

Glenville State College Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: February 23, 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 the MCCC 319 and via conference call.
- Senators present: Brian Perkins, Kevin Evans, Marjorie Stewart, Kandas Queen, Wenwen Du, Duane Chapman, Ken Lang, Maureen Gildein, John McKinney, Tim Konhaus, and Jonathan Minton.
- Also in attendance: Chelsea Stickelman, Gary Morris, and Mari Clements

II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

- Motion to approve the minutes for February 9, 2021 meeting from Marjorie Stewart, seconded by Ken Lang. All approved. Motion carries.
- Reports:
 - President's report: Brian Perkins yield to Chelsea Stickelman from Admissions. She talked about the difficulty of meeting face-to-face with students due to issues with COVID-19 and that they were trying to find other avenues to connect with students and get them to campus. Chelsea Stickelman commented on the open house at the baseball field, which had a great turnout and good feedback from visitors. Admissions is trying to do a similar open house in April related to homecoming. It would be a two-day event Saturday, April 10 and Sunday, April 11. Also, doing a football tailgate event on Saturday (homecoming) would allow faculty to interact with students, new and current. On that Sunday there is a baseball double header where Admissions would like to highlight the season getting started. Chelsea Stickelman also noted that Sunday worked best to reach athletes from the high school level since it was the only day that high school sports did not have games or practice and they would not have to miss school to attend. Chelsea Stickelman is looking for representation from departments for both days, noting it does not have to be the same person but wanted to have people from departments on both days to talk with student. Again, Saturday (April 10) will be at the WACO football field parking lot; Sunday (April 11) will be at the baseball fields. She does not have complete layout yet, but will keep us informed. Please share with her any ideas from departments.

The second thing Chelsea Stickelman talked about was trying to get students engaged. Admissions is trying to move their inquiry pool into the acceptance pool, and continue with communications from those in the

accepted pool to keep them engaged until they are registered for classes. Chelsea Stickelman commented that other schools had devised a way for students to sign up to a virtually meet and talk with faculty. Gave the example of a student interested in Land Resources meeting with Brian Perkins so students and parents can ask questions about the department or program. One suggestion to pair students interested with our office hours, but commented that many might need evening hours and asked if it would be possible to get one hour (or two hours – whatever would benefit department) in the evening with professors/faculty to meet with students and family. Admissions could sign up students and coordinate the meetings for the times departments could be available, which keeps students engaged and makes it more personal. Marjorie Stewart asked if the meetings were in Teams (could be done from home) and Chelsea Stickelman respond, yes – all virtual. Kandas Queen asked what Admissions time window was for these meetings to happen. Chelsea Stickelman responded as soon as faculty and departments got on board and she wanted to do them up to the point that student get to GSC. This included summer, which might involve changes in schedules for meetings. Chelsea Stickelman noted it could be mixed up throughout the department so one faculty was not doing it all, or she can give information by department on what the students are interested in to arrange meetings. She noted Admissions has that information in advance of the meetings and could provide it to departments, which Kandas Queen noted would be helpful information for departments. Maureen Gildein asked if meetings were to be structured as more of Q&A or presentations. Chelsea Stickelman responded it would be more Q&A. She further added meetings could be structured on a 15-minute basis moving from student to student or it can be done as a group.

Third idea from Chelsea Stickelman (Admissions) was trying to hold Sunday events on campus like what we used to as Department Days. Again, having these meetings on Sunday allows student not to miss school and sports. Chelsea Stickelman would appreciate our thoughts on these three ideas from Admissions. She will get back with us on the virtual meetings and ‘Department Days’.

- Board of Governors (BOG) Representative Kevin Evans: Noted the BOG meeting was postponed until tomorrow (Wednesday, February 24) and he would have more afterwards.
- Advisory Council of Faculty (ACF) Representative Marjorie Stewart: Noted they had not met, but stated there was a lot of concern on the legislation regarding K-12 before legislators now that could undermine K-12 education throughout the state.

- Administrative/Academic Updates (GSC President, GSC VPAA, Others): Brian Perkins recognized Gary Morris who commented on some good news regarding talks with Marshall University. Noted Glenville State College was looking at two initiatives. One was working on an MOU where we could bring in students straight from high school to Glenville State College who would be guaranteed slots for acceptance into the Marshall University Pharmaceutical program. This would be a good recruitment tool. Gary Morris further noted that Marshall University was very agreeable to bringing their Nursing Program to Glenville State College. He further noted differences between conversations with WVU and Marshall University and that Marshall was very on board with moving forward on this with Glenville State College. Gary Morris was hoping to begin recruiting for the Pharmacy program this fall and for Nursing next fall. He noted nothing was in writing yet.

Gary Morris stated that on COVID-19 this week marked the end of the period for anyone who received the first round of vaccines had completed their booster shot. On campus for faculty and staff, we will be about 140 people who have received it. Gary Morris has convened a COVID-19 Team. As of yesterday, GSC has 30 active cases, mostly students, there was one staff. Brian Perkins asked if the football players were out of quarantine yet. Gary Morris they were waiting for the results from some of them. If you have questions about an athlete, email Alecia Martin and she can confirm it.

III. Old Business

- Faculty Survey Overload Policy – Ken Lang noted he was still working on the revised draft and suggested revisions. He noted he would get this out soon. Brian Perkins noted this was the fourth draft and hoped to have something to vote on soon. Kandas Queen noted one of the issues from her department related to legal issues about the payment of overloads. Brian Perkins posed it was a question for administration. Duane Chapman commented it needed to be researched and was for administration to determine. Ken Lang noted similar issue in his department and the timing of payment being at the end of the fiscal year when funds are often low. Discussion followed regarding the ability and legality of paying out at the end of the year. It was noted this was something administration should follow up on. Kandas Queen questioned if it was being too specific for a BOG policy. Brian Perkins noted part of it related to going back to the 12-credit hours. Kandas Queen referenced a discrepancy in the language where we try to define overloads “where faculty member’s 9-month contractual teaching load is dispersed unevenly between different semesters” with another section in the policy where it states the

teaching load is defined as “12-credit hours per semester”. Ken Lang noted previous feedback on the policy had led him to work on removing specific data or number amounts. Discussion followed on moving specific number amounts to the Faculty Handbook. Kevin Evans share language from his current contract and where it stated ‘paid to teach thirty credit hours per year’, not by semester. Based on that language it negates some of the legalities involved in when we earn the overload since it was based on the number of credits taught by the year, not by semester. Brian Perkins noted in section 3.1 of the Overload Policy Draft it defines the overload as more contact hours earned than required for the faculty’s 9-month contract. He further questioned whether it should state credit hours to better align with the language in our contract. Gary Morris noted credit hours would probably be a better reflection.

- Return to 12 credits workload per semester - Marjorie Stewart thought what she had heard so far was pretty comprehensive of what we had discussed, but until department meetings happened it was hard to tell exactly what would happen. Kandas Queen asked if meetings had been set with department yet. Gary Morris noted it had been hard to find common times for the meetings. Part of the question for identifying times was whether to conduct them during regular department meetings or schedule a separate meeting. Kandas Queen questioned if this was being decided by Faculty Senate or was it a discussion for Department Head. Gary Morris noted we represented our departments, but it was coming up later in the week with Department Heads. Kandas Queen noted it was likely to be different from department to department based on the needs of each department. She further noted her department was in the planning stages for ABRE, which took up a lot of department meeting time. Brian Perkins noted he agreed with Marjorie Stewart and the sooner these could be scheduled the better. He further commented that Faculty Senate needed to think about having Bert Jedamski come to a Faculty Senate meeting twice a quarter, or at least once a semester, to update faculty on finances. Kevin Evans thought that it needed to be every other meeting, which could be for brief updates and better allow for a chance to respond should something arise. Several agreed and Duane Chapman noted that making it more transparent to faculty would improve reactions to information. Brian Perkins noted that Faculty Senate was represented with a seat in the cabinet and got weekly updates on finances. Marjorie Stewart noted that was true, but she felt there would be a huge advantage to him focusing on faculty related issues as opposed to the big general things. Kandas Queen agreed with Kevin Evans and noted that frequency of visits could be reevaluated over time. Brian Perkins will invite to Bert Jedamski to the next meeting.
- Faculty Handbook – Election procedures - Brian Perkins noted Maureen Gildein had typed up a draft for the process of voting on a motion. The other process was

for when we elect faculty (for example) to CLC, or Promotion and Tenure, the Strategic Planning Committee. These are two separate processes/procedures. One was already in catalog, which was the election process. The other one that Maureen Gildein had drafted was not. Kevin Evans had a minor comment on the document Maureen Gildein created and noted it referenced full faculty a couple of times and thought it should be full-time faculty. Brian Perkins questioned whether we wanted a title for this section in the handbook, suggested 'Electronic Motion/Voting Procedure'. Maureen Gildein responded Electronic Voting Procedures. Duane Chapman noted number 7 and questioned the language of Vice President of Academic Affairs or did we want to change it to Provost. Marjorie Stewart noted most documents had Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs. Duane Chapman noted we needed to be consistent with our language. Duane Chapman questioned order of it in the catalog, and it was confirmed the new addition would be below what was currently listed. Brian Perkins noted he had spoken with Larry Baker to have him look at handbook to make sure it is clear we are using electronic ballots now, but still have paper ballots as a backup. Maureen Gildein stated one of the questions she had was that it noted the Secretary of Faculty Senate would keep ballots for up to two years, and did we want to leave that language. Kandas Queen noted she had not received any of the ballot records. Discussion followed about that procedure and whether we were following it and how/where we were maintaining the records. Brian Perkins commented that perhaps the language just needed to read that results would be kept by Faculty Senate and recommended keeping long term. Maureen Gildein noted that as long as we had Survey Monkey, the results were kept in there. Gary Morris noted his concern with Survey Monkey and that to have continuity of our records meant we had to perpetually pay to have access to that data. He further noted the proprietary control over the data was controlled by Survey Monkey and as our number of surveys increased, we could have to pay more to have access to our data. They have us over a barrel at this point and there were free resources available to us where we could have control. Discussion followed on whether we had and/or kept hard copies of our data. Duane Chapman questioned if we had a downloaded copy. Kandas Queen recommended we needed to consider keeping a downloaded external copy of the results in the event there was ever an issue such as the one Gary Morris referred to with our data held hostage. Brian Perkins noted we would have a downloaded (physical) copy of the results to use even if we could not access the electronic version. Marjorie Stewart commented that we should ask Larry Baker what he had downloaded in the past for safe keeping. Duane Chapman noted that was part of what he was referring to and that it was located in various places and held by various people, but it was not downloaded into one location. Maureen Gildein noted it was all stored in the one location, Survey

Monkey. Duane Chapman wanted to know where we could have a backup of that information in one location that was accessible in the event Survey Monkey was no more, an area where we had permanent access to our data. Ken Lang noted we had a Faculty Senate Sharepoint and Brian Perkins noted we information store in there, minutes, etc. Kandas Queen reported that she had learned that SharePoint accounts not created with IT administration were subject to disappear when the person who created the SharePoint account left Glenville State College. IT were the only ones to create accounts that would have continuity and that they could then give administrative controls to whoever needed them. Discussion followed on shared drives and SharePoint accounts with Ken Lang noting his department had IT create their SharePoint account for the department and then as people come and go, IT adjusted who had access. Duane Chapman motioned to have IT create a SharePoint for Faculty Senate. Marjorie Stewart seconded the motion. Tim Konhaus abstained. Motion passed. Kandas Queen will work with IT to create the SharePoint account for Faculty Senate.

IV. New Business

- Academic Policy Bylaws Revision – Brian Perkins commented on changes by Schuyler Chapman to bylaws noting main changes included encouraging and permitting members to send a proxy to committee meeting, officially adding the registrar, and updating the title the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. Kevin Evans stated that Ken Lang and himself were both on that committee if anyone had any questions. Commented on the reason for adding the registrar was they were always part of the meeting and it would save on always having to recognize them to speak, and that sending a proxy was always encouraged. Marjorie Stewart noted the revisions were just formalizing what was already happening in the committee. Ken Lang further added that part of it was just bringing consistent language into the bylaws with other committees across campus. Marjorie Stewart motioned to accept; Kevin Evans seconded. Motion passed. Gary Morris asked if it could be forwarded on to him after signatures are finalized.
- Administrative Policy 9 – Surplus Equipment – Brian Perkins noted BOG was updating this policy on surplus equipment and materials. Brian Perkins noted since we do not have a Chief Procurement Officer that was one of the changes. Noted that things could be donated to any nonprofit entity. Does not apply to real estate. The BOG has to approve any disposition of equipment and materials. Brian Perkins noted the public comment period had not started for this change yet. Marjorie Stewart questioned about the BOG wanting to approve every piece of equipment, or was there a dollar amount regarding when they wanted to be

involved? Kevin Evans noted former presidents had either signed things away (sold at low price or given away – namely real estate) without BOG approval. He figures for now there will be no dollar amount applied, but the main point of the change was for the BOG to have a say on anything that would be significant. Brian Perkins noted when public comments open on this item we could respond if we wanted regarding it.

- Course Fees Change – Brian Perkins asked Gary Morris where this initiated from, Admissions or finance. Gary Morris stated it was brought up by several Vice Presidents and that initially Admissions had a hand in it too. Athletics was also a part of it. The center of it was upset parents who were very angry that what they had been quoted as the cost did not match the invoice when they got the bill due to all the course fees and other fees added. Gary Morris noted that when you look at the catalog the section on tuition and fees does not accurately reflect all the course fees and technology fees and everything else. It fell to the parents to review and calculate all the additional fees to see how much it actually cost. Brian Perkins noted it was reflected on the invoice. Gary Morris noted it was reflected on the invoice, but parents might think tuition and fees were supposed to be \$7,000 and then the invoice comes back \$8,000 or more due to adding in all the fees. Parents did not see the full cost until the bill came due. Duane Chapman noted tuition did not change, the cost of college changed. Gary Morris stated that was correct, but what was quoted in the catalog and what they were invoiced for were two different things.

Gary Morris noted there were several situations where this was deleterious. One was in the recruiting process. Another was with athletes. Further noted that coaches have to go out early to recruit and draft letters on what it cost to come to our college. Just quoting from the catalog would not provide an accurate cost since it might not account for a student wanting to take a lot of science courses with extra course/lab fees. This would not be determined until they made a schedule and the fees were compiled in the bill. Coaches needed to know what the cost was so it was researched. Jason Yeager researched other institutions and found out that most other institutions in West Virginia are pooling, or lumping, all the fees. Gary Morris noted that while Jason Yeager found not all the other institutions were completely transparent on all the different fees, from what he could determine most institutions were lumping them into a single fee.

Brian Perkins asked how it was going to be determined how much of the lumped sum was going to be budgeted for the departments. Gary Morris responded you would build your budget as done in the past. Departments that have greater expense would get a greater part of the budget. Duane Chapman commented on equitable distribution of funds and an increase to budgets. Discussion followed on

not increasing budgets, but Gary Morris noted that each department would have a budget that reflected the needs of that department. Brian Perkins commented the lab fees will continue, but not be funded in the way previously. Noted budgets would be flat lined unless demonstrated a need for additional funds. Duane Chapman referenced performance funding. Maureen Gildein questioned whether or not the amounts slotted for departments would change because of these pooled/lumped fees. Gary Morris noted if we were doing this properly in the past, this should have been reviewed every year and modified and adapted as needed, which has not been happening in all departments. Stated the intent was not to take money away from departments that needed the money. The intent was that departments that have the greater need will get more of the funds. Brian Perkins noted need was based on the number of students in the courses with lab fees. Gary Morris noted there was already a history created regarding the fees and what the cost was associated with them by departments. This information was part of the records in the finance department.

Discussion followed related to fees and department budgets. Duane Chapman commented on what determined the base pooled fee. Gary Morris responded it was in the handout. Brian Perkins questions about the differences in rates between commuters and on campus. Gary Morris noted the difference resulted in fees for items that commuters did not use, example: microwave and refrigerator fees for residents, the shuttle bus, etc. Discussion followed. Gary Morris stated the average course fee per student was \$90 per semester. Duane Chapman commented on concerns from his department and noted that money collected from fees helped to pay for adjuncts. Gary Morris noted this was a misconception about how money was used and that was why he thought it would be a good idea for faculty to hear from Bert Jedamski on these things. Discussion followed about fees for departments and how bookkeeping managed the flow of money, with Gary Morris noting it was not necessarily dollar by dollar. Duane Chapman commented on explaining to his department that money for budgets would be based on what was spent for the past seven years, but there might have been some inaccuracy or misconceptions on how that money was allocated. Noted skepticism on previous financial management/budgeting information based on past information, but thought Bert Jedamski would do a good job. Gary Morris acknowledged his comments. Tim Konhaus commented that unless we change from that former modus operandi and start with a new baseline we are just continuing to work in the dark. Discussion followed and Gary Morris commented that reviewing the track record for expenses was only part of the discussion and departments should have discussions with CFO on what was needed. Noted there needed to be healthy discussion as budgets are built. Duane Chapman commented on the two fees that

would not be lumped, parking fees and RBA portfolio fees, and asked that any fees that would fall outside of the pooled fees be shared. Gary Morris said he would share that information. Further noted that parking was already structured so that only students wanting to pay for premium parking on campus was charged the additional parking fee. Duane Chapman commented on the \$90 average and if it included averages of all fees. Gary Morris responded the \$90 was just for course fees. Discussion on how fees were problematic and the difficulty for admissions to project an accurate calculation for students on cost of college to parents.

Duane Chapman asked if this information was being presented to the BOG the following day. Gary Morris noted a presentation would be made to BOG. Kevin Evans commented that his department was also concerned. Noted their labs survived off of lab fee money. However, he sees the value of going to a standard course fee. Kevin Evans also noted the first year might be a learning curve and the regular meetings with Bert Jedamski could help figure it out so departments make budgets to cover expenses. Noted he thinks we should give it a shot and reevaluate and change budgets the following year. Duane Chapman agreed he thought it would be great for recruitment and retention and noted in the past there had been a pooled fee. Duane Chapman and Kevin Evans discussed the difficulty of billing for students under current system with multiple fees and billing invoices. Kevin Evans note that faculty needed to stay active in the budget process and make changes for next year to correct discrepancies. Duane Chapman stated it was common sense to support department needs if budgets missed, and gave example of needing more clay for class (due to a larger number of students taking the course). Kevin Evans noted Bert Jedamski would made the best budgets possible, but there was a lot of variables involved and information gathered throughout the year would help to improve future budgets.

Brian Perkins asked if departments would still have a lab fee account fund. Gary Morris responded that was a question for Bert Jedamski. Duane Chapman asked about money that departments had been saving for to cover expenses like replacing equipment. Noted he had been keeping his expenses down as much as possible to save that money for a new kiln and if it was now gone. Gary Morris noted these questions were important for Bert Jedamski to answer. Duane Chapman commented on information presented to BOG for a decision and to vote on it. Gary Morris noted it was just a talking point at the upcoming meeting. Duane Chapman asked Marjorie Stewart (who had already seen the presentation) if she liked the presentation. Marjorie Stewart replied she thought it was a positive thing for students, but would like the financial questions answered. Duane Chapman noted it would be good for recruitment and retention and that he had just lost three students related to the issue. Gary Morris noted it would have to be

voted on by the BOG in March to make it into the catalog for next fall. Brian Perkins noted to send concerns on the issue to Kevin Evans for the BOG meeting on the following day. Duane Chapman noted since this was just an informational item we should wait to discuss it further. Kandas Queen noted we needed to have that conversation with Bert Jedamski regarding deferred questions. Brian Perkins noted this would probably be voted on by BOG before that conversation took place and that this was a fast-moving thing, which meant we needed to send Kevin Evans faculty concerns. Kevin Evans commented that he could share concerns but this was not scheduled to be voted in the meeting and expressed concern about the time table mentioned by Gary Morris as the BOG only meet every other month. Duane Chapman noted there would probably be a special meeting by BOG to vote on the matter. Discussion followed with Brian Perkins asking Kevin Evans to share comments from faculty. Kandas Queen noted concern from her department dealt with the transparency of how the funds would be managed. Kevin Evans noted he would share sentiments expressed in Faculty Senate with BOG.

- Attendance Policy – Brian Perkins noted end of time and policy will be discussed at next meeting, please review.

V. Adjournment

- Brian Perkins asked if there were other concerns. Kandas Queen motioned to adjourn; Marjorie Stewart seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 1:21 p.m.