

Glenville State College Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: February 9, 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, Marjorie Stewart, Kevin Evans, Kandas Queen, Wenwen Du, Duane Chapman, Ken Lang, Maureen Gildein, John McKinney, Tim Konhaus, and Jonathan Minton.
- Also in attendance: Mari Clements and Gary Morris.

II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

- Motion to approve the minutes for January 26, 2021 meeting from Marjorie Stewart, seconded by Ken Lang. All approved. Motion carries.
- Reports:
 - President's report: Brian Perkins noted he did not have anything to report other than what was already on the agenda.
 - Board of Governors (BOG) Representative Kevin Evans: Noted the BOG are scheduled to meet next week and he would have more to report afterwards.
 - Advisory Council of Faculty (ACF) Representative Marjorie Stewart: Noted there was discussion on the ACF priorities she presented to Senate at the last Faculty Senate meeting, along with some other issues she will share. In terms of the priorities, the one in common for this group was concern over the confidentiality and the use of data produced by item, 'To provide transparency in campus governance, initiate faculty and staff evaluations of Board of Governors, and all administrators at the Dean level or higher'. Marjorie Stewart stated that she had commented on this and the response was this would be a personnel file/document and would be treated as confidential. The purpose for this priority was to get better boards and to counteract legislation that has been encroaching on the power of BOG. An example was an effort to pass something that would allow BOG to eliminate tenure. It has not been able to pass during the past few years, but there is concern this year that it might be more popular. Brian Perkins noted ACF priorities as an item on the on the agenda coming up under old business.
 - Marjorie Stewart commented on the Cabinet meeting. One of the big topics under discussion was the inauguration for President Manchin on April 9. Foundation is working on getting funding from donors and sponsors to add the money that was already in the budget for the inauguration and

Homecoming. A lot of talk about COVID, mostly due to students not following social distancing. None seem to be due to attending class in the classroom. Still working on Account Receivables noting that Fall 2020 was down to \$700,000. Spring is still \$1.5 million but a lot of that is Financial Aid that has not been collected yet.

- Administrative/Academic Updates (GSC President, GSC VPAA, Others): Gary Morris noted one update Mark Manchin wanted to share that the CFO is willing to come and give Faculty Senate regular updates on the finances of GSC. Would like some direction on what Faculty Senate would like to know in these updates. Noted this was bundled with the discussion on the 12 credit hours teaching load under New Business. Commented they had made progress on the timeline for building the schedule for the next two years. Gary Morris noted he would send that out shortly. The intent is to have the final version for four semesters of course schedules done by April 2. There will be an opportunity for departments, registrar, and Academic Success Center to weigh in throughout the process to make it comprehensive. Have data from Ad Astra, which Mari Clements can speak more about that supports the scheduling process. Lastly, the Strategic Planning Committee is finally formed, 18 members on the committee with roughly half being faculty in some capacity. Planning on having four meetings between now and April, and finalize the Strategic Plan by May so we submit it to BOG by June. Brian Perkins noted we will get back with him about information for CFO and when we would like to have Bert Jedamski present at Senate. Mari Clement noted if we want Ad Astra information, she could get it for us.

III. Old Business

- Non-Meeting Committee Review – Brian Perkins noted the last committee we reviewed was the Enrollment Management Committee. This committee was looked at by Wenwen Du, who was able to bring in the old bylaws from the Retention Committee and the original idea that the Retention Committee be rolled into the Enrollment Management Committee. Brian Perkins had sent this information out to Senate and asked Wenwen Du if he had anything further to add. Wenwen Du commented that most of the information came from the Enrollment Committee bylaws, which were very detailed. Duane Chapman asked if Jason Yeager had reviewed this information and had the chance to provide input as VP. Brian Perkins commented yes, and that Jason Yeager was happy to have the committee and wanted to know when it would meet. Brian Perkins noted the only change he had was to make the name just Enrollment Management Committee rather than Enrollment and Retention Committee since enrollment encompassed retention. Brian Perkins noted that a lot of this aligned with Criterion IV C for retention, graduation, and persistence. Brian Perkins commented on membership

calling for four faculty representatives and whether we might want a representative from every department, or would that be too much. Marjorie Stewart and Maureen Gildein felt the membership was fine, but Marjorie Stewart noted that when voting on members there should be something that they not all be from the same department. Brian Perkins further noted the committee might want to look at setting goals for retention and persistence, which might help with HLC Criterion IV C. Marjorie Stewart moved to accept with the revised title. Maureen Gildein seconded. Motion passed.

- Overload Policy – Ken Lang noted he took the comments from our last meeting and revised the Overload Policy. Recirculated / resent latest version to cover with departments and get feedback.
- Changes to FAR – Brian Perkins commented that Duane Chapman had gathered various versions of the FAR. Duane Chapman noted we need to look at all three of them to look at the points everyone wants and work towards developing an updated FAR approved by Senate. The 2nd form was the one previously voted on and approved by Senate. Duane Chapman noted we should look at it more like a self-reflection, as the Provost had previously spoken on. Send points about what like and do not like to Duane Chapman based on how faculty want to evaluate themselves. Duane Chapman noted he had been working on it with David O’Dell on how it was developed. Noted he would like to have it by May, but might not be till August under new Senate. While we have some time to work on this, please send information now on what kind of items would like to have in it rather than waiting till next fall. Duane Chapman noted he would like to have the cleanest draft possible before starting to make changes to it.
- Faculty Search Committees – Brian Perkins questioned Marjorie Stewart, who noted there was nothing yet to report. Marjorie Stewart asked if there was anyone interested in looking at it with her and Maureen Gildein stated she would help with it. They will continue working it.
- ACF Priorities – Maureen Gildein had some questions and asked what was the purpose of asking for Higher Education Evaluations. If they are asking for that, what kind of data are they looking for or do they get. Marjorie Stewart restated the information would be kept confidential and the point was to get better BOG. Marjorie Stewart noted that the BOG could have some who do not understand education, which was one of the legal requirements in the statutes. Getting it into the legislature will help to temper down radical/crazy legislative actions on education. Brian Perkins noted at this time these are just priorities, which may never make it to legislative measures. Marjorie Stewart noted if it was never set as a priority it would not be part of the conversation had with legislature. Maureen Gildein noted her concern was about them asking for the evaluations data. Marjorie Stewart noted that was not how it would work. Brian Perkins noted it would have to be drafted into a legislative rule that could address such concerns. Marjorie Stewart noted the ACF just wanted get our approval or endorsement of priorities they would be working with legislatives on. Duane Chapman asked if

this was what we normally did. Kevin Evans/Marjorie Stewart responded yes. This allows ACF to go to the legislators and say this is from all colleges not just one or two. Kandas Queen motioned to support the ACF priorities, Wenwen Du seconded. Maureen Gildein went on record expressing concern about legislature asking for results on evaluations. Marjorie Stewart will note this when sending in to ACF. Motion pass.

Marjorie Stewart commented the other big ACF concern was the bill in the senate to eliminate personal income tax in West Virginia, which will result in major cuts for funding to higher education. K-12 education is guaranteed by the constitution, but higher education is not. Some emails suggest they will cut the Promise program, eliminate funding for WVU and Marshall University. Brian Perkins noted timing might be off with placing a \$2 billion hole in the state budget.

IV. New Business

- Return to 12 credits workload per semester – Brian Perkins noted the main points from a meeting with the GSC President, Mike Rust, and other administrators was for the pay of overloads be at the end of the year, and reduce low enrollment courses by 120, eliminate minors that lose money, and have a monthly financial report to Faculty Senate. Email concerns to Brian Perkins, who will compile for administration.
 - Duane Chapman noted comments from the Fine Arts department included: 1) Faculty's option to deny overloads; 2) prorate the enrollment classes as we do in the summer and noted they liked being paid overload at the end of the year, which would benefit those overloaded in one semester but short in the other; and 3) minors – noted those served on the Curriculum Committee felt this was supported. Maureen Gildein asked if it was possible to reduce courses by 120 a year and still keep students on a progression track to graduation. Duane Chapman noted 15 to finish track should graduate them on time. Maureen Gildein questioned issues with the rotation of when courses were offered. Mari Clements noted Ad Astra had reviewed five years of data with our majors and minors to see what suggestions they had regarding classes that could be reduced to once a year, or which ones we could change to every other year. It may require us to think about being more flexible with the courses we offer. Mari Clements discussed examples of offering certain classes odd years, other even years depending on academic level of student (freshmen...., senior) and noted there were some cases where prerequisites will not allow this to work. She further noted that according to Ad Astra our courses over a five-year span are stable on the number of courses that are at or below 50% of capacity. This means we need to think more strategically on our faculty resources. There are

reality checks in place that they (administration) have taken back to Ad Astra stating that will not work. Mari Clements noted the number of really low enrollment courses was strikingly high. Brian Perkins asked if there was a report that could be shared with faculty. Mari Clements commented yes. Gary Morris reminded Brian Perkins of a conversation that noted administration said they (Gary Morris, Bert Jedamski, and Tim Henline) would like to meet with each department first and have a discussion with them before releasing that data. Agreed that was reasonable. Duane Chapman questioned about scheduling classes at the same time noting we are bringing our number down and asked if this program will help with laying out the courses in a more effective manner rather the 10 am – 2 pm window when everyone wants to offer classes. Mari Clements noted it creates what is called conflict risk, which shows what conflicts one class has with another, looks at student needs, and indicates where to move classes as needed by suggesting better times. Preference is shown by faculty and students for when classes are offered. Mari Clements noted it also suggests classes that we should add sections for that class. Duane Chapman noted he was excited to see what this would look like. Maureen Gildein noted the careful planning was good, but thinks 120 seems like a drastic number all at once and wondered if that could be phased in, noted there are international students and students with Financial Aid who need full-time status and wondered how this would work for them.

Mari Clements noted another topic that dovetailed with this was how departments handle internships, which currently is very different across campus. These were some of the main courses that got dropped from the Spring semester because they had zero or only one student enrolled. Noted exceptions with ones that are required for graduation. Commented there has to be a balance and to look at what is the best for students. The main thing to help students is for GSC to get out of financial trouble and for faculty not to be burnt out from teaching overloads. Tim Konhaus questioned if the program had a plan to allow for transfer students or high school students to get credit. Mari Clements commented that the program does a mini DegreeWorks for every student.

Gary Morris noted for context on the 120 reduction for the year, we had 250 sections this semester alone with low enrollment. So, when reducing it from 250 to 190 per semester we are not looking at a major change and it should not have a severe impact. A lot of this is looking at how we can modify when courses are offered. To keep it in perspective, with around 500 sections a year of low enrollment we are looking at a cut of only 120.

Brian Perkins asked if the definition of low enrollment was 10 students or less. Gary Morris confirmed yes. Based on repeated analysis, it takes seven students in a class to breakeven on variables and pay faculty salary. The other three goes to cover overhead. This is consistent with previous analysis showing that it takes 10 students in a course to cover the cost. GSC loses money on courses that average below 10 students enrolled based on a fiscal perspective. Duane Chapman noted that was based on one FTE. Each student in that class was based on one fulltime student for budgeting purposes. Gary Morris noted there are a number of considerations that play into that such as courses taught by adjuncts (lower salaries) and long-time faculty (higher salaries) and that overall, you are looking at averages. Mari Clements noted that a Part-Time student who is taking courses still needs all the same institutional support as the FTE student in terms of advising, etc. FTE students count for greater revenue and services needed. Headcount equals expense.

Tim Konhaus noted the Department of Social Science had a lot of questions. One piggybacked on the one Maureen Gildein raised on the 120 reduction and will that include upper division courses. We know we have some programs on campus that are not large. In some of these there will not be enough students to fill a class, but we have to keep classes open to allow students to graduate. Second question referred to opening up new programs and if there was going to be a grace period to keep courses open and get a chance to build up that program. Marjorie Stewart noted she had asked these types of questions in the meeting, and was told this was part of what the meetings with departments are going to be about. She further noted there was still a lot of anger and mistrust towards administration after the increase to 15 credit hours, and some faculty are skeptical about promises to do right on the courses for students.

Tim Konhaus noted some of the broader questions from his department was if these are either / or compromises? Are these the only two options on the table financially? Is there nothing else being looked at? Do we either have to accept the compromise or maintain the 5 / 5 load, which was introduced as a temporary measure not as a long-term solution. So is this compromise going to be temporary or is it more of a long-term solution. Why have we not seen the numbers on the short-term solution? Gary Morris noted the numbers were shared on the savings. They were reported at the BOG meeting and Kevin Evans shared them with Faculty Senate, savings was about \$100,000 and would have been greater if there had not been adjustments for COVID-19. Gary Morris noted there was nothing he could do about the mistrust

component, other than keep faculty informed on what the plans are for us. However, if there are other options faculty wants to look at administration was open to it. Gary Morris noted they were looking at about a quarter million in savings when went to 15 credit hours. The other thing is a matter of efficiency. The more obvious courses that would be elected for elimination would be electives. The goal would not be to eliminate all electives, but to reduce the number offered a semester. If a program has three or more majors, they should not be offering 6 – 8 electives a semester. It is impossible to spread faculty resources across all of that and still operate efficiently. Gary Morris noted he was not in favor of cutting upper-level courses that are required for programs that are being successful. Many programs with low enrollment at the senior level are bringing in kids on the front end and are doing a good job. Please think of the alternatives. Gary Morris stated they were not proposing cutting programs or cutting people at this time, but just trying to find savings. Noted that we are facing a \$2 million deficit this coming year, and ended last year with a \$1.3 million deficit. Wants to work with faculty and does not want to do anything unilateral, but there has to be reason and common sense on both sides. Understands the fear component and is asking for a meeting.

Brian Perkins noted running out of time. Noted to send concerns to Brian Perkins so he can share with Gary Morris for when they meet with departments. Brian Perkins asked Gary Morris when meetings will happen with departments. Gary Morris wanted to share with Faculty Senate first and noted will start next week working with departments to set up meetings. Kevin Evans shared that he knew we had mistrust with administration in the past, but we have got to reach past it. Administration is reaching out with a compromise and faculty need to realize it. GSC has averaged \$2 million in debt these past 10 years and cannot sustain that, we have to fix budget problems. A lot of institutions are closing doors and taking pay cuts and we are trying to hold it together. The administration is trying to work with faculty, and faculty need to work constructively with them. Suggested looking at reducing courses with low enrollment as a general statement with the goal of 120 rather than stating outright to reduce by 120. Noted we need to work together and not fight internally or we will not succeed. Brian Perkins thinks these things proposed by administration are going to happen regardless and appreciated administration reaching out to faculty as a compromise.

- Faculty Handbook – Duane Chapman noted we need to look at it. Kandas Queen asked about progress on the Adjunct Faculty Handbook and Mari Clements noted more edits from Gary Morris and that she and the committee (faculty members

included) assigned to the handbook are working on it. Mari Clements noted some of the policies may flow into the Faculty Handbook.

- Academic Policy Bylaws Revision - Brian Perkins asked these be reviewed and provide feedback for next time.
- Surplus Equipment – Brian Perkins asked this be reviewed and provide feedback for next time.

V. Adjournment

- Brian Perkins asked if there were other concerns. Kandas Queen motioned to adjourn; Maureen Gildein seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 1:18 p.m.