

Glenville State College Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: January 12, 2021

I. Call to Order and Roll

- President Brian Perkins called to order the Glenville State College Faculty Senate at 12:25 p.m. in MCCC 319 and via conference call.
- Senators present: Brian Perkins, Kevin Evans, Kandas Queen, Duane Chapman, Ken Lang, Maureen Gildein, Marjorie Stewart, Tim Konhaus, and Jonathan Minton.
- Also in attendance: Gary Morris, and Kristen Tunno.

II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

- Motion to approve the minutes for December 1, 2020 meeting from Marjorie Stewart, seconded by Maureen Gildein. Brian Perkins comments on usefulness of detailed minutes. All approved minutes. Motion carries.
- Reports:
 - President's report: Brian Perkins noted he had been attending the President Cabinet meeting and each member had given updates in their area.
 - Let Brian Perkins know if there is something that needs to go before the cabinet from Faculty Senate. He noted there might be some schedule issues this semester where he would need Marjorie Stewart to attend cabinet meeting as the Vice President of Faculty Senate.
 - Brian Perkins attended the BOG Executive Meeting and called in for the BOG meeting December 16, 2020. Maureen Gildein updated the Senate on election results for the Strategic Planning Committee Election: Jason Barr and Marjorie Stewart received the top votes.
 - Board of Governors (BOG) Representative Kevin Evans: Noted that he also attended the BOG Executive meeting on Dec. 2, 2020. Two unique topics that were not covered at the regular board meeting included the Nursing Program and the Faculty Morale Survey.
 - President Manchin shared that the college was in discussion with WVU about the 2+2 Nursing Program. Previously, the board had discussed GSC having a nursing program as either a four or two-year program. Board has requested a formal proposal on our Nursing Program to see if it is going to be 2+2 program, is it our own program, how is it funded, facilities, etc. Special BOG meeting scheduled next Wednesday, Jan. 20, 2021 to discuss the nursing program.
 - Kevin Evans shared the results of the Faculty Morale Survey. The BOG's had a copy of the survey results previously emailed to them.

Kevin Evans summarized the comments and shared the last three years of data to review changes. Overall, the data was relatively comparable over the three years as far as the numerical data went. The comments had changed significantly during that three-year period.

- Kevin Evans also attended all the committee meetings on Dec. 16, 2020 BOG meeting. Looking for nominations for board replacements; possibly up to four positions. The term Greg Smith is serving is currently expired. Tim Butcher's second term expires this year. Tilden 'Skip' Hackworth and Mike Rust first terms expire, could have a second term. Discussed having increased diversity within the group. Last year Faculty Senate discussed nominating a person. If Faculty Senate wants to do so, Kevin will present the name(s) and letter of interest from them to the BOG at the next BOG meeting when they will start looking at people to serve.
- The BOG also has plans to look at the BOG bylaws, focus on committee structures that have changed since the last bylaws were written. Discussed inviting groups to present to BOG; maybe have members from the community come to campus to talk about interactions between the campus and the community. Look at having different groups and departments on campus meet and present to the BOG at a board meeting.
- There were numerous updates from Academic Affairs: Faculty scholarship, HLC, CAEP Accreditation, etc. Provided BOG with a list of major initiatives from Academic Affairs with a time line.
- Reviewed financial savings due to increasing faculty teaching load to 15 credit hours. Only looking at a saving from adjunct faculty pay and overload pay from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020, the college saved \$106,000. Savings were not as great as predicted due to issues caused by COVID-19.
- Only action item came from Academic Affairs to develop and implement the two Master programs. The BOG approved proposals for Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction, and Master of Arts in Teaching.
- Major discussion on financial issues. Discussed Accounts Receivable. As of December 15, 2019 Accounts Receivable was \$972,000, which is down from the \$1.5 million in November, 2019. BOG discussion was on why the account was so high and how to address to minimize in the future. Comparison: 2015/2016 AY the Accounts Receivable budget of unpaid student tuition from students was 1.3% of the overall budget of \$250,000. In 2017 to 2019 increased to 3%. Noted there had been several ad hoc committees been created that can hopefully help with it. Brian Perkins noted

Bert Jedamski spoken on the Accounts Receivable in the Cabinet meeting and that it was down to around \$800,000. Kevin Evans noted it was going the right direction, but that it was getting harder to get the money after the fact when students go home and do not return for various reasons.

- BOG discussed the tuition discount data Kevin Evans had shared with Faculty Senate earlier. He noted this data came from an audit report and that BOG worked hard to track down where the data came from as it was misleading because the discount included Pell Grants and scholarships. The actual cash waivers were 28.9% in 2015, with an increase to 32.6% in 2017, which have since decreased.
 - Marjorie Stewart asked about Faculty Morale Survey and how numbers not changed but comments had and asked Kevin Evans to clarify. He noted the first time the survey was given was during President Barr's last year and right before Pellett came. Pellett was the one that added the two questions, 'what do you think should be the major initiatives of the college' and 'what are the areas of concern for the college.' At that time the comments were very positive on how to improve college, even when expressing the need for change it projected optimism and hope, with statements "we can do this..." The second time the survey was administered was during Pellett's tenure and comments turned towards anger and frustration, and were negative. This year they turned again away from anger and frustration to just exhaustion. Expressed faculty were tired and the 15 hours credit load was a concern, tone had changed during that time period.
- Advisory Council of Faculty (ACF) Representative Marjorie Stewart: It was noted by Marjorie Stewart that there was nothing new. The next meeting is set for January 21, 2021 and she would have more then. February meeting is traditionally a visit to legislature, but it will probably be virtual due to COVID-19.
 - Administrative/Academic Updates (GSC President, GSC VPAA, Others): Gary Morris noted January 13, 2021 was the beginning of faculty opening week and they were sending out a revised document with hyperlinks built in for virtual meetings.
 - Noted a lot of training opportunities, such as Blackboard, Assessment, and Microsoft. He encouraged new faculty to attend Assessment meetings conducted by Melody Wise. This will be under review from HLC in 2023 on their next visit. We need to be well versed in the subject of Assessment. Send thoughts if have questions about the schedule.
 - Please keep sending Gary Morris updates of things that faculty are doing, such as publishing, grants, meetings, etc. Gary Morris likes to

share with the community things faculty are doing, and noted that Mike Rust from the BOG was taking an interest in these events and had sent some faculty handwritten notes. Hoped faculty appreciated, faculty members present noted appreciation. Sharing information with Gary Morris on faculty activities shows campus committees, BOG, and community things related to faculty accomplishments and things worth promoting.

- COVID-19 related issues: GSC currently has eight positive cases on campus. All are either faculty or staff who are quarantining off campus, except one who is working in an area on campus where they do not have contact with other residents. COVID-19 vaccine, initial survey showed 31 of the 105 faculty/staff indicated they wanted to receive the vaccine. Gary Morris was notified we got more vaccine this week and will be giving another 20 more. We are promised to have more next week. This is a day-by-day process. GSC is slightly better than the national average of people requesting the vaccine, at about 70% with the national around 60%. There has been some confusion about testing before classes begin, partly due to new people in cabinet and limited years of experience in administration. Minnie Hamilton has donated 1,000 antigens to test students. That will be enough to test all students on campus. There were 120 students already on campus through athletics that were tested and had no positive results. The big trend across the state testing positive were faculty and staff returning from the holidays according to Sara Tucker. Maureen Gildein asked if there was enough room in the President's Auditorium for faculty following the schedule for faculty training, or is first come first served? Gary Morris stated it was set to be only 25 people in the auditorium. There will be a Team's setup for the event like we have done before. It should be a brief update from presenters. Faculty can attend via Team's. Kandas Queen asked about when the second round of the COVID-19 vaccine was supposed to be administered, would faculty be notified. Gary Morris noted it should be 28 days after the initial vaccine. Noted there should be an email sent to notify you when to get it. Gary Morris stated dealing with the vaccine process was a new hat for him, coordinating the process from GSC needs. It is a collaborative process involving the National Guard, HEPC, Minnie Hamilton, and GSC. The state notifies him when vaccines are going to be available, and Minnie Hamilton has to pick them up and administer. Brian Perkins asked if any faculty who missed the first survey can still get it. Gary Morris said to have interested faculty to contact him. Factors they are considering is whether you are 50 years of age or older, underlying issues that might put you at risk, and whether you

are you the primary care giver of someone at risks. These factors are used for prioritizing who gets the vaccine. If limited on the vaccine, those teaching completely on line go to the bottom of the list.

III. Old Business

- Faculty Survey Non-Meeting Committee Review – Last time we recommended that Library, Scholarship and Retention committees be revitalized and continue as committees. Leaves us to look at Textbook affordability - Maureen Gildein, Enrollment Management -Wenwen Du, Student Life - Tim Konhaus. Brian Perkins asks for updates on these committees. Tim Konhaus stated the Student Life committee had not met in years and that the two current committee members, one adjunct faculty waiting to hear something and the other faculty who had been on it for a number of years, knew of no activity. Noted there did not seem to be a need to keep it. Vice President of Student Life was not familiar with the committee. Brian Perkins asked Duane Chapman if this was the committee that was needed for athletics. Duane Chapman commented on how committee had served athletes as a venue to support efforts to transfer, to support student activities, review the student handbook, but if not using this committee questioned if it was still important. Maureen Gildein noted the Textbook Affordability committee had not meet and that she was informed they felt that it should be part of the Retention Committee. Duane Chapman noted it was once part of a directive from West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, but it does not seem to be one now and was a committee we could eliminate. Marjorie Stewart the discussed Faculty Development Committee with members and they felt it was a viable committee. She is working on reviving old bylaws for the Faculty Develop Committee to see how it can be made to work better.

Tim Konhaus motioned to do away with the Student Life Committee, Duane Chapman second, the motion carries. Maureen Gildein motioned to have the Textbook Affordability Committee be under Retention Committee and eliminate the Textbook committee. Duane Chapman second, the motion carries. Marjorie Stewart motioned to continue revamping the Faculty Development Committee with the intention to reinstate it. Duane Chapman second, the motion carries. Brian Perkins noted that left the Enrollment Management Committee once Wenwen Du reports back on that committee.

- Overload Policy – Brian Perkins noted there were a lot of different feelings on this issue by departments. Brian Perkins asked Ken Lang if he had made any changes to policy since last the last Faculty Senate meeting. Ken Lang replied he had not. He had been reviewing information from faculty and thanked faculty for the feedback. Noted concerns centered mostly on limitations for faculty overloads. Brian Perkins questioned how to go forward on this issue, and if Ken Lang should

revise and bring forth a new draft based on feedback. Maureen Gildein questioned Ken Lang to make sure he received concerns from Department of Education regarding overload courses a faculty could have in a semester and noted that as it was written it would not work for her department. Ken Lang commented he had and that what he had presented to Faculty Senate was just recommendations he had found from other institutions. Maureen Gildein further added the language that limited the number of semesters a faculty member could teach an overload was also an issue with her department. Ken commented he had received feedback on that issue from several faculty members. Maureen lastly questioned faculty receiving course reduction and release from other duties and noted her department felt it was an unfair policy and would like it removed also. Ken Lang stated he did not recall getting that information. Brian Perkins recognized Gary Morris who questioned if faculty felt they were assigned overloads? He noted he tried to be mindful to ask faculty if they wanted to teach an overload and not just assigning overloads. Under the purposed language it may indicate that overloads are being assigned, when actually under the current language they are optional. Marjorie Stewart clarified the use of the word 'offer' rather than the word 'assign' to show faculty have the choice to teach overloads. Brian Perkins noted the language using the term 'assign' was going way with the deletion of the items Maureen Gildein had just raised. Gary Morris just wanted to make sure that faculty did not perceive overloads were being assigned and faculty were always asked. Maureen Gildein stated that faculty did not feel they were assigned overloads, but agreed with the language using the word 'assign' was not supported in the policy. Kandas Queen noted most of the faculty issues related the language that restricted faculty's choice to teach overloads, especially in the Department of Business, and the way the policy was drafted it took away that option. Kandas Queen noted that Ken Lang had put a lot of work into providing faculty with some points for discussion and to garner feedback from departments for information to revise the policy. She further questioned the next step was for Ken Lang to develop a working draft of the Overload Policy based on the feedback that could be reviewed by faculty and revisited at Faculty Senate. Agreement was noted that it needed to be reviewed in departments again before passing through Faculty Senate to go on to Administration and BOG for final approval. Duane Chapman and Kandas Queen commented on the great job Ken Lang had done in putting this material together for faculty to consider. Gary Morris further commented the need to be mindful of the language so it would serve faculty regardless of administration changes in personnel and there is no misunderstanding. Brian Perkins noted if there was any other feedback from the departments on the Overload Policy it needed to be shared with Ken Lang and we would look at it again at our next meeting.

- Overload Procedures – Brian Perkins noted this was on the form and questioned if he had sent the last updated version incorporating changes suggested at the last meeting. Noted he would send it out with the final revisions. Duane Chapman

questioned Gary Morris if Academic Affairs was using the form yet. Gary Morris replied they were going to test pilot the form this semester.

- Changes to FAR – Brian Perkins noted that Duane Chapman and maybe some other faculty would look at the changes occurring on the FAR. Noted that there was a request from departments to provide feedback. Duane Chapman noted he had not seen anything yet and that David O’Dell was going to try and find an old copy of the FAR. Noted that the FAR was changed from the one voted upon and approved by the Faculty Senate. Over time changes were applied that had not been part of the Senate. Brian Perkins noted the original FAR was sent out at the end of last semester and questioned if it was what we wanted to go back to it, use the one we have, or recreate another one. Duane Chapman commented that we need to have more discussion and that it would be unlikely that all departments would agree on one FAR and that it has to be something that would need to cover all disciplines. Gary Morris commented on the difference between staff and faculty evaluations and noted staff are evaluated by direct supervisor. His impression as a faculty on FAR was he viewed it as a self-evaluation. The intent of the FAR was for a faculty member to see how they can improve from year to year. Gary Morris noted that somehow that had gotten lost and now everyone got excellence across the board, which left no room for improvement. The intent for the FAR is not for supervisors to tell faculty they are great, but for faculty to apply self-reflection and focus on how to improve. He noted given the data they provide it should be about self-growth and self-improvement. Kandas Queen noted that some of it could be based on how faculty perceive the FAR will be used. Noted that if it is about self-improvement, we need to promote the FAR as a conversation with faculty and how they can improve, not use it as an item to grade faculty and have the ability to affect career. Gary Morris noted he felt it should be a reflection and something faculty could look back on and see where they improved and met goals. Then when they go up for tenure and promotion you could see a progression of improvement. Feedback from chair observations, student evaluations, etc. could provide data for areas of improvement that faculty could list in FAR, reflecting the following year on what worked to show how they have grown. He never expected a perfect across the board and the discussion on FAR was one where ideas were shared for improvement. Marjorie Steward commented one of the changed parts was on the rating system. There were three options for scoring and noted discrepancies in her FAR process because she was noted for doing excellent, but chair stated they were not supposed to give ‘all great’ in all areas. She noted that department chairs were making judgement based on what you turned in and it needed to be a conversation. Gary Morris agreed and noted that system detracted from the self-reflection / self-improvement process of the FAR. Marjorie Steward noted at that time the FAR was part of a merit system that has gone now but then used the rating system. Discussion followed on the FAR in terms of how to use, is it like professional development, culture surrounding the concept of the FAR, still be able to use it as a tool to support tenure and promotion and the development of

faculty to get tenure. Gary Morris noted it should show the growth of a faculty member and agreed he viewed it as professional development and tool for discussion to improve. Duane Chapman suggested he would work on reviewing what had changed and maybe survey faculty to see what they liked and then see how to move forward. It was noted that it needed to be vetted well in the departments. Maureen Gildein and Kandas Queen noted they would like to work on the FAR with Duane Chapman.

IV. New Business

- Academic Calendar Endorsement – Brian Perkins asked if there was any feedback on the Academic Calendar. Discussion followed and it was noted that the calendar was based on the assumption that there would be no COVID-19 issues. Gary Morris noted the only major change was no winter term. Duane Chapman asked if that was because it was not successful. Gary Morris noted that from a logistical side it was not and that it would need buy-in to relook at it. Kevin Evans only comment from Math and Science was that at one point we did not have faculty develop and have now moved up a week and they would like to see it pushed back a week. Discussion followed about starting end dates on calendar. Kandas Queen made the motion to accept and endorse the Academic Calendar, Tim Konhaus second the motion. Motion carries.
- Faculty Search Committees – Marjorie Stewart noted when she first came to GSC Faculty Search Committees recommended who was to be hired and the process has since changed. Now instead of making a recommendation on who to hire they are to give strengths and weaknesses of the candidates and she feels strongly that faculty need to be able to give input and make the recommendation on who to hire for their department. Under the current process it does not provide for administrators making the decision to have seen the professor (candidate) present curriculum in the classroom environment and other parts of the process. Brian Perkins asked Gary Morris for his thoughts on the process and if it would be possible to accept a ranking of candidates from faculty conducting the interview process. Gary Morris noted there was a reason for the change in process and that it could be a demoralizing process for a candidate that was later hired to learn they were not the 1st choice. He commented that people tend to talk and this new process prevented those on the search committees from letting confidential information be shared that could cause negative consequences. Brian Perkins noted that seemed disrespectful for people from these committees to share that type of information, but Gary Morris noted it happened. The change in process was not meant to be not nefarious or take power away from departments, but to secure confidentially to protect new hires. Duane Chapman asked Marjorie

Stewart what she was specifically looking for in the process and she noted to be able to make a recommendation on who to hire. Discussion followed regarding how often departments did not get the new hire they were seeking, and the need for language to protect faculty's voice in the matter. Kevin Evans commented that sometimes it happened that departments did not get who they would have picked first, but he understood the position that Gary Morris noted regarding confidentiality. Process still allowed for a ranking process and comments. Brian Perkins noted everything a search committee does should be confidential and faculty should be aware of this. Gary Morris noted that even at the vice president level, there were people who talked to the community about it. Tim Konhaus noted there seemed to be two problems, one with Human Resources and search committees not keeping to confidentiality on ranking of candidates. This needs to be addressed so that down the road it works like it should and faculty input is appreciated, used, and confidential. Faculty are the people who will be working with the new hires in their department. Gary Morris noted another problem related to faculty not getting the candidate they wanted was because that person did not pass the background check. This information is confidential and Human Resources (HR) cannot share it. Gary Morris suggested that HR and faculty sit down and have a conversation about this issue. Discussion followed about that faculty need to be respectful and confidential on the process. Gary Morris noted he did not want faculty to feel disempowered. Marjorie Stewart noted she would participate in the conversation. Kandas Queen noted it sounded like a conversation needed to be had with faculty so they understood how the process had to work from a legal standpoint. Marjorie Stewart commented that there was no communication about why the process had changed, just that it had changed. Understanding why it had changed would have helped the process. Brian Perkins noted involving department chairs in the process. Duane Chapman noted that HR needed to be part of the conversation. Maureen Gildein noted the importance of not creating legal issues and the need for a process to protect everyone's legal rights.

V. Adjournment

- Brian Perkins asked if there were other concerns, Marjorie Stewart moved to adjourn, Duane Chapman second the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 1:36 p.m.