

Minutes

Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, February 3rd, 2012
Ferrell Hall 305
1:30 p.m.

- I. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order by Senate chair, Dr. Tim Ruhnke at 1:30 p.m.
- II. **Reading and Approval of Minutes:** Minutes from the previous Senate Meeting were read. **Motion to approve the minutes was carried with a few minor corrections.**
- III. **Reading and Approval of Agenda:** **A motion to approve the Agenda with a few additions was carried**
- IV. **Reports:**
 - a. **PRESIDENT CARTER** – President Carter did not attend the meeting and no report was submitted
 - b. **PROVOST / VP of ACADEMIC AFFAIRS.** - A written report is available on-line. Dr. Byers highlighted several sections of his report, calling attention first to a possible pilot study by Chairman Rowe dealing with changes to admission for conditional students. Dr. Byers has circulated the draft proposal to Deans and Chairs, asking them to solicit responses and reactions to the matter. In addition to the admissions proposal, Dr. Byers also explained the need for and creation of an admissions committee for the university.

Provost Byers explained that the full university catalogue has been published and, now that all printing is being done "in-house," there will be a full catalogue printed every year (as opposed to every two years). Savings for printing the catalogue at our print shop saves a cost of over \$100,000 as we now only pay the cost of paper.

Dr. Byers was asked to comment on the University's response to the murder / suicide that happened next to (but not ON) campus. Since the police actions could be seen from Dawson Hall, it was clear that the campus was affected. During the police action, the university WARN system was not activated on a full scale, instead, only going out to Dawson Hall. In addition, Chief Saunders also spoke personally to the students in Dawson. Several members of the senate wondered why more people were not notified and were told that since the action did not happen on campus, the university police (who are tied to the county) were involved, but not making the decisions. It was determined that since it was determined that there was no immediate campus threat, the situation was handled in the best way possible. However, the faculty senators explained that there were several "glitches" in the system and that more could have and should have been done to ensure the safety of

individuals at the school. It was concluded that the matter should be taken up at a future senate meeting.

At the end of the report, Dr. Byers went on to fully explain his comment "while I'm here" at the General Faculty meeting. He stressed that although it is still his wish to remain at WVSU, he understands that a new president has the prerogative for choosing a new Provost and VPAA. Again, although his hopes are to remain, the fact of the matter is that there are still things that need to get done in the interim.

Comments and questions for Dr. Byers included what printing was considered free by the print shop (anything that is for use for the entire campus (not for an individual, a class, or a department)). Dissatisfaction with the process of how the final exam schedule was expressed. Specific complaints were that the exam time was shortened by 10 minutes and that little to no faculty involvement was requested. Dr. Byers responded by stating that the schedule went out to the deans and chairs for comment.

- c. **VP OF STUDENT AFFAIRS** - (Written report available on-line). In addition to highlighting several announcements from his report, VP Casto presented an update to the new dorm project. He stated that the BOG had approved the demand study and is agreement for building of up to 300 beds. The next phase is to present the study and plans to the HEPC on Feb 17th for endorsement. Then the RFP can go out, the selected developer will create a plan, which goes back to the BOG for approval, and then back to the HELP. Once all of the hurdles have been passed, building can begin. One concern that has been brought up in the plan is a recommendation for raising or "mothballing" Gore and Prillerman. The Historical Preservation Society has taken an interest in the buildings and is currently researching if they should be preserved. The plan for these buildings must be presented before the History and Culture committee before final approval. It was noted that cost-wise, the raising of the buildings makes financial sense as they currently cost more to maintain than can be made from them.
- d. **BOARD OF GOVERNORS (BOG)**. (Written report available on-line). Dr. Guetzloff presented the Senate with the current BOG agenda and made special notice of the university budget. Currently the progress of maintain the budget is on schedule, however, he did note that this is only true if you look at the budget as a whole. If looked at individually, some departments have overspent their budgets within 6 months.
- e. **COMPUTER & NETWORK TECHNOLOGY** - (Written report available on-line) Bob Houston reported that computer his department is racing to fix all problems that occur. Currently, Banner is up to date and the degree audit module installed (however, it needs staffing and analysis). The phone system (thanks to spare parts from Marshall's old system and equipment from the rehab center can be sustained for at least a year or two. The biggest issue of concern for the technology department, of course, is funds.

- f. **ADVISORY CONUCIL OF FACULTY (ACF).** Dr. Ford reported that the ACF is currently working on networking with the Legislator discussing bills that would benefit the faculty. These bills include 1. Holding office, 2. The textbook policy, 3 college completion, and college prep for 10th grade and earlier. Feb. 10th will be Higher Education Day at the Capitol.
- g. **CULTURAL ACTIVITIES** – Dr. Marsh-Minnerly presented written handouts and a report. She highlighted the work that the committee has done and its recent restructuring. In addition to requesting a change in the make-up of the committee, she also presented recommendations by the committee. (available in the on-line report). **The report was accepted by the Faculty Senate.**
- h. **EDUCATIONAL POLICIES** – No New activity took place in terms of class changes, however, a question was posed by the EPC as to changing the dates for submission to coincide with the schedule of the new catalogue. **The report was accepted by the Faculty Senate.**
- i.

V. **New Business:**

- A. **INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT** – (See Written Report and handouts.) Dr. Berry, VP of institutional advancement, addressed the Faculty Senate as an invited speaker and began by introducing himself and stating the mission of his office. He also presented the faculty with literature outlining the goals for the university's current fundraising project. When he had finished, several questions arose about the state of the effort. Dr. Berry reported that to date (from July 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011) \$525,249.16 had been raised and \$1,673,626.45 since the BOG had started the campaign. When asked if we are on-track to meet the goal of the campaign (which would need an average of \$2.5 MIL / year), Dr. Berry stated that he believed that we could still make the goal as fundraising should "pick up" though time. He stated that we are currently working with changing issues as the campaign is moving along. A question if indirect funding was being used as part of the campaign numbers was posed (NO, that would be illegal). Dr. Berry also fielded questions on when he saw a projection of breaking \$1 MIL in a year and if we are on schedule to raise the same amount of money as last year. These projections had not been prepared for this meeting. Dr. Berry stressed that the goal is to have people invest in WVSU and the students and that the office cannot raise money alone but on the strength of the institution.
- B. **WVSU ADMISSIONS STANDARDS AND VARIANCE PROPOSAL**
Continuing the discussion of the proposal by Chairman Rowe, the faculty Senate looked at the proposal. It was stated that 332 students were turned down by WVSU but went to other state-funded institutions. WVSU's conditional acceptance was 7% of the 10% allotted.

(Senate Secretary Dr. Pietruszynski had to leave the meeting. The following minutes were provided by the Senate Historian, Deborah Wells)

332 students were rejected. What was the fate of the students in earlier years that were admitted in the conditional status? How successful were they?

Is it a timing issue; what is the success rate when students come in late and unprepared? How to we determine factors to select/factor those students who will be successful or deny a student a chance to attend and graduate from college.

[in reference to draft document] All the student needs to do is go into their principal's office and ask for a recommendation.

What is the graduation rating for students who are current admitted below the standards? Let [students below the standards] take a remedial class or two [as part time students] which would not affect WVSU's retention/graduation ratings. Have them take tutorial classes instead of the standard pattern.

We have always taken pride in helping people receive an education, whether they were prepared or not. WVSU provides a value added education, sometimes better than higher ranked institutions.

If the retention rate drops because students [admitted below the standards] are not succeeding, the faculty will be blamed by the administration, no matter what.

We should be tracking these students for better answers

If a student has lower grades and ACT scores are we misleading the student by allowing them in. Are we acting in competition with the CTCs, shouldn't we be going after the 90% instead of the lowest 10%.

HEPC Series 23 may not allow the flexibility of this draft [Admission Standards Variance]. Students should display initiative to show they want to work for their degree.

WVSU's standards were always higher, students were admitted into the CTC in the past and since it was part of the university, they were not counted differently affecting the institution's ratings. That's how we got the reputation for open admission.

We don't want a Walmart image for our institution. Or be seen as second rate.

We need a policy for our 10%, look at early filers, look at their profile. I am not hearing from this body a desire to vary from Series 23 except for Dr. Magan.

Motion: To endorse the concept of a variance of the admission standards beyond the 10% in series 23.

Not voted on, talk moved to:

Motion: To ask the HEPC to give us a variance. vote: Passed 4 to 1

Motion: To accept the Draft document "West Virginia State University Admission Standards Variance – DRAFT". vote: Rejected, 0 to 7 with 1 abstaining

Idea and discussion may continue under old business next month. Too many questions about it now

Dr. Byers said even if the faculty senate approves a draft for variance, it will need to be approved by the deans, chairs, academic affairs before it would go to the BOG.

- C. **Faculty/BOG dinner** – suggested the dinner be the regular scheduled day that the faculty annually speak to the BOG about their concerns.-Tom G
- D. **Discussion of legislative session-** February 7 6:30

VI. **Adjournment:** There being no further business or announcements, **a motion to adjourn the general faculty meeting. Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Pietruszynski, Secretary
Faculty Senate