

**Minutes from the WVSU General Faculty Meeting on Wednesday, December 11, 2019  
Wallace Hall Auditorium, 2:00 p.m.**

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m.

1. T. Ruhnke moved and J. Barnes-Pietruszynsky seconded approval of the agenda. The motion passed by voice vote.
2. F. Vaughan moved and T. Ruhnke seconded the approval of minutes from the August 13, 2019 General Faculty Meeting. R. Ford suggested and faculty agreed to postpone approval given only email access for review in the meeting (no hard copies or early email access available).
3. R. Ford asked if there was a need for standing committee meetings in the spring meetings schedule. F. Vaughan said a committee he serves on would have one. The meeting slot will remain on the calendar and be used at the discretion of committee chairs.
4. President search. The BOG had no knowledge of the change before the campus community. The BOG will discuss procedures during their Friday Dec. 13 meetings, weighing the need for a search firm. R. Ruhnke suggested that not using a search firm could cause problems. F. Vaughan said the bias of head hunters is one issue there. B. Leidl said that, based on her work on 4 provost searches, the search firm search (1 of 4) was much more professional and we don't have the man power or personnel here to run a professional search. We would look much better with professionals doing the management. T. Ruhnke added to consider that the search firm will have clients, but will have others brought into the discussion as well, and though they may have a thumb on the scale, if there is a formalized list of people, we as faculty can do our own due diligence on the matter before public announcement. We can come up with our procedure, and B. Leidl emphasized references. B. Ladner suggested they select a search firm that sends out a call, not just working with a pool they already know. F. Vaughan said we should do our own encouraging of potential candidates. G. Palaubinskas said that if we go outside of academia, we are cautious to make sure they know academia and choose to view it through that lens. F. Vaughan said that if they went non-academic it would vault up the Provost position here. R. Ford asked F. Vaughan the best time for faculty to attend the BOG meeting. 1:30 p.m. T. Ruhnke asked about the current role of Pres. Jenkins between now and May 15. F. Vaughan said it will be discussed.
5. Provost search – The plan is to keep Dr. Byers around and have the new Pres. do the new search.
6. New R&D Director – Pres. Jenkins suggested that there might be a change of leadership structure, since it is within the University. They may not replace the director position. B. Leidl said that Brunetta may be leaving in May, leaving only Toledo and Smith with no one over OSD or Business and Finance. Byers could oversee AOR in their absence. T. Ruhnke said the strategic plan needs to be addressed. B. Leidl says they are not included in any discussions in terms of direction. She reminded the faculty that we don't have the guarantee of the same match after this year from the legislature. R. Ford said that the faculty sent a strong message in May about problems there, so may have contributed to this opportunity to change. B. Leidl described the following problem. Now all R&D employees are on 9 month contracts and are faculty, but not held in actuality to the same schedule. They were told they had to accept it. B. Ladner said we should be aiming at the counties that need our help, adjacent but needy. It should also have an

outreach and branding/recruiting purpose. B. Ladner said she has asked for 8 years for recruiting materials. Brunetta is listed as chair of R&D in a recent meeting. B. Leidl said not even they were told McMeans was leaving. T. Rhunke says the independent board walls themselves off from input from the school, though it's part of the school. Can this be explained to the board that we'll be in the same position if the Board of R&D is not revisited. It's a 20+ year-old BOG decision to structure it that way, but some who are still there now like that structure. B. Lander said initially they thought it would work. B. Ladner said it doesn't need a big structure, if you look at other institutions. F. Vaughan said in a year or two the BOG would be more open to change. B. Leidl said the research and outreach should go across academics, as well, so all are doing so. We need to show we are serious about being a research institution. She does not want to be a lone wolf out there doing research. We need to improve our focus, or at least communicate our work, in research and outreach.

7. President said that there would be a search in the spring for a VP of Finance. B. Leidl asked who would head the search. T. Rhunke asked why we couldn't keep going as we currently have with K. Williams. R. Ford said Pres. Jenkins said it would need to be a Ph. D. Why? T. Guetzloff said that, by law, we need CPA in the office, and that is also preferred in a Director. Several asked why K. Williams can't continue, but not be interim so she has some clout. J. Barnes-Pietruszynsky voiced the concern of Pres. Jenkins directing the search given he's leaving. F. Vaughan said there are board members who share the concern.

8. T. Kiddie said that he expressed in the Aug. general faculty meeting that he needed help to accomplish the Web 30 online evaluations. It was stated (referred to minutes) that the faculty would provide help, but none was provided despite 30 + hours to put the links onto the Web 30 + hours, so it was not significant. The window is closed by midnight tonight, and with two busy days this week, and the break beginning next week, then he can't meet the objective to be done by next Tuesday without the help of a person at the level of at least a grad student due to administrative access. T. Guetzloff said that he is using both his temps, leaving only him and one other with admin. Access, so he needs 2 more. Anyone with a grad students interested? T. Rhunke asked the difference between web 100 and the others that were online. T. Kiddie said that about 50% are web 30. T. Kiddie said that the responses were about 50% higher, so that is positive, but he thinks the percentage is still pretty low. G. Palabinskas asked if there was a way to compare online responses to written. B. Ladner says she's ok doing whatever. She is ok with Web 30 being taken off, but not Web 50 because they don't come all the time and she sees worse absenteeism, recognizing the difficulty to Tom. T. Kiddie said that we only have 20 or so Web 50 and he thinks students like one or the other.

9. R. Ford reminded the faculty of the online suggestion box.

10. Faculty awards – M. Fultz wants to talk about those in the general faculty meeting in January.

11. Policy on tuition waivers – R. Ford asked if anyone has heard of anything new for dependents of employees beyond Pres. Jenkins saying the policy is soon to be announced No responses offered.

12. R. Kendrick's survey of "the next five years" is about cost over 5 years, not the length of the program.

13. Faculty self-report evaluations committee. B. Ladner said that she emailed Scott Woodard, and he referred her to the deans to get data. She has sent an email and has heard from two deans.

She expects that process will work. J. Barnes-Pietruszynsky described the work of the committee with one meeting. G. Palabinskas asked for them to discuss timing of when they are filled out.

14. Policy of getting paid for grants. J. Barnes-Pietruszynsky and K. Steele drafted a policy for any pay above our 38.5 hours. They have sent it out to various offices to make sure they are in compliance with all laws, etc., as well as in line with peer institutions. It has been a year trying to get traction. B. Ladner asked if GRDI is allowed to write grants over the summer? K. Steele said that faculty can do that now, and B. Leidl can, too.

15. Academic Honesty – T. Kiddie wrote a draft policy (last updated March 2019), but with losing the Provost, it has been sidelined. J. Magan emphasized the need for teaching moments to be part of the policy, rather than only punishment, to allow differences between errors and intent. B. Leidl suggested an Academic honesty policy rather than academic dishonesty policy. J. Barnes-Pietruszynsky said that, given administrative staffing inconsistency, the faculty should move forward. R. Ford suggested the spring is a good window for us to get some work done. B. Ladner said max and min punishments should be determined by the faculty member. It was said that there should be some say by faculty unless it is the most extreme case. B. Ladner said we should be able to decide the seriousness of the offense. G. Palabinskas said that it was a University-wide policy, right? B. Lander said we're talking about a policy that empowers for serious offenses. Also, that it would help communicate across disciplines. G. Palabinskas questioned if that labeling of students would help. She said that that would best be held by an administrative office. R. Ford said that we need a way to keep track so we can warn effectively once, but have consequences thereafter. T. Rhunke echoed the need to keep multiple incidents with one student. It was said that using withdrawal currently, students get away with it without any record. B. Leidl said in a previous institution there was a physical submission kept in the administrative office and by the advisor. B. Ladner said one of our several lost policies had that. T. Kiddie said Achieve might be used to keep track. T. Guetzloff expressed concern about Achieve sharing info and prejudicing against students. It could be a law suit.

15. D. Johnson said he'd send out minutes ahead of time, given new email-only policy. He had envisioned folks reading them on their phones in place of printed copies for today's meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:08 p.m.