

Glenville State College Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: December 1, 2020

I. Call to Order and Roll

- President Brian Perkins called to order the Glenville State College Faculty Senate at 12:25 p.m. via Teams conference call.
- Senators present: Brian Perkins, Kevin Evans, Kandas Queen, Wenwen Du, Duane Chapman, Ken Lang, Maureen Gildein, John McKinney, Marjorie Stewart, Jonathan Minton, and Tim Konhaus.
- Also in attendance: Gary Morris, David O'Dell, Amy Adkins, and Kaitlin Ensor.

II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

- Motion to approve the minutes for November 10, 2020 meeting from Marjorie Stewart, seconded by Kevin Evans. Jonathan Minton abstains. Minutes approved. Motion carries.
- Reports:
 - President's report: Brian Perkins attended the President's Cabinet meeting and noted for Senators to let him know of any items we would like for him to bring to cabinet meetings. Noted it was the first time faculty had been invited to the cabinet meeting and that it was an improvement.
 - Board of Governors (BOG) Representative Kevin Evans: Talked to Mike Rust about issues that were faculty related. Told Kevin Evans that he would be invited to the next BOG Executive meeting that was occurring the next day. Kevin Evans noted he was told of three items related to faculty concerns on the agenda for discussion in that meeting. The areas were teaching 15 credit hours, continue information related to discounts previously discussed, and review of the cost / savings of going to 15 credit hours. Discussion on the process for getting the invite. BOG have a full meeting December 16. Any comments of things would like to see the BOG do, improvements for the BOG, or suggestion for BOG let know Kevin Evans know. Feels that BOG wants to address faculty concerns and wants to know how they can help us. He will share any issues we have with the BOG without naming anyone. Marjorie Stewart commented on the cost / savings analysis on the 15 credit hours stating BOG need to look at the long term and not just short term data to understand how this will affect us down the road. Kevin Evans noted both were being discussed by the BOG, along with if there were any savings. Brian Perkins recognized Gary Morris who commented looking at it based on different semesters from previous years would not be a fair comparison because we cut classroom occupancy to half and therefore the data would be skewed in comparison to previous

semesters with normal occupancy. We might have spent less money, but the final numbers are not in yet. Noted the same situation will apply to the spring semester, which had the same 50% reduction of classroom occupancy due to COVID-19.

- Advisory Council of Faculty (ACF) Representative Marjorie Stewart: Noted there was a meeting. Talked about enrollment down 4% at 4-year colleges, not sure about spring. Have lost a number of single mothers due to COVID. There was a decrease in Promise Scholarship applications and FASFA applications. Increased food insecurity.
- Administrative/Academic Updates (GSC President, GSC VPAA, Others): Brian Perkins asked Gary Morris for updates. Gary Morris commented he had sent out updates the two weeks before Thanksgiving break and asked if they were well received. No new cases on campus for COVID. We have around 20 students in dorms that did not leave campus, around 90 athletes who returned and are completing the saliva test. They should be having limited interaction until test results are returned. Gary Morris noted he was going to try to have an Academic Policy meeting on Friday, and a CLC in early spring. Waiting for feedback from all three bodies regarding the proposed Academic Calendar before going forward to CLC. Brian Perkins requested to provide Gary Morris direct feedback on calendars (AY 21-22 & AY 22-23). Kevin Evans question when Gary Morris thought the calendar would be ready to go to CLC, and that Faculty Senate should endorse the calendar. If have time, wait till the Faculty Senate meeting in January and make a motion on the item then. Gary Morris would appreciate that and if we see any errors send them to him. Noted the catalog will be completed in April and that January would still give them enough time. Brian Perkins will add it to the agenda for the meeting in January. Gary Morris commented on the letter for support for the graduate programs. Waiting for survey results percentage to fill in the missing information for the letter. Maureen Gildein will have data on Friday to fill in the percentage. Brian Perkins asked that we encourage colleagues to complete the survey showing support for graduate programs at GSC. This information goes to Academic Affairs and on to Higher Learning Commission (HLC). Gary Morris confirms and noted it was part of our Substantive Change application. Will also have a letter from BOG following an action item showing their support, along with West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (HEPC).

III. Old Business

- Non-Meeting Committee Review – Brian Perkins noted review of committees not meeting recently and trying to figure out purpose of committees and if we need to revitalize them. Brian Perkins noted he had some contacts on the Scholarship

Committee and he had spoken with Lloyd Bone, emailed with Rico Gazal, and that Duane Chapman had responded too, along with Dave Hutchison. It sounds like the committee is active. Dave Hutchison had agendas and meeting minutes. There are two faculty members as part of the committee. Dave Hutchison and Lloyd Bone felt faculty on the committee was good. Brian Perkins asked Duane Chapman if there were any new updates on the Library committee. Duane Chapman noted that Jason Gum and him are reviewing bylaws and were going to try to meet and have something when we return from break. Ken Lang provided an update on the Retention Committee bylaws and noted the bylaws were changed back in 2007, but they were not signed off by administration. The revisions on the bylaws showed the committee was in transition from a recruitment and retention committee to solely focus on being a retention committee. Two of the three faculty that had served on the committee had retired, leaving just Jason Barr. Ken Lang spoke with him and learned that the committee had not meet since he had been assigned to it and had no action items. They think it would be a good committee to retain based on the focus by administration and the importance of retention. Ken Lang noted one of the revisions to the bylaws was to meet regularly with people on campus involved with retention to help come up with new ideas and innovative ideas to retain students. Maureen Gildein reported on the Textbook Affordability Committee. She noted there was nothing new at this time and she would have more to present at the next meeting. Wenwen Du commented there was not much new information on the Enrollment Committee. He noted there was some information in the Faculty Handbook, but no bylaws. At this time Jason Yeager was in charge of it. Tim Konhaus reported on the Student Life Committee and that he had nothing to report to Faculty Senate at this time and noted he had recently sent out emails, but only one person had responded and they did not know the committee existed. Marjorie Stewart commented on Faculty Development Committee and that she had been talking to former members, and reviewing old bylaws, but did not have anything nailed down yet. Brian Perkins asked for a written summary about the committees like the one Ken Lang had done. Brian Perkins thinks committees are important, but need to keep working on these as we move forward. Kevin Evans stated we are making progress on these committees, especially the Scholarship, Library, and Retention Committees, and felt we could move forward on these three now. Kevin Evans made a motion to retain the Scholarship Committee. Marjorie Stewart seconded the motion. Motion carried. Kevin Evans motioned to retain the Library Committee. Duane Chapman seconded the motion. Motion carried. Kevin Evans motioned to retain and revitalize the Retention Committee. Wenwen Du seconded the motion. Motion carried. Brian Perkins noted we will have to revisit committees again as we get more information on the remaining committees.

- Committee Reports – Template of a form for committees to use to report back to Faculty Senate. Brian Perkins showed the report that he had revised from the one used by the Assessment Committee and covered points in document. It was a one-

page report intended to show record of main work of committee. The report would be due at the end of the academic year in May. Brian Perkins asked if there were any questions comments related to the proposed report. Gary Morris asked if it would be appropriate to add a line of next steps for items listed, such as going to the catalog, presenting to BOG, or next step after received by Faculty Senate to help keep the ball moving. He noted this could be helpful during the event there were changes made to the body of the senate or to administration so it is clear what needs to happen with that information. Discussion followed resulting in changes made to report that bulletized the next steps of where the action item/information needs to be presented and followed up on. This would be a separate section of the report from the action items to help outline what needs to happen with the information. Marjorie Stewart motioned to approve the report as amended. Maureen Gildein seconded. Motion carries. Brian Perkins will send out updated version of the report to Faculty Senate and committee chairs.

- Overload Policy/Procedures – Brian Perkins commented that since the last meeting Ken Lang had done some research and looked at revising policy. Brian Perkins worked on the form for overload. Ken Lang noted what he had listed was not necessarily suggestions but things he thought should be discussion points. Collected information based on his review of policies online from other institutions. Tried to review institutions that resemble GSC, but mostly found policies from larger institutions that involved faculty doing research and other activities. He did find some policies from smaller institutions that tended to dissuade faculty from carrying overloads. Noted it was unorthodox to carry more than one overload a semester and not to be more than 20% of annual (contractual) pay. Ken Lang noted that highlighted in red were points that could be discussed and worked through. Brian Perkins thanked Ken Lang for taking lead on this. He noted overload was a concern of all faculty and that overload was something we would like to avoid and not be the norm. Brian Perkins asked for discussion on the matter and what faculty thought about it. Kandas Queen thanked Ken Lang for the hard work and research he had done on the topic. She further stated that there were many points noted in the language that protected both faculty and administration, but it was also restrictive regarding faculty options and felt further time needed to be allocated to discuss in departments. Brian Perkins noted the senate would not be voting on it that day and this was a starting point for discussions. Gary Morris asked to comment and noted that faculty had previously requested to carry what he thought was excessive overloads; sometimes teaching 24 – 27 hours in some cases. He referenced the “20% of contractual” salary language but questioned if it could be clearer in the policy to stipulate what a reasonable overload would be in terms of time commitment without an erosion on quality of teaching. Stated that otherwise it becomes an arbitrary decision for the Academic Affairs office to decide how many hours to teach a semester without hurting the quality of the curriculum. It was a problem that faculty had brought up before, but there was no language or policy that addressed it. Gary Morris asked for faculty to think about

what was a reasonable cap on courses taught without hurting the quality of courses being taught. Ken Lang noted that was addressed in the document / policy in two places. He referenced section 5.6 which stated no faculty could be assigned to more than one overload in a single semester, and 5.4 noted a faculty could engage in course overloads for no more than two consecutive semesters. Ken Lang noted that was a consistent theme he discovered when looking at examples of overload policies from other institutions. Discussed examples of how overloads per semester worked. Gary Morris questioned points regarding 12 credit hour semesters compared to 15 credit hours and faculty teaching 18 credits a semester, and if it was being driven from a financial standpoint or one based on quality of courses. Brian Perkins asked if there were any policies or guidelines from HLC regarding overloads. Gary Morris was not aware of one and commented it might be hard for them to develop something that would fit all the institutions they served. Brian Perkins thought it would be useful to look back over the past few years at average number of overloads and what faculty were teaching. Noted that average could help to inform if the section 5.6 was too restrictive or not. Gary Morris commented he has data from previous reports and could provide that data if someone wanted it. Brian Perkins asked if he would provide that data to Faculty Senate to review. Duane Chapman asked about removing the red from the Overload Policy document shared by Ken Lang and share it with faculty to review over break and that it would be a good action item for us to pick back up on and move it forward when we return. Noted that since it was a BOG item, we would just make a recommendation. Kevin Evans confirmed it was an administration decision. Brian Perkins noted that one of the reasons it was in red was to track the changes so people can understand what has been added or changed. Discussed how to disseminate the document to faculty. Kandas Queen noted that it needed to be shared with departments (by senate representative) to discuss possible revisions. Then when senate resumes after break draft a document that incorporates feedback from departments before finalizing a draft of a policy to be shared with faculty for a final review. Brian Perkins commented current policy was very general and that revisions (shown in red) were mostly just additions. John McKinney commented he felt it would be easier to discuss in a department meeting if just one document was sent by Brian Perkins to all faculty versus six or seven departments sending out copies with some showing red (revisions) and others showing it all in black. Brian Perkins noted the main thing was to get document into the hands of faculty and asked that senators share it with faculty in their department and bring feedback to next meeting. Noted suggestions could be added to the document to and show tracked changed.

- Overload Request Form – Brian Perkins noted trying to lay out the process for getting a faculty member to take on an overload. Commented that there had been concerns from faculty about being asked to teach an overload then paid for one of their regular classes rather than the one they were asked to teach as an overload. Brian Perkins discussed points of the form and how it would serve to make it clear

what the overload course would be, the payment for it, and a place to check if they accepted or refused the overload. Duane Chapman stated it looked pretty straight forward and asked if there were other steps involved for approval or if the Provost could approve to accept the form. Brian Perkins asked Gary Morris if he had reviewed the document yet. Gary Morris commented it was a clear agreement between the faculty and Academic Affairs office. He noted a suggestion would be to add a section on the amount to be paid, and not sure if you need the check boxes below since they are included in the table above. Overall, Gary Morris liked the document. Discussion on changes and clarification on the payment information. There were questions on the amount be paid if prorated. Gary Morris raised a procedural question regarding whether or not multiple forms would be created when faculty were asked to teach an additional overload course at a later date / after already signing an overload form, or should he wait and just have one form? Brian Perkins noted it was important to faculty that it be in writing and noted you would not want to go back and change a previous form already signed off on. Duane Chapman stated the forms would be dated and it should be a new form with the updated information of courses already agreed upon as overloads listed along with the new information. Gary Morris further suggested a total line to clarify what was agreed upon. Noted that in the table faculty could accept or reject which they wanted to teach as overload and though the price was included in the chart a final total line might be helpful. Brian Perkins noted he would delete the check box section and add a line item stating what the total payment would be and send a revised version back out. The idea would be that Patty Snyder would develop it as an electronic form. Brian Perkins asked if there was further feedback from departments on the form and if we wanted to vote on it for approval in our next meeting after he makes the final modifications to it. Duane Chapman stated he thought that was what should be done. Kandas Queen complimented Brian Perkins on the good work he had done on the form. Brian Perkins said he would make the changes and send it back around.

Maureen Gildein was asked to have senators and faculty encourage students to complete the course evaluations and noted there was a better chance they would be completed if requested by faculty to complete them.

IV. Adjournment

- Brian Perkins asked if there were other concerns. Duane Chapman motions to adjourn. Marjorie Stewart seconds the motion. Motions carries.

Meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m.