a great opportunity to showcase this campus as a recruiting activity (200 boys, 120 adults–mostly parents). The merit badge booklets contain the required material to be covered, but experts in the field, like the faculty at WVSU, provide a useful broader context. M. Fultz asked what the deadline is for letting Rhonda know. C. Sullivan said as early in January as possible when you know it is possible based on your teaching. Someone asked if the registration had improved. When it was done it at WVU-Tech the boys could sign up the day of. That is no longer true. It is all by pre-registration.

4. R. Ford announced several Faculty Senate actions. First, for the spring 2018 and fall 2018 semesters, all faculty evaluations will be done online. K. Jayasuriya asked if this would be done in class or out. B. Ladner said it could be done in class on phones. M. Fultz asked when the details would come for how to do it. R. Ford stated that the exec. committee would be working on those details. K. Jayasuriya asked about survey monkey. T. Kidde said that it costs $400. M. Lewis expressed concern about the percentage of participation rates. His online classes are 25%. Jessica Barnes-Pietruszynski stated that research says there is a dip in the first few semesters, but it comes back up. F. Vaughan said that, while the percent of participation is important, the value of the information, based on the value of the instrument, is most important. K. Jayasuriya said that research shows the rates are 40% at best, 20% for some junior faculty. Also, those who are upset write a lot, while others who are positive don’t say much. R. Ford asked R. Baker what the procedure would be to reverse the faculty senate decision. R. Baker said it would be poor style, but legal. Dr. De asked what the cost would be, and R. Ford referred to previous answers. M. Lewis is alright with its potential low participation rate because it is not a valid instrument, but mostly a customer satisfaction survey. T. Runke says there could be cost saving. R. Ford asked that if it is the will of the body to rescind the change, then let’s have a motion and vote, or if the questions are about how the process will work, then contact an Exec. Committee member. R. Baker stated that, while he did not vote in favor of the motion, he would prefer it not be overturned.

5. Online courses policy changes. M. Lewis expressed concern about being too restrictive. While most changes were made for good reason, the online teachers don’t want to be handcuffed. M. Lewis also voiced concern over the required 7-day window for tests. While he has done this in the past, he was actually wanting to narrow the window. K. Jayasuriya suggested we collect faculty suggestions and re-revise the policy. D. Williams also doesn’t like the 7-day window. She has only had one complaint about the 2-day window in many years. M. Lewis reiterated that the more policies you add, the more restrictive the teaching becomes. T. Kidde said part of the restrictions are to help create consistency in the brand. B. Ladner asked why the 2-day window creates test concerns vs. 7-day. M. Lewis says it has to do with answer changing. A. Ziyati stated that a 2-day would be sufficient.

6. R. Ford briefly stated other faculty senate actions as outlined in the agenda.

7. R. Ford stated that the faculty senate has requested a Title III budget report from the Research and Development Corporation. A. Ziyati asked the purpose. B. Ladner stated there is limited accountability for these funds. T. Rhunke asked what percentage of the overall university budget was covered by R&D. Te answer of 40% was offered. D. Williams states that the R&D Board of Governors meets once a year. T. Rhunke thinks it is a good idea to seek out the facts. We are being asked to do more with less with budget efficiency task force, but 40% of the budget is outside of the prevue of our governing board or comment by the faculty. D. Williams suggested we go back to the original documentation of how the BOG originally set up R&D’s authority. T. Guetzloff said that the first year of R&D’s existence the BOG decided they did not want to take on that responsibility. T. Rhunke asked for clarification that the BOG could get back the oversight. B. Ladner says that if we don’t say we care, they won’t make changes.

8. F. Vaughan reported on the BOG policy regarding post-tenure review. There was a policy proposed on Thursday, Nov. 30, the first that Frank had heard of it. Since then he has talked to many faculty and the president 3 times. As of now, the proposed policy won’t be considered this coming Friday, Dec. 8. Frank says that some form of post-tenure review is coming, so we should take this on and propose a policy. If we do nothing, then we lose our chance for input. A. Ziyati asked what the purpose of this review is. F. Vaughan stated that it isn’t a bad thing because we can show that we are still active. S. Armstrong asked what the purpose would be without financial exigency attached. She says that the latest evaluation process is problematic and we need to be treated more professionally. T. Guetzloff said that once post-tenure review occurs it should be the only determinant of raises. No additional processes needed. F. Vaughan said those are the reasons we should propose a policy. T. Rhunke said that, given the Faculty Senate does not meet until February and this should be a general faculty issue, the BOG should not act until later in the spring if not later than that so that the faculty can propose a policy according to its processes/procedures. If it is so important, we need that window to do it right. The faculty would have the court system at their disposal should the process lead to unfair dismissal. M. Pennington said that a policy person should be on the task force. A. Ziyati suggested that the first step should be clarification from the board about the purpose for the policy. M. Fultz stated his agreement, asking about the agenda on the 8:30 a.m. meeting on the coming Friday. Dr. De said that each faculty fills out an annual plan with scoring, so what is the change? R. Ford agreed that we should take this opportunity to propose a policy. A. Ziyati thinks we should be questioning the very need for post-tenure review. B. Ladner says that HEPC already, in a holistic way, states that post-tenure review exists, so that ship has sailed. K. Jayasuriya stated that, due to a piece of legislation, faculty personnel decisions are now with the board. They can actually say that no one has tenure. This post-tenure review policy change is going to happen in this context. Our best bet is to come together for a policy where, if you are doing your job, you won’t be affected. The current plan in K. Jayasuriya’s mind is a 4-year progressive plan, allowing a faculty member time to meet expectations. He suggested we make a good policy. One faculty member expressed concern that the policy might have academic freedom implications. J. McGann reminded that the faculty that tenure is a defense of ideas. Incompetence is not appreciated anywhere. K. Jayasuriya stated his agreement, that our policy would include this protection of academic freedom. M. Fultz reminded the faculty that each has to score above marginal in each category. There are faculty that don’t teach, that are administrators, or that don’t focus on research, so how will they be evaluated? K. Jayasuriya said that the task force should look at overall performance, not require each category. M. Pennington said this task force should weigh in on the instrument currently being used. K. Jayasuriya said there are some faculty who refuse to use the instrument, so they don’t pass. This is why we need this. S. Armstrong said that only 1 person on the Math faculty has access to [a necessary resource in one of the categories of the current instrument], so a passing grade on all other categories would still lead to marginal. T. Rhunke said that we used it for a year, so we need to populate it with scores. We can’t fiddle with the instrument continually. We need several years of data leading to meaningful analysis from the Tenure-Promotion committee. It is very frustrating to the committees needing to use it. B. Ladner understood that the form was developed as a merit pay instrument. A percentage of the things on the list vs. how we score it is the issue. Rob Wallace stated that it was a living document, evolving and being changed for the better. M. Pennington didn’t give input having not been hired before its creation, and now applies to him. He is going up for tenure now, so that is his concern. F. Vaughan expressed his appreciation for those who provided input in the past 5 days.

The WVSU General Faculty Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Dirk Johnson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate