

**Minutes from the WVSU Faculty Senate Meeting on Friday, Feb. 2, 2018  
Hamblin Hall Auditorium, 1:30 pm**

**Attendance:**

Senators: A&H – J. Barnes-Pietruszynski (vice-chair), D. Johnson (secretary), T. Kiddie; BSS- M. Ray, M. Seyedmonir; LC – M. Casey, D. Wells (historian); NSM – R. Baker, R. Ford (chair), M. Fultz; PS – O. Banks, S. Richards; ACF – B. Ladner; BOG – F. Vaughn

Executive At-Large: T. Guetzloff, J. Pietruszynski

Library: W. Stinson

Parliamentarian: J. Magan

Other: Brandi Bricher, K. Workman, E. Waugh

Constitution and Bylaws: M. Workman

Chemical Safety: Melissa Charlton-Smith

Deans/Interim Deans: R. Wallace (A&H),

1. R. Baker moved and O. Banks seconded approval of the agenda. The motion carried by voice vote.
2. B. Ladner moved and M. Ray seconded to approve the minutes from Dec. 1. The motion carried by voice vote.
3. Chair Remarks: R. Ford reminded the senate to get committee reports in by the Wed. before Exec. Committee meets. He hadn't kept up with student committee members. According to J. Barnes-Pietruszynski, one was added. J B-P sent the names of these students to the chairs recently. SGA took a while and she got the list just before finals. R. Ford would like to see SGA act earlier next year. J Barnes-Pietruszynski asked if they could make these appointments in the spring.

R. Ford asked if Feb. 7 department chair election is too soon, given he hadn't given the 3 weeks written notice. J. Pietruszynski suggested that it was on the general faculty meeting agenda, so in written form. B. Ladner suggested that if they are all happy, we can move forward. R. Ford felt it important to gain consensus to make an exception. Criminal Justice has had their 3 week notice. Mathematics and Chemistry elections dates were confirmed.

4. Pres. Jenkins report

**Budget efficiency**

He has gotten the recommendations from the budget efficiency committee and plans to act on 90% of the recommendations. He is not going to discuss implementation until he has had personal conversations with those impacted, but he has to have it in place by the end of the spring semester. M. Ray asks about the details of the Emeritus Transition Program for the benefit of her colleagues. He is working on Title III reform to allow E&G funding to be freed up. We can not use Title III on recruitment, but can use it to improve programs for 5 years. It's not intended to be a long-term funding solution. Money will be a 60/40 split, President/Others (academic, student affairs, etc.) earmarked for 1-time usage. It is approx. 2 or 3 million, but some is already earmarked. We're looking at those earmarks for positions and services, to see if they are what we want to be investing in, or if we can peel them off to state budget or determine they are unnecessary. Title III is to help balance our offerings compared with schools with money flowing in from

donors. The president has decided to deny the faculty senate's request for 3 years of financial accountability in the past. As of July 1, 2016, he wants the past in the past and move forward. B. Ladner suggested that our vote to request records suggests the need for financial transparency in the future. K. Jayasuriya said that the Budget Efficiency saw ways Title III could be used where E&G was being used, and that was part of the recommendation. There are institutions living on their Title III (90-95%) and we are on 40%. R. Baker says there will be multi-year commitments. What faculty would like to know is that we have a plan of transitioning off of Title III. Pres. Jenkins is prioritizing 1-time projects. Internal and External follow-up is a challenge.

#### Land Grant

The Land Grant match (1.3 million) is something we are working toward. The WV Senate has been asking for documentation, and Pres. Jenkins has been supplying it. We are gaining traction. He expressed the frustration of having to come and present documentation to get what the law already requires. WVU is not being asked to do that, and the same laws apply. They are looking at it and more discussion is going on than in the past. 92% of our students are WV's, and WVU is 52% out of state, yet our money is going there. We are simply requesting what we are owed.

#### IRB

IRB is meeting next Wed. The committee has been formed and we need to get them functioning. The website, communication flow, standing meeting times on the site, and the animal research component will be part of it.

#### Chemical Safety Officer

The provost and O. McMeans have drafted the job description and are putting together the committee. Orlando will recommend some folks, and K. Jayasuriya needs to get with R. Ford to get faculty on the committee. R. Ford says we need faculty input throughout, including the job description. Pres. Jenkins requested K. Jayasuriya pause and get the job description in front of the faculty. M. Charlton-Smith stated that two people are really needed to cover the chemical side and the occupational side. A look at the job description would help. Pres. Jenkins requested K. Jayasuriya share it by 5 p.m.

#### Legislative issues

WVSU looks very good at the access, completion, and student success model the legislature is considering for assessing schools. We'll gain 1.5 million if adopted. Campus Carry is getting traction, allowing people to come on campus carrying weapons. Regional Council of Presidents are sending a firm "No" letter, and asking SGA and chiefs of police to also sign. He might be asking us to do a write-in campaign. If these efforts don't work and it passes, he'll compromise on restricting weapons from certain activities. The Free 2-year college piece is moving, and we are trying to see we are hit as minimally as possible. We are not in favor as it stands now, but it has passed the senate and there is fuzziness in the house. B. Ladner asked if it would help to have a senate resolution on the campus carry? Yes. M. Fultz asks where we stand with fall numbers given the possibility of the CTC being free. It won't impact until next year. There is a drug test restriction. It will have an impact moving forward, however. If it is an issue of access, then it should be free for all schools. The WVSU Loyalty program is being monitored, and roll-out of Straight-to-State is happening in two schools lately. T. Guetzloff suggested that a week 3 non-payment deadline creates significant issues and asked if Pres. Jenkins would look at that policy, researching best practices. J. Magan wonders if the new emeritus status plan means anyone who opts for this is given emeritus status? Pres. Jenkins turned the question over to K. Jayasuriya

5. Provost report: K. Jayasuriya first named it "incentive retirement plan" and the State said you'd have to pay money to certain entities. It is only valid while you are teaching, and when this ends, you are not

emeritus. S. Richards asked when was it considered. Somewhere in December, with final recommendation sent in early January. R. Baker asked if it is substantively different than phased retirement, so why are we calling it by a different name? K. Jayasuriya said it is mostly the same, but with a 10% bonus for the first two years, then after that, they can teach 1 class at ¼ of salary. R. Ford said that the name was to recognize they, with long service, are valued. If people would like the name changed, he will do it. They have to pay more money to retired folks, so we can't call it retirement. This is not the ideal retirement plan, but the best we can do at this point. He heard second hand the question of if it is legal, if it is it age discrimination, or different from what we've been doing, so he would like to explain it now. This was run by the attorney general and all approved. They only looked at those eligible to retire, so this was an age consideration, but program and budget needs were also considered. No one is being forced, but gives them another option. They have a month to talk to PEIA and see if it will help them or not. S. Richard asked, in interest of transparency, if we can all get the information? K. Jayasuriya said they are only offering it to certain people, and legal counsel says this is ok. Those selected still can say yes or no, and if not contacted, they don't even have to tell us no. It is a contract template for them to consider. WVSU never said they should, just presented it as an option. They did not ask those with programs who have too many people of age that if they all retired at once it would cause a problem. R. Baker asked what the eligibility was, and HR gave that information. The letter was sent to all faculty. Stinson asked if one does it and others like the idea, will those be eligible? Stinson wondered why the information would be dangerous to let out, given that people can choose for themselves. M. Fultz asked how they decided who got the invitation and who didn't, if 6 of 7 were eligible? Business needs were considered. It doesn't prohibit anyone retiring, but they might not have this option.

K. Jayasuriya reported that M. Jones said that the computers are at 90% replacement. T. Guetzloff said that maybe 50% is more accurate. Naveed said that IT says this year's computers have not even been ordered yet. K. Jayasuriya said he will talk to IT and get the information to the president. J. Pietruszynski said his is from 2007, is a loner, and can't be undocked. Early Enrollment he intentionally stays out of to have faculty make the decisions. B. Ladner and K. Harper, on the committee, are rolling things out but this is subject to revision. They confirm it is a good committee. Dean Karney is doing a great job. With free tuition, loyalty and early enrollment becomes very important to us. R. Ford is particularly concerned about the forms. B. Ladner said that the implementation is crucial, and the provost said he promises to do it. Online has 185 students, so that is great progress. M. Ray said that, with the higher fees for online courses, then the department should get a bigger cut because it's delivering the content. K. Jay said he doesn't think the fee should go to things other than online issues. M. Fultz asked what the \$144 fee is spent on. Staffing, licences is \$100,000. There is a surplus in that account being used. There is a faculty incentive of \$1000 for building the online course. The students don't like that they pay the fee and then the professor requires them to pay additional online fees associated with textbooks. B. Ladner suggested using some surplus money to buy online faculty computers. K. Jay said there might be restrictions due to how fees can be spent, but there might be an argument for that.

6. ACF report – No updated information regarding Go365. J. Pietruszynski stated the Governor now says Go365 is not mandatory as of two days ago. ACF also has discussed campus carry. B. Ladner moved and R. Baker seconded that the senate pass the following resolution.

*The West Virginia State University Faculty Senate, representing the entire faculty, opposes any legislation that would forbid colleges and universities, including public institutions, to regulate or ban firearms on their campuses. Further, the Senate opposes any legislation that extends concealed carry privileges, unless it specifically allows individual institutions to ban firearms from their campuses/facilities.*

The motion carried, with one dissenting vote, by voice vote.

7. BOG – Most of the discussion is about financial challenges, and they are crossing T's and dotting I's. Dorms are costing \$1000 a bed. They are asking the administration some tough questions. R. Guetzloff said the board has requested the administration present a solution. It was an open meeting with faculty and students there. Faculty not meeting ADA accommodations was a grave concern. Good showing of our faculty (12–15) at the special committee meeting. The policy review committee has a special meeting next week to discuss furloughs, evaluation of tenured faculty, and records retention to go to the full board, and if board votes in favor, there will be a 7-day review period, then a 30-day public comment, then adoption. There is some time worked in there, and the faculty input has made it a better policy. M. Fultz asked about furlough policy details. F. Vaughan asked about impact on faculty and hasn't gotten an answer. Unless they cancel classes, it seems like a stretch. T. Guetzloff said that the only way it could impact is if 9 month faculty are furloughed, they can't stop payment because they did the work already. If Christmas cash-strapped, they could do 15 day furlough to affect faculty. Vaughan says that spring break might also qualify, but we are being paid for work being done. The provost said that he does not see any way it could be applied to faculty. B. Ladner suggests that it is us getting in front of the legislature not passing a budget, but is concerned of people being in the policy who get paid for work already done. M. Fultz asked how do we move forward without academic support staff? F. Vaughan hopes that it would be employed by Pres. Jenkins very carefully. B. Ladner asked could the policy consider less than 15 days?

8. B. Ladner amended and M. Ray seconded to change language of her previous motion regarding concealed carry from “speaking for the entire faculty” to “representing the entire faculty.” The motion carried by voice vote.

9. K. Jayasuriya commented on faculty not complying with ADA accommodations. These are federal laws, so we must do this. There were numerous complaints that after his office approves, faculty are saying, “No, I can't do this.” M. Ray asked what kind of issues were they? Physical? K. Jayasuriya said that one case was heard where one student said, “I take 16 credit hours and half of my classes say they can't accommodate me.” D. Johnson asked about the practice of switching students to another section to solve the problem of a faculty member not complying. M. Casey said that the complaints are relatively rare. R. Wallace said this specific case was the student's opinion, not a faculty refusal. D. Johnson suggested a communication between M. Casey's office and both faculty involved in such situations to keep collegiality in place. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said that faculty need training. K. Jayasuriya said we need to keep doing it. M. Ray said that online is a different issue with specific needs. Mobility issues are also a problem on campus, and it is not handicap friendly. Naveed asked if a student doesn't feel like they were accommodated, what's the next step? M. Casey says that he reaches out to the faculty member. M. Casey said too many students don't come back to him.

10. Cultural Activities – Z. Fitchner couldn't come, so J. Barnes-Pietruszynski represented the committee. Black History Month is an active time. They are collecting proposals for next year. They are working on a handbook to help with turnover. R. Baker moved and M. Fultz seconded to approve the report. The motion carried by voice vote.

11. Library Committee – Rachael Jackson and Seth Cottell were introduced as two new hires. There are 8 goals for 2025. Dr. Stinson highlighted assessment, staff, and learning. Initiatives: STACK coded by EPSCO fall 2018 to empower librarians to engage with patrons anytime. They intend to create awareness of resources. Experiential learning, security and surveillance, technology from granular to clearer images, are part of a 4-year initiative. She referenced an active shooter 2014 drill to help make sure there is a safe learning environment. R. Jackson demonstrated discoverability under journalFinder.

It will pull of things from a variety of places. M. Seyedmonir asked if it can work off campus. D. Wells said that the new software has been installed and it is testing and will be ready hopefully in the next few weeks. They are being cautious to not loose currently working materials. She said there was a list of currently subscribed journals. B. Ladner requested it be sent to the faculty list serve. S. Cottell said that he works for archives and would like faculty to sent him materials. M. Fultz moved and R. Baker seconded to accept the report. The motion carried by voice vote.

12. M. Anderson referred the senate to the written report. B. Lander moved and R. Baker seconded to accept the report. The motion carried by voice vote.
13. R. Ford asked for an update about online evaluations. B. Ladner said she has discovered Banner can do it securely, but we might need to purchase a module we don't have. B. Ladner says faculty said "not before fall 2018."
14. M. Seyedmonir presented a powerpoint about the process of reforming the instrument. This was a ground-zero, lit review-based process leading to the questions. He will put more information into google classroom to see resources, etc. The committee wanted to share there would be one more session with FPC for implementation. M. Fultz asked if there was still a free response section. Several faculty expressed approval. D. Williams thought 13 should be rephrased. M. Seyedmonir said it has been the hardest question, and breaking it into 3 was the only way all could be happy. They left out one question after going round and round. The focus groups wanted it left in there. B. Ladner said that, the way it is worded, it colors the way they answer the other questions. M. Seyed said if any have a suggestion email Emily or Mehdi. D. Williams said it is the only question that doesn't start with "The Instructor" and you can't measure a feeling. S. Armstrong suggested you reword that they can be someone differently and not all the same. This is not a psychological instrument, but a measure of their perception, any way you slice it. Stinson asks if it measures teacher effectiveness. It a certain aspect of it is more weighted? M. Seyed says that teaching effectiveness is multi-pronged, and the 4 dimensions are in the instrument. B. Ladner said can the feeling question be put on the back with stats questions and free response? S. Armstrong expressed concern about some of the vocabulary that might be a challenge to new students (ex. theory and applied). M. Seyedmonir responded that #11 came from student focus groups, and it is complex. K. Harper said that if it came from ed. majors, they will know terms others won't, so please consider this. M. Ray said that we receive disrespect from students, so can there be a question gauging. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski moved and B. Ladner seconded to accept the report. Motion carried by voice vote. T. Guetzloff asked when it will be implemented. R. Ford says that it will return to the senate in final form. Fall 2018?
15. M. Workman stated the committee is wondering how the handbook is revised. There was no clear answer. R. Ford said it should be a process we collaborate on. S. Armstrong said that it does come from Academic Affairs after the Senate looks at it. K. Jayasuriya said the senate has to approve the constitution and B. Ladner reminded that the full faculty vote. The rest of the faculty handbook has come in a variety of ways. B. Ladner says that faculty committees have, at times, worked on pieces. M. Fultz asked if M. Workman has the EPC piece gotten to him. He didn't think he was there that meeting, so it hasn't made progress. R. Ford confirmed it was passed in April 2017 and will send it to Mike. R. Baker said the committee has an editorial redacting responsibility. They review form and style. B. Ladner said they also make sure it is not in conflict with other areas. R. Ford asked if April is the date, with a recommendation to bring to Exec. first. This suggestion was confirmed. D. Wells asked if the committee member should be here to know if things are past. R. Baker said the parliamentarian should act as liaison. B. Ladner read language from the constitution outlining it, and it refers to a handbook committee.

16. R. Ford asked if the request for the Title III report has been rejected. What do we do with this now? B. Ladner suggests keeping it on the table, but don't push the matter now to see how Pres. Jenkins works through this. K. Jayasuriya thanked the faculty to making this happen because it is freeing funds we should use.
17. F. Vaughan says that the original Review of Tenured Faculty policy isn't being actively discussed, but they are mainly going from what the faculty submitted. Those additions not from the faculty committee are positive, in Frank's view. Specifying the committee has been important. They are mostly stylistic changes. Next week or in the near future is another meeting to decide to move forward to the board, 5 day notice of intent, policy proposal, 30-day comment. F. Vaughan has been encouraged by the process. R. Wallace asked why he thought the committee constitution was an improvement. F. Vaughan said the ability to extend the probation could be useful for close calls. The language clarifying who is on the committee is much better than the initial language of appointed by provost and faculty senate chair. This is now a stronger, more concrete policy. T. Kidde asked if there is a definition of marginal. F. Vaughan said the language went through several revisions. This is all determined by the instrument, which is not part of the policy. S. Armstrong thinks a policy based solely on negativity does no good for an institution and should include an incentive for those who have done well. F. Vaughan said he doesn't see this happening at this time. The board won't consider it. It is to identify unsatisfactory faculty, not to identify exceptional work. M. Fultz gave an example of crossing the threshold by submitting grants previously rejected. F. Vaughan says we should work hard on the evaluation instrument. He suggested that she come to an open meeting. T. Guetzloff said they will point to the merit policy. F. Vaughan remembers that is now out of the hands of the faculty. B. Ladner reminded all that it is evaluation of tenured faculty, so she would hope the board would entertain putting in a sentence saying it can come up with non-monetary ways to recognize excellence. K. Jayasuriya said the board shouldn't have to do it because he can do this anyway. He thanked Frank and Rich for their leadership.

J Barnes-Pietruszynski moved and M. Fultz seconded to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.