Minutes from the WVSU Faculty Senate Meeting on Friday, May 4, 2018
Hamblin Hall Auditorium, 1:30 pm

Attendance:

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

Parliamentarian: Jack Magan; Visiting Faculty: T. Rhunke, M. Pennington, R. Francis; Library: W. Stinson Promotion and Tenure Committee: T. Kiddee; Constitution and Bylaws: M. Workman Deans/Interim Deans: R. Wallace (A&H), D. Williams (BSS); P. Carney (PS); N. Zaman

Meeting called to order at 1:37 pm

1. M. Fultz and M. Seyedmonir seconded to approve the agenda considering F. Vaughan’s request for President Jenkins to address the plan for raises. The motion carried by voice vote.

2. President Jenkins: Research and Development Corporation. Our R&D falls under VP McMeans and includes R&D, Title III, and Land Grant. Out of the budget efficiency taskforce, questions arose about financial issues in R&D. Dr. Jenkins responded to these questions as follows. Question 1: Administrative structure. The VP and 3 Associate VPs report to me. Question 2: What rules govern R&D? This is available on their website. The R&D Board is made up of internal and external members that govern R&D. They help develop the rules of the R&D corporation. Question 3: How were salaries of administrators determined and approved? I don’t know. I am not going to spend a lot of time worrying about things in the past before I arrived. There are faculty on that board. M. Fultz stated that those salaries were never brought before the board. President Jenkins said that he can’t speak to it. T. Rhunke said that the former President set these, and this is how it occurred. M. Seyedmonir asked if the VP of R&D was paid with R&D money or university funds. President Jenkins said the salary was paid by the University but the raises are approved by R&D. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski asked who knows how they were approved? Pres. Jenkins said called Radford University. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said that he could find out. Someone around here knows, will you ask? Is it written down anywhere? Brian Hemphill knows, Orland knows, and the board of directors knows. M. Fultz reminded the president that the board of directors were never in the loop. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said this that not knowing, when questions could be asked, is not acceptable response. Pres. Jenkins said that the contracts are there, we can’t change them, so let’s look toward the next contract. T. Rhunke said that, while they have a board, the majority of the voting members are expected to be from the parent organization to constitute a majority, according to the legislative language. This tells him that they are to be subservient to the parent institution, and it is the President’s show when it comes to governing the board. He doubts that K. Jayasuriya and other VPs would consistently stake out board issues that are contrary to the President. If we could come to an agreement as a group of administrators and faculty that it is not an independent entity but part of the University, and operate from that standpoint, we would be able to move forward. According to the language, Hemphill could do this. T. Guetzloff said as a former board member, the BOG never hears about the Foundation or R&D. The President is their employee, so the issue gets murky. B. Ladner would feel better not to worry about the legal things about breaking contracts, but she wants to know how things will be handled in the future for more transparency and rational decision making to other stakeholders. R. Ford said he did not see the rules or minutes posted on the R&D website. T. Rhunke said that Pres. could guide that process. M. Fultz said that, at the May 29th meeting, posting of minutes and governing rules could be addressed. K. McDilda moved and T. Rhunke seconded that M. Fultz propose to have minutes and governing rules posted online. The motion carried by voice vote. The Pres. will not circumvent their boards actions. D. Johnson asked that if the board is an independent governing body to that extent, where is there accountability to the institution? Who can make changes to that disjunction? T. Rhunke stated that Pres. Jenkins appoints the board. Dr. Jenkins said he appoints the chair, and the chair appoints the board. T. Rhunke suggested that he then appoints the board as the person who appoints the chair. Pres. Jenkins would not agree to that statement.
Legislature defined raises. The decision for raises are to be decided by the President’s council and have not been fully decided. Pres. Jenkins said that the R&D corporation are not state employees. Pres. Jenkins said that the raises only will be shared with E&G, so the 2.3 raise simply means that the legislature did not actually provide enough money for us to provide the publicized 5%. They added $346,000 and it simply doesn’t cover it. F. Vaughan said that the media and governor are saying 5%, but it isn’t actually the case. This is based on an average of all state employees salaries, not an individual’s specific salary.

Title III. The University is revamping how Title III will be spent. Innovation, Student Success and Retention, and Experiential Learning. For example, M. Seyedmonir had a microscope problem, communicated this to the President, and he committed money to the project. They may not be MIT, but they won’t have cheap microscopes, either. Also, more money will be spent on faculty travel. Dean Carney has suggested that we need to improve technology in our classrooms (ex. SMART classrooms.) Our students graduated from and teach in these classrooms, but aren’t experiencing them here. The library 2nd floor is another project, a student one-stop shop area.

Pres. Jenkins asked the senate to believe him. Tell him one thing he hasn’t done that he said he’d do over the last two years. He said the trust is there, and he has felt that, and we want to keep that going. It isn’t about him building trust, it is about us doing what is right. He was not trying to expand his circle of friends or get on someone’s Christmas lists, he didn’t come to be liked, but to do what’s right, and we’re going to do those things.

Research faculty evaluation procedures for promotion/tenure. We need a researcher promotion pathway, and they need resources they can tap into. We’ll make that happen and have been working behind the scenes. There is action being taken, so what you’re saying is not falling on deaf ears. Dr. McMeans is the VP and will remain the VP. He has not seen anything up to this point that would make me think otherwise. No one on the BOG or Board of Directors have had anything ill to say until the last couple of months. All the sudden it is a landslide of complaints. Pres. Jenkins said that’s not fair. T. Rhunke said that you get a much closer experience to what the problems are when you get in Hamblin Hall, and, sparing an example in the last few days, given the salary we are paying VP McMeans, we are not getting the service we are paying for. Pres. Jenkins asked why there are complaints all of the sudden? J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said no one knew. She reminded the President that Title III is a report we’ve been asking for (before this all broke out), and this request was based on these concerns. Pres. Jenkins said Title III isn’t R&D. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said it is confusing. It’s governed by R&D and yet isn’t part of it? She said we’ve been in an extreme budget crunch. It was stated by the attending R&D Researcher that no one has been complaining for years but they are afraid to say anything because of fear of retribution from VP McMeans. This is why you haven’t heard, but he would be happy to have a private conversation to share things he wouldn’t be comfortable sharing in this room. T. Rhunke said that we know how people operate to put shine on the boss. He said that J. Barnes-Pietruszynski is spot on that, given the budget efficiency talk, he would be disappointed if his colleagues were reacting in any other way. Pres. Jenkins said he has an open door policy. We have more access to him then most institutions. M. Fultz asked if, in the near future, there will be a capital campaign needed to fix things up? We will use Title III for now. Pres. Jenkins said yes, but said that the focus has been broadening our donors. Some of the previous capital campaign donors are paying for the next 5-6 years. He says we’re probably 2 years away, and with a silent mode to be considered as well. R. Ford said that with the blow up of R&D, we as a faculty have not been blowing up. O. Banks expressed gratitude and said it is a well received message. D. Wells said that the transparency needs to be solved. There will be a one-time money wishlist from VPs. His job is a challenge to get to every corner of the past, and he can’t fix everything in year one. D. Johnson suggested that if the President is hearing more about underlying problems, it suggests that trust is being built. Pres. Jenkins said that his door is always open. He loves the interaction with us to keep getting on the same page, and there’s not a question he’s going to duck. He’s not telling rich he can’t show up. If we can’t talk about it, we can’t fix it. K. McDilda expressed gratitude for him coming out to meet students on Earthday.

3. M. Fultz suggested that, at the general faculty meeting, the faculty senate nominate a person to the R&D Board of Directors to know the inner workings of R&D. M. Fultz moved and O. Banks seconded that we provide
one faculty and one dean. K. Harper should have been replaced when she stepped down as dean. The motion carried by voice vote.

4. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski moved and K. McDilda seconded to approve the minutes from March 2 and April 6. The motion carried by voice vote.

5. R. Ford mentioned those he knew who were retiring, and asked if there were others. Chris Clark, it was clarified, is eligible for a 2nd term, having completed the end of someone else's term the first time he was elected. Marc Porter is the A&H alternate. There was some question about Seth Caudill for Library, Jay Canterbury for BSS. The alternate for NSM declined afterward. T. Rhunke was nominated. T. Rhunke moved and M. Fultz seconded to elect R. Ford as Senate Chair. The motion carried by voice vote. M. Fultz moved and O. Banks seconded J. Barnes-Pietruszynski as Senate Vice-Chairman. The motion carried by voice vote. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski moved and M. Fultz seconded to elect K. Harper as an at-large member of the Faculty Executive Committee. The motion carried by voice vote. M. Seyedmonir moved and M. Fultz seconded to elect D. Johnson as Faculty Senate Secretary. The motion carried by voice vote.

6. Provost Report – K. Jayasuriya said that he is as frustrated with the R&D situation as everyone. He reminded that it is not Pres. Jenkins' doing. Also, he chose to come here to address the questions. The Provost hopes that some here will write to thank him.

The committee appointed to draft a policy for research faculty did not meet the deadline, but they were given a short length of time. One individual worked on the task, but the committee did not have time to confer. R. Ford said he told the president to blame the faculty if it didn't happen. K. Jayasuriya said he did give them short time. T. Rhunke said that the Exec. could speak on behalf of the faculty over the summer.

Program coordinator descriptions and evaluations needs to be worked on by the deans.

HEPC provided updated suggestions for replacing grades by retaking classes. Are there issues with our academic replacement rule? A total of 21 credit hours are allowed, according to the HEPC document, with a date of implementation. B. Ladner said that if they come back after time off, they don't get a new slate in our policy. K. Jayasuriya said that he thinks the old cap was 15 hours, so the HEPC policy is the more lenient policy. D. Williams thought there was no cap in the old policy. T. Rhunke said he never ran across the cap issue in discussions. If no cap, he will have to figure out a plan for the grandfathering in with new limits. R. Baker suggested that at one time a form was used to apply beforehand, and he suggested that has value. K. Jayasuriya was part of the revising committee, and the commission approved what is in there, but we have the option to let them know what we don't like. We can be more restrictive. B. Ladner said that there is no cap (confirmed looking online), but was wondering if this rule would impact that other aspect of forgiveness. R. Ford said he had heard there could be flexibility, and Donna Hunter had concerns, thinking we wanted to take a look at it. The Provost said that he thought this is the policy we will be required to follow. K. McDilda asked what a clean slate meant. Provost clarified, stating that only transfer students have a fresh start, not returning.

Learning House online students. There were 197 last semester. 93 registered for summer. M. Seyedmonir asked if we are planning to separate from Learning House. Provost's goal is 500 students. K. Jayasuriya said that he has asked T. Kiddee to copy the courses we have so we can transfer them to another vendor with Moodle. M. Fultz asked if the online is cash positive. The Provost said that it is very cash positive. We only pay 10,000 to enroll our not 100% online. We pay 50% to Learning House. It was asked why we are looking at the separation. Provost said that, once we know how to market and maintain enrollment, we would not have to use their service for enrollment. They paid out $350000 in initial marketing, so a good use of them early on. T. Guetzloff said we have 250 students. As we grow in this area, our face to face is going down. Each semester it is going down with in-face students. The grow areas are online, grad, international, and early enrollment. T. Guetzloff said there's about 82% retention for online. T. Kiddee asked if we need to give notice to get out of the contract. T. Guetzloff said that we have to give 30 days. M. Fultz asked if the face to face students loyalty program is helping. The
Provost said it is too soon to know. 13-17% of our enrollment had early enrollment credits. 2200 fall, 1800 spring early enrollment.

R. Ford asked about teaching emeritus. The retirement benefit would have to increase insurance costs if named retirement. In the emeritus transition plan, for two years while teaching in the plan, this will apply to them. This status applies for the two years. Next year ½, next ¼ time, then it goes away. Three took advantage of it. T. Guetzloff asked if the provost received their department’s recommendations for Emeritus. He said not yet. M. Fultz said it was in the minutes.

7. ACF – There is concern (Fairmont and Concord) with policies eroding tenure. Glenville is growing. They cut tuition this past year and may have gotten them good press. K. Jayasuriya said they have a new president who brought a new admission team, etc. and is doing very well. Some schools are suggesting ebooks to save money. It was asked about the new formula-based funding. Provost said that it will go into effect Fall 2019. M. Fultz and M. Seyedmonir seconded to accept the report. The motion carried by voice vote.

8. BOG – F. Vaughan reported there was no meeting since last senate meeting. T. Guetzloff suggested a resolution saying not to tie the raise to merit, but have it across the board. T. Rhunke asked the provost if he had any mechanism for merit. K. Jayasuriya asked the deans, and they said that there is not a current mechanism. T. Guetzloff moved and O. Banks seconded that the faculty senate recommend to the provost that the 2018–2019 raise be across the board increase and not be tied to merit. M. Workman asked if we could move it to the general faculty meeting. R. Ford asked if it would hurt to pass something now. It was asked if the president asked if the raise would be subject to merit. T. Guetzloff said the President mentioned it and he mentioned the merit. M. Fultz asked when it was determined that we didn’t want raises tied to merit. T. Guetzloff said in 2006 and 2008 it came up. M. Fultz suggests we have things written down to make sure. D. Johnson asked about M. Fultz’s question, if we as a faculty really believe no future raises should be tied to merit. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski seconded the question. The motion carried by voice vote.

9. EPC – 4 total passed, with no objections, a few abstentions. A class passed in 2015 hadn’t made it into the catalog. The form was resubmitted to make that change. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski moved, K. McDilda seconded to accept the report. The motion carried by voice vote.

10. T Kiddee - Promotion and tenure. 2 portfolios this year, one for tenure and one for promotion. There was a unanimous tenure vote, and discussion about the promotion candidate. Three committee members said we should strictly follow the handbook, so there was a 3-3 split and it was referred to provost. The other issue was to make recommendations for the future in handbook updates to accommodate research faculty. This was done and this was the first time he had heard today a second committee had been formed. M. Seyedmonir moved and M. Fultz seconded to accept report. The motion passed by voice vote.

11. Retention - T. Rhunke. In addition to the written report, he highlighted a multi-year calendar so that people don’t miss 3rd year reviews as has happened in the past. We don’t have numbers to compare candidates to in the past. The ranges for the points were conjured, so we need to compile scores from across the board for context to tenured faculty. There is a digital submission process to be implemented next year. K. McDilda asked about the digital process. He said he would like to not see a complicated Adobe presentation, but a document with instructions to organize the portfolio to see the points awarded and need to provide evidence for that claim to support it. M. Fultz asked about K. Steele being wrongly categorized (social work, not criminal justice). He also said good luck getting a bank of scores. T. Rhunke says it is the legal action that will be a problem for the University if we don’t have them. M. Workman asked why P&T candidates are confidential, but not confidential on the Retention report. T. Rhunke said that stating who the applicants where is not a secret, it’s the decisions that are private. M. Fultz moved and J. Barnes-Pietruszynski seconded to accept the report. The motion carried by voice vote.

12. R. Ford asked for information regarding the controlled substance policy that BOG requested of the faculty. F. Vaughan stated that a policy was drafted and submitted. G. Hankins said that opioids, once in the water, aren’t
changed by the treatment process and get into the bodies of those who drink it. This research line led to the need for controlled substances. Dr. Toledo worked on a Yale-revised policy, and had gone through some revisions. G. Hankins has used comments from that and written his own, as well. There are still comments in there regarding Dr. Nichols’ research. He asked what he wanted us to do with what he has written. The safety officer is something that should be tied in, but we don’t have that yet. Also controlled substances that don’t fall within WV board of pharmacy and federal, but needing industrial hemp through the dept. agriculture. It still requires licenses, FBI review, but is beyond this policy’s scope. O. Banks asked why it was designed. To establish Univ. guidelines as to what has to be done from individual point of view and on university level. M. Fultz asked how many faculty were effected. One for sure, him perhaps, industrial hemp would be 3rd. We have to have a policy for research to move forward. He invited anyone to take a look. T. Guetzloff moved and T. Rhunke seconded that the policy move forward and go before the board without further review by the senate. The idea is to have this ready by August when the lab space will be completed. The motion carried by voice vote. F. Vaughan expressed appreciation for his work.

13. R. Ford asked N. Zaman to report on the safety officer. The paperwork to post the job was prepared and sent to the Provost. He has been looking for the posting. It was asked what the job of this person would be. G. Hankins described the duties and said that we are not in compliance with federal law. D. Wells asked how it’s taking so long with fines at stake, and N. Zaman said he agrees and expressed this to M. Jones a year ago. He didn’t see it as a priority. M. Fultz said the hang-up was not just the CFO, but also who will pay. R. Ford asked if the minutes reflected our concern with the slow timeline. K. McDilda asked what we can do. R. Ford said that he brought it up in Sept. with the VP of Research, yet still no action. T. Rhunke expressed that the salary will be too low, and we’ll hire someone without the interest or expertise. Could we add this to duties of someone already here? T. Guetzloff said he hoped it got resolved by July 1.

14. Student Evaluations – R. Ford. D. Johnson moved, M. Fultz seconded to accept the provided form as the new front material to our form, with the back being the same as in the past. The motion carried by voice vote. M. Seyedmonir said he would provide this to the FPC.

15. R. Ford asked about inviting Pat Schumann to show the website.

16. The general faculty meeting is scheduled for May 10th at 10:00, which will not interfere with the BOG meetings.

17. M. Seyedmonir thanked R. Baker for his contributions along the years.

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.