

**West Virginia State University Board of Governors  
Policy Review Special Committee  
Erickson Alumni Center, Grand Hall  
Thursday, January 25, 2018  
8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.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 Meetings 3
5. Committee Recommendations and Report on Proposed Policies:
  - 5.1 Post Tenure Review
  - 5.2 Records Retention
  - 5.3 Furlough
6. Next Meeting – *April 6, 2018*
7. Adjournment

**West Virginia State University**  
***Board of Governors Special Policy Review Committee Meeting***

**Date/Time:** 1/25/2018 -- 8:30 AM

**Location:**

Erickson Alumni Center, Grand Hall  
West Virginia State University  
Institute, WV 25112

**Purpose:** To conduct the regular business of the Committee in preparation for the January 25, 2017 Full Board Meeting.

**Notes:**

This is a compliant meeting.

**Meeting was approved : 1/17/2018 11:47:12 AM**

**West Virginia State University Board of Governors  
Policy Review Special Committee  
Erickson Alumni Center, Weisberg Lounge  
Minutes  
December 8, 2017**

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

Mr. Konstanty called the meeting of the West Virginia State University Board of Governors Special Committee on Policy Review to order at 8:33 AM.

**Present:** Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Kelley, Mr. Konstanty, Mr. Lipscomb, Mr. Swingle and Dr. Vaughan. Board Chair Williams, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Kumara Jayasuriya and faculty members Michael Pennington, Dr. Tom Guetzloff, Dr. Micheal Fultz, Dr. Barbara Ladner, Dr. Ginta Palubinskas and Marc Porter were also present.

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

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

**3. Review and Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Swingle motioned for approval of the agenda as presented. Dr. Vaughan seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

**4. Committee Recommendations and Report on Proposed Policies**

Mr. Konstanty stated this new committee was appointed to review and consider certain policies, which is a practice that has been utilized in the past. The two draft proposed policies on the agenda are Post Tenure Review and Records Retention. The proposed policies were distributed to the Board prior to the meeting.

**4.1 Post Tenure Review**

Dr. Vaughan said he had was unaware of the proposed policy until last Thursday and was only appointed to the Committee this morning. To that end, he suggested postponing consideration of this policy to allow more time for review. Mr. Konstanty noted there is no action on the agenda and said he would like the Committee to discuss the policy as planned. Provost Jayasuriya commented that he was asked to draft a policy on post tenure review, but it appears the draft policy and the existing review process need to be reviewed together, with concurrent changes to both. The intent of the policy he drafted was to have faculty go through the existing review and provide a vehicle for any performance based issues. As an example, Provost Jayasuriya indicated that the research component of the review could affect some faculty negatively due to shortage of financial resources devoted to research. Provost Jayasuriya also indicated that about two years ago Academic Affairs developed a new instrument for faculty evaluation that actually gives points to different activities. He said this is administered by deans, department chairs and himself. Mr. Swingle asked when the annual

review takes place; forms are due in the fall and the reviews are conducted in the spring around February.

Dr. Vaughan said if the policy is going to be adopted, there needed to be consideration of unintended consequences. A question was raised about the definition of marginal as mentioned in the policy. Mr. Konstanty asked if the rubric is fair across all faculty, and Dr. Vaughan responded that it is a concern because faculty responsibilities vary. Mr. Kelley asked about the service piece. Dr. Vaughan explained it includes community service, participating in university events, service to their profession, etc. He also commented that much time is spent with students by faculty and they would have to cut back on this in order to meet expectations in the service review. Dr. Ladner said one concern of faculty in the policy was that if they are not doing enough research they would be facing a problem even though they do a great deal of service. Other faculty are heavily involved on a more administrative level and do not have time to teach many hours, which could also affect the review. She said another problem she sees is many similarities to something created by the deans that could be counted towards merit should they ever be merit funds. She suggested a college-based research requirement. Dr. Guetzloff said the new instrument does have a merit base.

Dr. Ladner felt faculty agree there should be accountability, and they just want it to be fair across the board. There is a concern that the policy is intended to fire faculty. Dr. Vaughan said since the proposed policy was distributed to the Board last week, there has been much discussion among the faculty, and the majority are in support of a fair review process. Mr. Konstanty clarified that there has been a faculty review or evaluation in place, but not one for post tenure. Mr. Swingle expressed concern with the sanctions in this policy, as there are consequences for the review and the fact that not all faculty are the same in what they do. Dr. Palubinskas said with regard to the research portion, there are no resources for her faculty to conduct research and they therefore could not meet that criterion. Dr. Guetzloff said in 2019 new faculty hires would have to have research in their portfolios in order to get tenure. Provost Jayasuriya commented the new instrument was created with faculty input and went before the Faculty Senate three times. Mr. Kelley said there is a policy coming before the Committee that does not include the scorecard that the policy is based on with regard to review that could result in sanctions. Mr. Konstanty agreed and said from this discussion he felt the faculty agree that there is a need for a review; it is a process that may need revisions. He agreed that faculty should have input into a policy that directly affects them. Dr. Ladner noted it is important the policy does not undermine protections for academic freedom, which is one main intention of tenure, has an appeal process that protects from personality conflicts and that faculty are not being asked to do something for which there are no resources.

Dr. Vaughan agreed that tenure provides academic freedom, but does not provide protection to disregard classes or slack on performance. Currently, the University does not have a process in place to address tenured faculty members who do not

perform at levels they should be. Mr. Williams agreed there needed to be some revisions to the drafted policy. Mr. Konstanty said he would like a faculty meeting of some sort to be held and faculty to draft a proposal for this policy. It was agreed that this should be a collaborative process. Dr. Fultz commented that this policy should also contain a positive element to award faculty who are performing above that level even if it is not a financial award.

#### 4.2 Records Retention

Mr. Konstanty said he has technical edits to the proposed policy. He also said he felt such a policy was necessary, but the proposed draft is too cumbersome. The Committee agreed there should be something in writing about records retention. Mr. Konstanty said the Research & Development Corporation has a records retention policy, and the two policies should be similar. He would like to compare that policy with the drafted policy presented to the Committee. Mr. Williams stated that most government agencies have a records retention policy and the length and detail depends on the nature of the business. Mr. Konstanty said it would also be helpful to look at what other institutions have in place. The Committee agreed that the chart as listed in the proposed policy is helpful but should be available as a reference and not included in the policy. Mr. Konstanty said he feels it is important for the Board to say to the University that there needs to be a policy on retention of records.

#### 5. **Next Meeting Date**

January 25, 2018

#### 6. **Adjournment**

With there being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:31 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Crystal Walker  
Executive Assistant to the President  
Campus Events Coordinator