

**West Virginia State University Board of Governors  
Academic Policies Committee  
Erickson Alumni Center, Weisberg Lounge  
December 8, 2017  
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
Agenda**

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Verification of Appropriate Notice of Public Meeting 2
3. Review and Approval of Agenda 1
4. Review and Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting 3
5. University Recommendations and Reports
  - 5.1 Proposed Policy from Policy Review Committee
    - 5.1.1 Post Tenure Review 6
  - 5.2 Program Update
    - 5.2.1 Bachelor of Fine Arts in Music Performance
6. Next Meeting Date – *January 25, 2018*
7. Adjournment

West Virginia State University  
*Academic Policies Committee*

Date/Time: 12/8/2017 -- 11:00 AM

Location:

West Virginia State University  
Erickson Alumni Center  
Weisberg Lounge  
Institute, WV

Purpose: To conduct regular business of the Committee in preparation for the December 8, 2017 Board of Governors meeting.

Notes:

This is a compliant meeting.

Meeting was approved: 11/28/2017 9:54:29 AM

**West Virginia State University Board of Governors  
Academic Policies Committee  
Erickson Alumni Center, Weisberg Lounge  
Minutes  
September 14, 2017**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Dr. Thralls called the meeting of the West Virginia State University Board of Governors Academic Policies Committee to order at 10:46 a.m.

**Present:** Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Kelley, Mr. Roberts, Dr. Thralls and Dr. Vaughan. Several members of the administration, faculty, and staff were also present.

**2. Election of Committee Chair**

Dr. Vaughan nominated Mr. Kelley for Committee Chair. Mr. Buchanan seconded the nomination, and the motion passed.

**3. Election of Presiding Officer in Absence of Committee Chair**

Dr. Thralls nominated Mr. Konstanty for Presiding Officer in Absence of Committee Chair. Mr. Buchanan seconded the nomination, and the motion passed.

**4. Verification of Appropriate Notice of Public Meeting**

Mr. Kelley announced the Verification of Appropriate Notice of Public Meeting.

**5. Review and Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Kelley asked for approval of the agenda. Dr. Thralls made the motion, and it was seconded by Dr. Vaughan. The motion passed.

**6. Review and Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Mr. Kelley asked for approval of the minutes from the June 15, 2017 meeting. Dr. Thralls made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Roberts. The motion passed.

**7. University Recommendation and Reports**

**7.1 Program Approvals**

**7.1.2 Engineering, B.S.**

Dr. Jayasuriya reminded the Committee that the Board approved the Bachelor of Science in Engineering program and stated this program has also received approval by the Higher Education Policy Commission (HEPC). The program is now pending approval by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). He stated that the University wants to add a Civil Engineering major and this can be done without approval from the HEPC. The University has the staff to begin the Civil Engineering program, and the equipment and labs in Wallace Hall as well. Dr. Jayasuriya is asking the Committee to approve the Civil Engineering major so it can be presented to the

HLC. Mr. Kelley inquired as to when the program would start, and Dr. Jayasuriya answered it would be in fall 2018. Mr. Roberts inquired if there was time to plan for the program and if the HEPC knew about the program. Dr. Jayasuriya confirmed that there was time and that the HEPC was aware of the program.

Dr. Thralls commented that with the previous legislation the HEPC policies were changed for certain institutions. He inquired if this would change what the Committee would need for approval of academic programs. Dr. Jayasuriya confirmed that it was an informant process instead of approval.

Mr. Roberts inquired about the professors that would be teaching the classes and their credentials. Dr. Jayasuriya answered that they had a Ph.D. and although they are junior faculty they have been involved in the process. Dr. Vaughan asked how this component would affect current program and if faculty would be taken away from existing classes. Dr. Jayasuriya assured the Committee that faculty would not be taken away from current classes.

Mr. Williams asked if the Committee would provide the financial information for the new program to the Finance Committee and inquired if it would affect the time line if they did. Dr. Jayasuriya commented that the financial information was in the Board packet. Mr. Williams commented that it could be helpful in finding resources for new programs if the financial information was submitted to the Finance Committee as well. There was concern expressed that the approval process would take longer if they had to be submitted to multiple committees. Mr. Kelley said there was discussion with the Finance Committee to have a special meeting in October to discuss financial concerns. Mr. Williams inquired if the Board could receive a list of classes being presented this semester with the number of students before the next Finance Committee meeting. Dr. Jayasuriya said he would have the information for them. Dr. Jayasuriya also commented that HLC takes five to six months to review a program, and to start in the fall of 2018 it would have to be done by October. Mr. Williams stressed that the Finance Committee needs to be aware of the financial projections of the programs. Dr. Jayasuriya stated he would send all copies to Mr. Jones in the future. Dr. Thralls commented that the process of approval needs to be defined and developed for the future. Mr. Williams commented that making the Finance Committee aware should be a procedural matter and not an action item.

A motion was made to approve the Engineering, B.S. with a major in Civil Engineering by Dr. Thralls. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion. The motion passed.

### **7.1.1 Computer Science, M.S.**

Dr. Jayasuriya stated that the Computer Science, M.S. was a fast growing program. He commented that the University's goal is to increase the master's programs. He

stated there is potential in the program. Dr. Jayasuriya commented that the program proposal will have the chance to be approved by the HEPC.

Dr. Vaughan inquired as to resources and institutional support for the program. Dr. Jayasuriya commented that Academic Affairs has shifted resources into programs to make them successful. He stated his concern is if the University does not add programs that student numbers will continue to decrease. Dr. Thralls felt that looking at programs carefully, sensitively and critically with regard to budget cuts and offering more programs should happen. Dr. Jayasuriya stated that was happening currently with every program and course.

Dr. Vaughan stated that the proposal contains information about library resources. He inquired as to where the money was obtained from and if the graduate students tuition could be increased to obtain those funds. Dr. Jayasuriya commented it was a possibility, but the Board approved increasing the literacy fee last year. He also commented that Title III funds also are in use. Mr. Kelley stated that the Finance Committee should be given the projections of the program. Dr. Vaughan agreed and stated that new programs could impact existing programs because resources would not be readily available. Dr. Jayasuriya commented it was a fair statement, but the University has grown in new areas and feels this program would be beneficial.

A motion was made to approve the Computer Science, M.S. degree by Dr. Thralls. Dr. Vaughan seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Mr. Kelley stated that if the committee was agreeable to involving the Finance Committee in future program approvals he would let the Committee know. The Committee agreed.

**8. Next Meeting Date –**  
December 8, 2017

**9. Adjournment**

With there being no further business, a motion was made by Dr. Vaughan and seconded by Mr. Roberts to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 11:28 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy L. Allen

# **WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

## **West Virginia State University**

### **BOG Policy #//**

**TITLE: Post-Tenure Review of Faculty**

#### **Section 1. General**

- 1.1 Scope: This policy establishes guidelines and procedures related to a post-tenure review process of all tenured faculty to include, but not be limited to, all current tenured faculty and any future tenured faculty.
- 1.2 Authority: West Virginia Code § 18B-1-6, § 18B-8-7
- 1.3 Adopted:
- 1.4 Effective:

#### **Section 2. Post-Tenure Review Procedures**

- 2.1 Pursuant to West Virginia Code § 18B-8-7, any rules adopted by a governing board related to faculty preempts any conflicting rule adopted by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission. Therefore, the West Virginia State University Board of Governors adopts this policy to ensure a post-tenure review (PTR) is conducted on all tenured faculty to include, but not be limited to, all current tenured faculty and any future tenured faculty.
- 2.2 PTR is intended to support faculty development and productivity. It considers the professional quality with which faculty members discharge the academic duties associated with their positions. It is designed to support the development of faculty and to enhance student success that is to be assessed by qualitative and quantitative measures to include, but not be limited to, retention rates, persistence rates and completion rates of students through faculty teaching, research and service.
- 2.2 The Board of Governors, consistent with West Virginia Code, hereby establishes the following procedures to be implemented immediately upon adoption by the West Virginia State University Board of Governors:
  - 2.2.1 During a faculty's annual review, should the chair or dean determine a faculty's performance to be marginal in overall performance for two consecutive years in one of three areas: teaching, research and/or service, the Provost shall direct the faculty member in collaboration with the chair or dean of the department or college the faculty member falls within to develop an improvement plan.

2.2.1.1 Upon receipt of the directive from the Provost to develop an improvement plan, the faculty member must write within fourteen (14) calendar days an improvement plan, covering the timeline established by the Provost, which addresses the area(s) found to be marginal. The improvement plan must include performance goals to raise the performance of the deficient area(s), strategies for attaining the goals, specific measures by which the goals are to be assessed, meet the timeline established by the Provost and be approved by the chair and/or the dean and the Provost.

2.2.1.1 The timeline for the improvement plan shall not be more than two regular semesters and shall begin the next regular semester after the regular semester in which the improvement plan is developed. Any resources needed to meet the requirements within the improvement plan shall not exceed any resources that may have been required should the faculty have met the satisfactory rating to begin with or be needed as a result of the improvement plan itself.

2.2.1.2 If the chair or dean determines a faculty member's performance to be marginal in the identified area(s) in an annual review that falls within the timeline of the improvement plan, such determination does not initiate an additional improvement plan but also does not extend the timeline by which the faculty may extend the timeline.

2.2.2 If, at the conclusion of the timeline for the improvement plan, the chair and/or the dean determines the faculty member's performance is still less than satisfactory, the Provost, upon review, may initiate sanctions to include, but not be limited to, termination of employment of the faculty member.

2.2.3 The Provost is to develop a form that is to be utilized for the faculty to utilize should the need arise to develop an improvement plan and will be listed within the Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Handbook is to be amended as soon as practical following the adoption of this policy to comply with the provisions provided herein.

### **Section 3. Appeals**

3.1 The faculty member may appeal the judgement of the chair and/or the dean and/or the sanctions of the Provost to the President. The President's decision is final.