

# Glenville State College Faculty Senate Minutes

Date: Feb 25, 2020

## I. Call to Order and Roll

- President Tim Henline called to order the Glenville State College Faculty Senate at 12: 25pm in the Mollohan Conference Room, Room 319.
- Senators present: Tim Henline, Amanda Chapman, Marjorie Stewart, Megan Darby, Duane Chapman, Dana Wilson, Maureen Gildein (proxy for Shelly Ratliff), David O'Dell, Wenwen Du, Chris Cosner, Kevin Evans, Kandas Queen, Dennis Wemm, Adam Black, Jeffrey Bryson
- Also in attendance: Kathy Nelson, Gary Morris

## II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

- Motion to approve minutes for February 1, 2020 from Marjorie Stewart, seconded by Kandas Queen. Motion carried.
- Reports
  - President's Report: President Tim Henline reports that he's working on the committee reporting document online that will allow committees to report to the Senate automatically. Tim will send us a link for review.
  - Board of Governors/ACF Representative Dr. Kevin Evans: Kevin Evans reports that the Board of Governors has not met since our last meeting, and the ACF has been quiet via email.
  - Administrative/Academic Updates: Gary Morris notes that CLC met once and approved the academic calendar with recesses but no study day. The college is not closed on recess days, but students will not have class. They are still working out whether Election Day is one of the floating holidays, so that may still be added to the calendar for next year.

## III. Old Business

- Faculty Senate Constitution: We still have not come to a consensus on the question of having a part-time faculty representative on the Senate. Marjorie Stewart has done some research, which reflects that many more colleges have given such representation over recent years, reflecting in part the greater number of adjuncts on faculty. Some colleges offer representation to all adjuncts, some only to on-campus adjuncts. Some institutions have a Senator to represent the adjuncts, while others have adjuncts who represent their departments. Some adjunct representatives have voting rights, some do not. Research shows also that adjuncts do wish to have representation. Tim, who

has also been conducting some research, reports similar findings. Kandas Queen notes that the discussion in her department underlined the question of whether the adjuncts have a voice via their chair. The department did not come to a consensus on this matter. Jeffrey Bryson adds that his department asks whether adjuncts have the same investments in the college, and also brought up the question of whether an adjunct needs to be actively teaching in order to have representation. Marjorie notes that some institutions require an adjunct to have so many semesters of active teaching in order to serve on Senate. Adam Black reports that his department was fairly indifferent. Chris Cosner notes that our adjuncts tend to be in communication with the chairs, but not so much with the Senate. Duane Chapman points out that not all adjuncts are as attached to a particular department as others. Jeffrey Bryson raises again the question of how much the adjuncts communicate among themselves, and whether an adjunct representative would be able to convey anything but their own personal thoughts. Marjorie asks how that's any more true of adjuncts than of a department and their Faculty Senate representative. Jeffrey and Gary note that there are many more adjuncts than there are members of any department. We currently have about forty active adjuncts. Gary Morris adds that the adjuncts have their own email list separate from the other faculty, which does not inform them of all developments on campus. If we want to bring them on board, they need to be better included in campus announcements. Kandas sums up that we seem to be in agreement that it's worth having adjuncts represented on the Senate, but we have not settled whether they should have voting rights. Marjorie asks Gary what sorts of things his office might decide not to share with adjuncts. He answers that he has made it a practice to include them on all emails going out to faculty, but that has not historically been the case. Kandas asks whether the adjuncts could communicate with their constituency via the adjunct email list. Tim asks what is our goal in having adjunct representation, and whether we can meet that goal. If not, what compromises can we make to get closer to the goal. David O'Dell notes that he is generally opposed to extending representation to adjuncts because he doesn't see it having any material benefits, and notes that the trade-off for the low adjunct pay is not having to be involved in anything but teaching. We have very different expectations and investments. Chris Cosner asks whether the input of the adjuncts is valuable to the work of the Faculty Senate, given that they are involved in matters the Senate doesn't touch, like high schools. Marjorie notes that the studies show that adjunct morale increases steeply when they get representation, and we all belong to the same institution. No one is going to volunteer for a Senate position if they do not want to do it. The question is raised of whether our adjuncts have ever expressed a desire to have Senate representation. Tim notes that if the goal is to have representation for adjuncts

on campus, and we do not see them having Faculty Senate representation, is there some other avenue we could consider. Chris Cosner wonders how well adjuncts understand their role as representing GSC. Duane asks what's the timeline for revising the Constitution, and whether we can further discuss this matter as an amendment. Tim notes that we need to finish discussing revisions to the Constitution today; Dennis reports that no further suggestions for revision have been submitted. If we want to finish the revision discussion today, we need to send around the current revisions and finalize it next week. Then we could quickly start the amendment process. Kevin offers that the Senate seems split 50/50 on the matter of adjunct representation, so if we include that in our vote on the revisions, we'll be deadlocked. He suggests we table the adjunct representation for now and vote on the constitution revisions without that change included.

- Kevin moves that we strike the adjunct representation addition from the constitution and vote to approve all other revisions after a final review. Duane Chapman seconds. Motion carries with one opposing vote from Marjorie Stewart.

We will revisit the issue of adjunct representation, and consider at our next meeting how to gauge interest in representation from the adjuncts. Dennis suggests that we make a record of the fact that the next Senate should revisit the two-fold nature of this question. First, can an adjunct representative be connected enough to the other adjuncts to responsibly represent their interests? Second, do we want an adjunct representative to have voting power?

Tim asks that we review the Constitution and get back to him with any comments by next week. He also asks how we want to conduct the vote.

- Jeffrey Bryson moves that the Senate direct the Election Committee to take a vote to approve the revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution by electronic means. Marjorie Stewart seconds. Motion carries.

#### IV. New Business

- Presidential Search: Tim begins by saying that because this involves personnel matters, we should have a motion to go into executive session. Marjorie Stewart so moves, the motion is seconded, motion carries. Gary and Kathy leave the meeting.
  - Kandas Queen motions that we do not take minutes during the executive session. Duane Chapman seconds. Motion carries with one abstention from Jeffrey Bryson.
  - We came out of executive session at 1:22 pm.

- Committee Reports: Tim will email the committee reports to us.

#### V. Departmental Representative Concerns

Meeting adjourned at 1:23 pm