

# Glenville State College Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: September 14, 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 Teams.
- Senators present: Brian Perkins, Kevin Evans, Marjorie Stewart, Jonathan Minton, Kandas Queen, Wenwen Du, Duane Chapman, Ken Lang, Maureen Gildein, John McKinney, and Tim Konhaus.

Also in attendance: Gary Morris

## II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

Motion to approve the minutes for August 31, 2021 meeting by Ken Lang; seconded by Marjorie Stewart. All voted; motion approved.

- Reports:
  - Brian Perkins stated the bill was due that day on Survey Monkey for \$372; we have a budget of \$500. Discussion followed on whether to keep SurveyMonkey. Brian Perkins noted we had kept it before because it was more private than some of the Microsoft products. Ken Lang questioned if there was still an issue with keeping the data and whether we would lose the data collection. Maureen Gildein noted that issue was resolved, but we would need more than that day to download it all. Duane Chapman motioned to keep SurveyMonkey; Marjorie Stewart seconded the motion. Discussion followed and Duane Chapman stated there needed to be more notice than the day it was due to allow for discussion. Gary Morris noted it could be paid that day. All voted, motion carried.
  - Board of Governors (BOG): Kevin Evans noted BOG were meeting on September 20 for a special virtual meeting to look at the budget and financials. At the August meeting/retreat, Bert Jedamski noted he wished it was a month later and the meeting set for September 20 was based on that request, which would allow for a more detailed financial picture of GSC.
  - Advisory Council of Faculty Representative (ACF): Marjorie Stewart noted we needed to look at the legislative agenda she had sent with the report (see previous email), and noted there was a lot of confusion on the process with discussion centering on the fact ACF had sent a rough draft, which some institutions had already approved. She further noted that we could agree to the main points or provide feedback. Marjorie Stewart listed the main points: a) Ensure that higher education is funded to develop the educated

workforce needed to grow the state economy; b) support an initiative to recruit and retain global talent in West Virginia; ensure that the changing employee healthcare needs are effectively and continually met; ensure transparent and fair employment practices by strengthening due process protections, enhancing shared governance, and preserving tenure and academic freedom; support the improvement of the state's broadband coverage; and ensure institutions of higher education are able to regulate the safety and security of their campuses. Marjorie Stewart noted the last one was to encourage campuses to make their own decisions on issues such as campus carry, rather than have it dictated statewide. Discussion followed and Kevin Evans noted previously we approved the ACF brochure, rather than this final list. He further commented that we were being asked to approve something that could still go back and be changed since it was a draft and he was not comfortable with that process. Discussion continued with Kandas Queen commenting on whether they were just seeking feedback that institutions were in agreement with those key items, which they could then finalize for our approval on a brochure. Discussion finalized with GSC Faculty Senate stating they were fine with the key agenda items, but would need to see a finished product before giving actual approval.

Marjorie Stewart asked if there were any questions about the cabinet meeting notes she had sent out via emailed. Kevin Evans responded he had a question about the bookstore and people not opting out and if that issue was resolved. Marjorie Stewart noted it was, but she would ask for an update on that at Thursday's meeting. Kevin Evans noted that could be a huge financial hit to college. Discussion followed on the number of students that had actually opted out of the process.

- Administrative/Academic Updates (GSC President, GSC VPAA, Others): Brian Perkins recognized Gary Morris for updates. Gary Morris commented that the HLC visit was very successful and we had received an initial report. He commented it will not be finalized until November. Gary Morris noted the next step was for West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (HEPC) approval. He was meeting with Corley Dennison from West Virginia HEPC to discuss it later in the week. Noted Randal Brumfield was the new Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at West Virginia HEPC. Gary Morris provided updates for COVID-19, and noted that Leisa Dean was moved to the COVID-19 team in Human Resource to help with communication. Tegan McEntire was not able to get Human Resources done because of dealing with the extra load of contact tracing

and other COVID-19 related duties. Leisa Dean will be communicating with the students, and notifying faculty immediately. This would save faculty time on reviewing the Institutional Absences list. Kevin Evans questioned the language on the Institutional Absence list about when it said ‘through Friday’ and whether that meant students were back in class on Friday or excused. Discussion followed where Gary Morris noted there were several variables that went into determining when students were safe to return to the classroom and the excused date was posted for a worst-case scenario, which might not be needed as students progressed through the process. Gary Morris noted he was not concerned with a student showing up one day early for class, but if it was five days that could be an issue for concern. Gary Morris noted he would check on the language and see if it could be made clearer. He further commented that GSC currently had 12 students in Pickens (isolated), one student was hospitalized over the past weekend and was on a ventilator; this totaled two students hospitalized over the past few weeks. GSC had eight students in Goodwin (quarantined), and had a total of 62 student COVID-19 cases (isolated or quarantined) overall. The other 42 cases were off campus. Duane Chapman noted that number was about the same as last year. Gary Morris noted our peak last year was over 100. He further noted the difference between last year and this year included cases being more symptomatic and they are more severe; no students were hospitalized in the previous two semesters.

Gary Morris commented that a taskforce had been created to work on the nursing program, which involved about ten people and included Kevin Evans and Sara Sawyer. Denise Campbell has been hired as a consultant to help with the nursing program on campus and recruiting students. Gary Morris also noted they were meeting with Marshall University the next day to look at Marshall’s facilities and moving forward with the nursing program. He further commented a goal of the taskforce was to look at developing a department of Health Sciences. It would house programs that nursing students could transition into as an alternative to nursing.

Gary Morris commented they were working on course schedules for the next three years.

### III. Old Business:

- Faculty Handbook – Review of the Faculty Handbook resulted in the following recommended changes (Listed below):
  - Marjorie Stewart noted on page 26 in the first paragraph the language for lecturer needed clarification in terms of pursuing a terminal degree.

Discussion followed on how that could be interpreted. Kandas Queen suggested to add “at this time” after ‘terminal degree’ and Marjorie Stewart agreed with the addition, but noted it should go after ‘or performing scholarship’; this would to provide more options for scholarship.

- On page 35 in the last sentence of the second paragraph Brian Perkins noted there was a missing period.
- On page 36 Marjorie Stewart questioned the formatting on the list of five things and then the paragraph in the middle of it. Discussion followed noting that was not the normal format for a list. Brian Perkins and Marjorie Stewart noted that it might need to be moved, possibly to number two as it referenced there was not a maximum time, if that was the intent of that language.
- On page 38-39, Wenwen Du discussed the wording for lecturer and noted that last year there was discussion about levels of promotion for lecturer. Kevin Evans commented on the language and Gary Morris noted it was open for discussion to have different levels of lecturers and if pursued it would need to be included in the budget for next year.
- On page 40, number seven, in the first sentence Brian Perkins noted it stated ‘the College Tenure and Promotion Committee will conduct a full review..., recommend approval or disapproval of the chairperson’s actions.’ He questioned if it should read that they recommend approval or disapproval of tenure and promotion. Gary Morris commented that the current process was for the committee to review the evidence and decide whether they agree or disagree with the chairperson’s recommendation. Discussion followed on the approval/disapproval process for the committee.
- On page 42, Kandas Queen commented on the alignment of language (Accomplishment Report / Faculty Accomplishment Report) and alignment with Appendix M in reference to the FAR. She further noted it referenced a section 4.6 (see...below) but there was no such section on that page.
- On page 44, Brian Perkins noted in the first paragraph, second sentence there was information regarding student evaluations and that they would ‘only be shared in classes of eight or more students’ where he questioned the reasoning for that language. Gary Morris noted it was for anonymity. Discussion followed where Marjorie Stewart noted you could ask for results if the class size was too small. Wenwen Du noted currently we still get feedback if we have 5 students.
- On page 45, Brian Perkins noted merit pay referenced in the second paragraph and questioned if that was eliminated. He suggested that the reference to merit pay be removed since it longer existed. Also, on that page, in the second paragraph in the last sentence of the paragraph it states ‘his/er designee’ and questioned if we should select a gender-neutral

pronoun, such as their. Marjorie Stewart approved. Discussion followed in agreement.

- On page 46 and 47, Brian Perkins noted there was a duplication of the first part of the workload statement. On page 45, there were five paragraphs; and on page 46 there were ten items and at the bottom there was the same five paragraphs again.
- On page 52, under the annual leave section, there was a reference to non-classified staff. Brian Perkins commented that should be removed because we do not have that classification system any more.
- On page 55, Wenwen Du and Kandas Queen questioned the removal of the 'Faculty Post Retirement Employment Plan (F-PREP). Gary Morris noted it was removed because the college was not going to financially support that at this time. Kandas Queen asked when that decision was made and Gary Morris noted it part of the tracked changes that occurred over the summer and noted there had been some previous faculty that took advantage of it. Wenwen Du asked if it could be discussed again to reinstate. Gary Morris noted it could be discussed. Discussion followed with focus on the financial cost of it to the college. Wenwen Du referenced Paul Peck and noted that some retired faculty might still enjoy teaching but might not be able to manage the previous workload. Gary Morris noted there were always special cases. Duane Chapman noted faculty could still teach as an adjunct.
- On page 58, second bullet point Brian Perkins suggested a revision for the section 'is eligible for consideration for overload pay' and stated that if you were eligible for overload you should be paid for an overload, not eligible for consideration of an overload pay. Kandas Queen noted revision was also needed in the bottom paragraph of Overload Pay Policy to match what our current practice regarding overload pay. Discussion followed on how to address specifics on overload pay. Ken Lang noted issues he had seen with new faculty not knowing what to expect in terms of an overload pay or how much pay that entailed. Discussion centered around what and where that information could be found; discussion included a link to website and/or in the appendix.
- On page 59, Brian Perkins noted in the first sentence it states 'the following procedures' but there were no procedures listed. Ken Lang noted adding a weblink to Series 11. Discussion included agreement with a weblink, but noted revision was needed to the language regarding 'the following procedures'.
- The next section of the Faculty Handbook up for review are pages 60-82.
- Secretarial Support – Kandas Queen noted there did not seem to be an overwhelming need for a departmental secretary in the Department of Business. She further noted that most felt the current process was working well overall. However, there was a suggestion to check with the secretaries shared in Academic

Affairs to see if the process was working well from their perspective. She also noted that comments in support of a departmental secretary noted they served as the hub for the department and were often the face of it for the students. Maureen Gildein noted the Education Department would benefit by having their secretary back. She further noted this was due to the nature of the Education Department and the amount work required to put together packets, and schedule admission interviews. However, she did note that the current process was working, but this was largely due to the organizational skills of Connie O'Dell and could become a different matter under different leadership. Marjorie Stewart noted for them it was just certain needs that were not happening, and special circumstances. Most of the day-to-day was ok. She further commented they were finally staffed on student workers. Kevin Evans shared that from a chair position it might be a benefit to have a more dedicated student worker for specific tasks, such as lab or secretarial. Further commented they spend more time being trained by Academic Support Center and the other secretaries help train student workers to perform the secretarial duties needed. Ken Lang noted as a chair he was heavily dependent on the departmental secretary services. He noted they were instrumental in the program review process, and with chairs having to take on more work it limited other things. Ken Lang further talked about the role of the departmental secretary supporting initiatives. Kandas Queen stated that her chair, Dwight Heaster, supported the current process and had not had any major issues as long as it followed the shared secretarial process. Brian Perkins commented that if chairs were still doing additional duties, they should be compensated for it. Gary Morris noted chairs were being compensated more and the stipend had gone up \$1,000. Discussion followed on the value of secretaries as the face of the department and the success of the current process based on the key people currently serving as chairs. John McKinney noted the Fine Arts department was very different from other departments due to shows and tickets sales. He commented that was a lot to put on students and that not all departments were equal in terms of need. John McKinney further noted that their need changed at various times throughout the year and that it would go beyond the scope of a student worker. Many of the shows involved the faculty working backstage, which would not leave anyone up front to attend to customer needs. He further noted the security risks involved with customer credit card numbers provided to pay for events. Brian Perkins noted we could revisit this topic again.

- Provost Evaluation – Marjorie Stewart provided some background research on how to establish a program and what other colleges do. She noted a good way to go would be a full faculty survey and something like the presidential survey that provided space for a narrative and sharing thoughts. Kandas Queen shared thoughts about a 360-degree evaluation approach. Marjorie Stewart stated we would create a survey.

#### IV. New Business:

- Faculty Development Funds – Marjorie Stewart stated the committee was meeting the following week. Brian Perkins and Marjorie Stewart noted there were parts of the Faculty Handbook that needed to align with the committee bylaws.
- Kandas Queen questioned Faculty Senate about proposed changes in development for the RBA program and required credits.

#### V. Adjournment:

Kandas Queen motioned to adjourn the meeting. Marjorie Stewart seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 1:28 p.m.