**Minutes from the WVSU General Faculty Meeting on Tuesday, January 9, 2018**

**Wallace Hall Auditorium, 10:45 a.m.**

1. R. Ford called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m.

2. T. Runke moved and M. Fultz 2nd the approval of the agenda. The motion carried by voice vote.

3. T. Alderman moved and T. Rhunke 2nd the approval of the minutes to the Dec. 6 General faculty meeting.

4. R. Ford provided the faculty the opportunity to speak to money issues at WVSU. It was requested before the meeting that it be added to the agenda. No faculty chose to speak to the issue.

5. R. Ford reminded the faculty we are going to do fully online faculty evaluations. T. Kidde asked who would pay for it, since the provost will not. Huber expressed reservation about participation and disgruntled students. T. Alderman said a faculty member tried it a few years ago and had very poor participation rates. B. Ladner suggested it is a new culture with online classes. K. Jayasuriya said that there is a cost under $1500 per semester for paper evaluations. He would pay for Survey Monkey. A faculty suggested that there were security issues with Survey Monkey. B. Ladner said she advocated this and thinks this is good because of the handwriting issue. Students won’t make written comments. This is her biggest concern. She also suggested the smartphone solution means you wouldn’t need a computer lab. We could have the launch date back one semester. M. Lewis said you make it a prerequisite for taking the final. If not, you would expect low rates. One faculty member suggests a wheeled kiosk. Survey monkey link would be a security issue, Moodle wouldn’t. F. Vaughan said that the quality of information is what matters most, so hearing from the people who really care, positive or negative, would be good. Survey Monkey means they might be able to take the evaluation multiple times. Quality data means survey monkey is not an option. B. Liedl said you can set things up in Survey Monkey to avoid this problem, so we should look into this and see what other schools our size do. R. Ford suggests we might want to override this idea as a general faculty. T. Rhunke moved and B. Ladner 2nd that we postpone the adoption of the online evaluations until Fall 2018 at the earliest. J. Martin said that, within google, there are some tools for the backend already connected to email accounts. F. Vaughan said we can work it out. We can move quickly if we decide to. T. Kidde said that if we postpone it will be the same discussion in August. R. Baker suggested that postponing won’t help unless we have a trial this spring to work out some kinks, but he is in favor of postponement. T. Rhunke’s concern is that we’re looking for ways to save money, then we’re finding out it will cost more. Is this where we want to invest money? $1500 per year vs. $8000 for Moodle. Patricia Wilson requested to amend to have the Faculty Personnel Committee address the issues discussed today and come back with a report in 2 months. T. Rhunke accepted the amendment and S. Armstrong seconded. The motion carried by voice vote with three dissenting votes. B. Ladner expressed the opinion that they could suggest a trial this semester or a trial next semester. M. Lewis asked if the cost with Learninghouse could be negotiated down. T. Kidde quoted the price of $7 per student.

7. BOG policy for post-tenure review. F. Vaughan reminded the faculty of the Dec. BOG meeting proposed policy. Over the break a group of faculty met to suggest a second policy. The biggest difference between the two is that you would be required to be proficient in teaching and either service or research. This policy would help those who are doing their jobs keep their jobs. M. Porter professor said he went to the BOG meeting and no one would admit to having written it. S. Armstrong said that many of the faculty assume this will not affect you so you are not weighing it carefully. She was reminded of a poem of a bridge builder who was only to pass the road once. He was building it for those coming next. Neither address the issue that we have a review (5 year), then another 5 years (2nd promotion), so whatever policy to be done should at least include a 5 year review. She would like the chairs or deans to answer the question if you would be able to send folks away when you are not doing that work. She suggests a 5 year post-second promotion dossier reviewed by a committee. B. Ladner said it is not a post-tenure review policy, but an Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. She also said that we could propose a 5-year review as a better policy that would be more consistent with our institutional peers and those around the state. As long as we put some teeth in our annual review policy, we could have their ideas together with ours. F. Vaughan said that, with the annual review we already do, accepting this would help us prevent doing the portfolios. M. Lewis said that in the 2 of 3 idea F. Vaughan stated, the language is not as clear. T. Rhunke said that the verbiage “unsatisfactory overall performance” helps the Provost with some flexibility. S. Armstrong said that it’s not written in the policy. T. Rhunke said that we can come up with the specificity of the evaluative procedure after the fact. M. Pennington said that there was more specific language in a previous draft, but the idea is to have a more general language (less prescriptive) so that those issues can be addressed in procedures written later. There was also specific language of the make-up of the committee, but that was deemed too prescriptive. F. Vaughan reminded us that there is a policy in play. T. Alderman asked of the consequence, and if it’s firing, then they are changing our tenure status. F. Vaughan said that tenure doesn’t protect poor teaching, and we should all agree with this standard. You would have 1 year to remediate teaching and service, and longer to address research. T. Rhunke said that tenure still has power because we have access to the courts. If we don’t write a policy that makes sense, any lawyer will take it apart. The BOG should be asked for a list of 5 lawyers you would not want to against, and realize these lawyers will be calling the faculty member if this happens. F. Vaughan suggested we’ve stepped up the bar for tenure and promotion in the past few years. With our annual review document, the Provost is willing to hear us out. K. Jayasuriya said that there is a piece of legislation that took away the bumping rights of staff and gave the BOG the right to take away tenure all together. This is the better option to what they can do. Don’t take me as a person, but think of the position of Provost without any one person having too much power. Empower the committee to address the rights of faculty and administration. B. Ladner, in channeling Jack Magan, said tenure is to protect academic freedom, not poor performance. A faculty member suggested that this becomes a popularity contest, and S. Armstrong agreed. J. Magan said that the way the BOG policy is written is that it’s way too restrictive. If someone does something controversial, they will crank up the policy and fire the faculty member. Academia is full of this. Tenure is a practice in higher ed. and lawyers think of it as protection of jobs, but it is a protection of ideas. If we let the board pass this policy, they will use it as they need to get rid of someone they don’t like. We need to give Frank the support to say “here’s a better policy” and it can spur discussion. F. Vaughan said that, according to the board policy, there is no peer evaluation, so no protection of ideas. M. Fultz asked what the BOG knows about the instrument, and how this weighs into the policy creation. If you have a shot of being fired, you also have a shot of rewards. Implement a pay raise so it’s just not negative. C. Taylor-Johnson would like us to clarify what constitutes good teaching, how to document this work in the classroom. Student evaluations are spotty and erratic, and Carol works hard to challenge students and they work through the relationship. How serious are we to take all of this? F. Vaughan suggested that student evaluations are feedback. Carol said that the board might not take this attitude. A. McConnell stated that the evaluations are part of the tool we are currently using, so it matters. Participation matters. These will be part of the post-tenure review process. F. Vaughan said that the policy will be adopted by March. We are the population who knows best how to evaluate a professor. Our policy places the decision in the hands of a committee to recommend to the provost. The BOG policy includes no faculty involvement. B. Ladner moved and T. Rhunke 2nd we adopt the policy created by the faculty with the amendment that we change the name to “Evaluation of Tenured Faculty”. K. Jayasuriya gave his word he will work with faculty in developing the evaluation tool, but we have a policy that needs to be passed. S. Armstrong wanted amendments to define “productivity,” what measures will be used to determine productivity, what if the faculty senate chair is deemed unsatisfactory, and what does it mean to provide the “highest level of education to the students,” and what of the 21 calendar days if they fall over the holidays. F. Vaughan suggested those issues are good points, but they are issues of implementation. T. Rhunke said it happens all the time that if one side is dissatisfied they do all they can to water down the legislation and then go hammer and tongs in the implementation phase. If we can get the peer review into this policy, we will help the institution in a court case. It will cost the institution backpay and give it a black eye. K. Harper called to question. The motion carried by voice vote with one dissenting vote. R. Ford said that, if the board responds and adopts our ideas, we should be supportive. Frank will notify the faculty of the meeting date. T. Guetzloff said that we not fight about the policy, but fight it out in the internal implementation. T. Rhunke said the two primary changes were peer review and the more general evaluation with an emphasis in teaching. B. Ladner said that the board would welcome hearing that the peer review policy makes it more robust. T. Alderman moved and M. Fultz 2nd to adjourn. The motion carried by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 11: 45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Dirk Johnson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate