**Minutes from the WVSU General Faculty Meeting on Thursday, May 10, 2018**

**Wallace Hall Auditorium, 10:00 a.m.**

1. R. Ford called the meeting to order at 10:09 a.m.

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

3. R. Ford acknowledged all retiring faculty and thanked them for their service: R. Baker, T. Alderman, B. Wamsley, ???, J. Magan (emeritus phased retirement).

4. Student scholarships: Rhonda Brogan said that when she came it was still all done on paper. P. Schumann brought in the approval to develop a portal. R. Brogan did much of the work, and mid-semester an email was sent out announcing the launch. There has been money left on the table in past years, and we hope this portal will help us maximize the scholarship aid. R. Brogan said the portal is a one-stop shop for scholarships. After an overview of the page, she explained the access process, which students can access once accepted. There are over 120 scholarships through the Foundation. There is one general application that does an auto match and gives a list of “applied to” scholarships that need additional information (more restrictive). Y. Underdue Murph said it pulls information from banner to automatch and posts the number of scholarships you would qualify to apply for. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski asked if faculty can fill out scholarships for students. No, students have to log in themselves. There will be scholarships (ex. dept. scholarships) where faculty will be in a position to provide input regarding who receives them. T. Rhunke said that if students have changed majors, they need to make it official so it is listed correctly in Banner to correctly automatch. He suggested this be posted on the page to remind students of this. Y. Underdue Murph said that a consultant has suggested a process of communicating with applicants, and this could be included. R. Baker said that Banner does not allow students to list two majors, so this is a problem in matching scholarships. B. Ladner said Banner would not be able to pull this information, with only one slot for a major. T. Rhunke asked if there is anywhere this is included in the form. R. Brogan said they can write it in the essay, but they could add that field to the general application. B. Ladner clarified that a form has to be submitted, majors can’t be changed in Banner. Brogan shared the page that shows the populated information. B. Ladner asked if the software picks up the major from the essay. No, but R. Brogan reads them all. B. Ladner suggested offering a keyword box. G. Palubinskas asked for clarification regarding the general application interacting with Banner. Y. Underdue Murph said that 1-43 are all pulled from Banner. Students have praised the portal for its ease. Parents can be involved. D. Johnson asked if the faculty’s job was to now encourage students to use the portal. B. Ladner asked if they have to do this each year. Yes. B. Ladner said she has students fill out the general application as an assignment for the freshman experience course. T. Rhunke asked if the money left on the table suggests inefficiency. R. Brogan said that there is money left (ex. McDow County specific). She provided an example of a scholarship with the donor placing many restrictions and no one applying who match it. They are looking at approaching those donors with needs to see if they are willing to broaden the scope. D. Williams said her daughter got a scholarship that was HS specific. They could suggest that there be a tiered process, broadening the circle. T. Rhunke asked if there are recruiting efforts tailored to these constraints (McDow). Yes, there was an event in the county in addition to the other efforts. M. Fultz cited there are more Bluefield applicants than Poca applicants, so distance is not the only source of application issues. Why are students not interested in coming here? O. Banks asked what is the plan for admissions and recruitment. R. Brogan said they have a search on for a new admissions director. There are data that have not been analyzed. This problem cannot be turned on a dime, but will take a few cycles to determine the market and how to target it. It has also been an event schedule approach that hasn’t reaped rewards. Given low staff and little yield, these events aren’t going to occur anymore. Given the lowering population in the next 10 years, this could be a challenge. K. McDilda asked if Upward Bound was part of the discussion. Y. Underdue Murph said this was under the Provost, so she would have to ask him. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski asked about transfer students. Efforts are being made but can be improved upon.

5. Honors Program. T. Rhunke just finished his first year as chair of the committee. There is one graduate finishing this spring. One other carryover is in the works. There are 10 new students. All but 2 are in NSM, and the other two are psychology majors. He would like to expand the footprint to the other colleges. The program is focused toward a project or thesis. Students coming in will need faculty mentors to help guide them in those projects. There have been 4 faculty members who mentored students. He asked that we send him the potential name, A#, and email to him or encourage them directly to look into the program. He can send them the URL to the online application. He will be receiving a list of first-time, full-time freshman who meet the guidelines and he will send out a letter to those students. Faculty need to step up as mentors as the program expands. G. Palubinskas asked if there was a written report today. He said he presents a written report to the faculty senate in October. Jonathan asked about the requirements. 24 ACT and 3.5 GPA. Those with 12 credit hours or more hours need a GPA of 3.5 to apply. T. Guetzloff asked about honors students living near each other in the dorms. T. Rhunke said that the number of dorm students is too small now. He hadn’t been making plans in this direction, but isn’t opposed to this as the program grows.

6. M. Workman proposed an amendment to the bylaws regarding the honors program. T. Rhunke had the submitted language. B. Ladner asked if it was constitution or bylaws. Since it was bylaws, the general faculty can act. K. McDilda and J. Barnes-Pietruszynski moved to table the issue until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

7. Program Review Committee (AL). R. Baker nominated K. Harper. T. Guetzloff moved and J B-P seconded to elect by acclimation. M. Workman said that he had reminded past Provosts that they need to appoint this position in the spring. T. Guetzloff pointed out that K. Jayasuriya was in the room and has been reminded.

8. R. Ford stated the Senate’s resolution for an across the board pay raise not tied to merit pay. J. Magan moved and J. Eya seconded to ratify the senate’s resolution. T. Rhunke asked what the process would be to evaluate faculty. He said it would be the dean-created tenure/promotion instrument. T. Rhunke said that, since not all knew it would be tied to a raise, there would be grievances. T. Guetzloff said that 11 years ago HEPC required merit and we complied, but we didn’t want merit. M. Fultz asked what the problem is in using merit if there is an instrument (not applied to this year). D. Johnson said that, while he agrees with merit, this year should not apply due to the intention of the legislature. B. Ladner said that, once we’re within 10% SRB, we can look at merit, but until then, we should be fighting for each faculty’s raises. J. Magan said that, with that reality, we should all fight for a raise for all. The motion carried by voice vote.

9. R. Ford said that the faculty senate resolved for the general faculty to recommend a faculty member to the R&D Board. M. Fultz said that it is a hard to do the job if you don’t know about R&D. The best representative is someone who knows about this, including the current frustration of the faculty. R. Ford asked if we were ok doing the election. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said it was like the BOG representative. R. Ford reminded that the R&D faculty member is by appointment. B. Ladner suggested M. Fultz, but he was thinking of D. Huber to serve. He wasn’t in the meeting. J Eya asked if we can make a recommendation. R. Ford said that we can recommend. T. Rhunke said that K. Harper is still on the board, though she hasn’t been a dean for 3 years, implying stagnation of the process. He thinks that us recommending helps action to occur. R. Baker asked about the meeting schedule. There is a Dec. meeting and June meeting, with appointments in Sept. K. Jayasuriya said K. Harper hasn’t been a dean while he is here, now almost 4 years. It was decided that we would hold an election.

10. M. Workman asked about tuition waivers for faculty and family. R. Ford said there is no progress. J. Barnes-Pietruszynski said that Tom Bennett has left, so we’ve probably taken a step back.

The meeting adjourned at 11:16 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Dirk Johnson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate