

## **Glenville State University Faculty Senate – minutes**

Meeting Date: Oct 28, 2025

Meeting Place: 319 MCCC

Meeting Time: 12:25 PM

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

- a. President S. Chapman called the meeting to order at 12:25 pm.
- b. Senators in Attendance: S. Chapman, G. Lieving, S. Haynes, D. McEntire, D. Lewis, J. Bryson, M. Gildein, N. Nasser, S. Silva, M. Sarver, S. Beatty, (J. Wenner – Transcriber)
- c. Administrators: M. Clements
- d. Others in Attendance: Jason Gum, J. Carpenter

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

- a. The minutes of Oct 14, 2025 presented for approval. Bryson motioned to approve. Sarver seconds. No discussion, all approve, no oppositions, no abstentions. Motion passes.

### **III. Reports**

- a. President – S. Chapman
  - i. Promotion and Tenure election complete, results emailed out. A. Nicholas contacted for finalization.
    1. Sarver, Black and Hutton were elected.
    2. Notes sent to Nicholas information regarding inconsistencies in P&T bylaws.
      - a. Can be reviewed when committee meets
      - b. Number of members not updated since addition of Senior Lecturer
      - c. Nothing in bylaws addresses how tie votes will be handled.
      - d. Faculty Senate does have such language in Constitution for at-large election. But it is complicated and needs to be reviewed.
  - ii. Faculty Senate Constitution task force
    1. Chapman, Bryson & Beatty
    2. GSC vs GSU needs to be corrected
    3. BoG representative language needs updated due to legislation changes
    4. Meets Wed Nov 5
  - iii. HLC Assurance Team
    1. Document for Senate/Faculty to review
    2. Will be focus for Nov 11 meeting
  - iv. Dr. Manchin needs to meet with Senate. Will try to schedule December 2
- b. ACF – J. Bryson
  - i. Survey of issues came back highlighting
    1. PEIA and cost of healthcare for faculty
    2. Faculty pay
    3. Tenure and Academic Freedom protections
    4. Shared governance re: voting rights on BoG
      - a. Identified previously, but was majority of response
  - ii. WVU's faculty sent the president a request that ACF work on drafting legislation to repeal the no vote on BoG rule.
    1. Other faculty senates are joining in this type of request
    2. Clements – that will be necessary because BoG met with delegates at last meeting. Delegate L. Dittman, chair of the Higher Education subcommittee said she has no plans to reintroduce this issue in this latest

term, so there will need to be a request. It was less clear on the senate side, so it may be introduced.

3. Gildein added that B. Queen was listening when the issue was addressed.
4. Clements said that due to the higher education committee being in the House, we would want L. Dittmer to be on board with reintroducing the bill.
5. Gildein said it does not hurt to write letters, and let the issue be known, even if the legislature is not doing anything on it right now.

iii. The ACF retreat is coming up.

c. BoG – M. Gildein

i. BoG met last week. Overview was sent out already. It is quite lengthy.

1. The retreat is at the beginning and the meeting was the next day and is at the end of the pack.
2. Reiterates the need to change the legislation.
3. Dr. C. Marsh. WV Director of Health Sciences face of Covid who worked with Governor.

a. He says by 2030 we will need one million nurses.

b. This means we are moving in the right direction with the nursing program

4. Student government reported that they are very close to finish reviewing the data from the survey to expand the library hours.

a. The library will not be open 24/7, but there will be expanded hours.

b. Bryson asked about changes to the physical layout of the library, comparing it to Marshall.

i. They have a room they can enter with student ID to access computers, copier, etc. You cannot access the main library, but this space can be accessed after hours. Do we have any plans for something like this?

ii. Gildein said J. Gum was in the meeting, and could address that.

iii. Gum said that such things have been discussed, and he is open to suggestions. He would prefer that type of system.

1. Fairmont is open less hours than GSU, but they have a room with keycard access. That sounds like what Marshall has.

2. This is a possible solution for 24-hour access eventually.

3. He is waiting for guidance from the administration on how to proceed, but the key card limited access is a good plan.

4. He is not sure if that is what SGA wants, but it is what others have done.

5. This solution would require walls to limit access and restrooms within the area open to students.

d. Academic Affairs – M. Clements

i. At the end of 2024 we were looking at Dean & department Chair evaluations.

1. What we had was not reflective of what we were doing.

2. It was returned to Faculty Senate, who had the same feeling.

3. Deans and Chairs are working on a new faculty observation form
4. Comments are most appreciated. Checked boxes are not always relevant.
5. They looked at other schools to see how it was being done elsewhere.
6. Clements sent S. Chapman the existing evaluation, with examples of three other places. He forwarded to Senate.
  - a. There is less out there about the evaluation of Deans and Provosts.
  - b. They would like to hear suggestions from Faculty.
  - c. They would prefer not to start at nothing, but instead to use these samples for reference.
  - d. Deans & Chairs will be discussing it further at their next meeting
  - e. Senate will need to weigh in
  - f. S. Chapman said to bring suggestions to the next meeting.
  - g. Sarver said that this should be seen as a senate driven evaluation, as staff and students will also be doing Provost Evaluations.
  - h. This led to a discussion of evaluations and who does them and how they are done. There was some miscommunication about how and when the evals should be done, and who would review the evaluation. There is also a fear that the questions from a student or staff survey would have the same questions as a faculty survey, convoluting the results.
  - i. Chapman says we have not evaluated the Provost in three years, and these should be a routine event. But we need a foundation for regular evaluations.
  - j. Bryson motions that Faculty Senate conducts a Provost evaluation.
    - i. Sarver seconds.
    - ii. Lieving says he thought we were constructing an instrument with which to do the evaluation, as opposed to actually conducting the evaluation.
    - iii. Sarver says you have to create the instrument in order to do the evaluation. In doing an evaluation, we create an instrument that can be used for future evaluations.
    - iv. Gildein says we created a Provost Evaluation when we last conducted one.
    - v. Bryson believes we must decide to do the evaluation before we create the instrument.
    - vi. Silva asked if we are going to look at the questions for approval, how we will populate the survey.
    - vii. Chapman states that we would create the survey via Survey Monkey, and we would send out the survey to faculty, and then it would be reviewed, but asks what would happen to the results. He is not sure that it is appropriate for faculty to see the results.
    - viii. Sarver says the results could go directly to the Provost and President. Faculty issues are different from staff and student issues.
    - ix. Chapman – There would be areas that faculty would have input in that students and staff would not have input in. He agrees that the questions should be different for each entity. We are not creating surveys for all. Each should

have separate question pages. We should give input to the questions to address faculty related issues.

- k. Nasseri says there are two points to the motion. One is that we need to vote on creating the instrument and two is to vote on moving forward to come up with the questions for the evaluation.
  - i. Bryson states there is a motion on the floor. He says we vote on that issue.
  - ii. Chapman says that the motion is to conduct a Provost evaluation and asks for a vote. Haynes asked what Senate is charged to do. Chapman says he believes that Senate is asking to create and distribute a Provost evaluation. That would include coming up with questions, and soliciting input from faculty.
  - iii. Silva adds through Survey Monkey.
  - iv. No further discussion, all approve, no oppositions, no abstentions. Motion passes.
- l. Chapman states that this does not determine who will create the survey.
  - i. Bryson state Senate will do that through committee.
  - ii. Sarver says Senate should solicit input for the questions from their departments.
  - iii. Sarver motions to create an Ad Hoc committee to come up with questions for the Provost evaluation. Bryson seconds. Nasseri suggests “collate and create the questions”.
  - iv. No further discussion, all approve, no oppositions, no abstentions. Motion passes. Chapman does a count of ayes, to be sure there was a majority vote.
- m. Chapman asks for volunteers for Ad Hoc committee
  - i. Sarver, Lieving, Bryson volunteer

#### IV. Old Business

- a. Course Program of Study Policy
  - i. It is a new policy based on an existing practice.
    - 1. Title IV funds are only distributed for courses within the student’s program of study.
    - 2. Minors are not included, unless the program explicitly states that minors are required.
    - 3. Courses for dual or second degrees are considered degree pursuant, but once you finish a degree, you are considered done and financial aid would not longer be available.
    - 4. Those advising students with a double major must make sure the students are finishing the coursework for both degrees in the same final semester. You can’t finish one and then try to finish the other after the fact.
    - 5. Students repeating courses for grades can do that once, but further attempts will not be considered degree pursuant.
    - 6. It affects the overall number of credit hours attempted.
    - 7. We are recommending it be forwarded or not. It is a policy based on practices and tied to federal guidelines.

8. Bryson moves the policy is forwarded to ULC. Silva seconds No further discussion, all approve, no oppositions, no abstentions. Motion passes.
- b. Related to this, Chapman will be sending out information about the guidelines for sending policy's to ULC.
  - i. According to the constitution, the Senate president should send a memo to the faculty for review for 10 days. At the end of ten days, a memo is sent to the Provost to take it to ULC for review.
  - ii. Chapman has taken to doing this, but this is explanation for this. It can be reviewed as the constitution is reviewed. It does extend the timeline, which could lead to bottlenecks.
- c. Online Faculty Cap
  - i. Clements states when we first started having online only faculty, the President and Provost both were opposed to the concept and set limits on the number that could be within each department. The feeling was that it would take away from who we were as a university. The agreement was that each department could have no more than 2 online faculty, and only in departments that have an online degree.
    1. We have since accepted other online only faculty in other departments. It was supposed to be temporary, but was extended.
    2. We now have a proof of concept. Online faculty can be engaged and participate on committees at a distance.
    3. Many departments that do not have an online program are considering online programs or are supporting online programs.
    4. Online only instructors have insight into the struggles online students face.
    5. Hiring decision are the domain of the president, so this would be a recommendation as to whether we should change the current caps? Should we open it further to departments that do not have online programs? Should we remove the cap all together? What are the pros and cons?
      - a. Sarver- from the business department, the last three hires have been lecturers because the salary is insufficient to get tenure track professors. When you stop getting tenure track professors, the nature of the institution changes. Last year we ran 120 classes online. 2 may not be the arbitrary number for business. CJ, Social Sciences are growing.
      - b. Clements we have 500 dual enrollment students who are taking classes online. CJ last year had 70 percent of their courses online, but only 30 percent of their students were online. I there is a balance that departments need to think about.
      - c. Gildein – I certainly do believe in the balance. Some students do well online, others do better face-to-face. I support it. In our efforts to reduce low enrollment courses, we've gone to odd structure of courses with courses every other year. As an Advisor, I have a hard time finding classes that will fit my students' schedules.
      - d. Bryson- In order to support and understand that for an online major, getting a degree fully online, they are not losing Glenville having an online professor. All of their professors are online. I don't think that is an issue for online students. I had two sections of the same class, each with four students. I combined those to a blended learning course, which skews the number, because we try

not to have low enrollment classes. It is more work for me. I think we need to look at allowing more. It does not matter to all online programs, they do not care if I have an office on campus or not.

- e. Sarver- It should be departmental driven. Some departments are used to having online faculty. The business department has adapted well to having several of our members not here. I would like to push an unpopular opinion that online faculty should be required to come to GSU for commencement and welcome back week.
  - i. Clements- we actually have, in the online faculty expectations that they are expected. Sometimes those faculty request exemptions from that. But as they can tell you, their contract has an extra page with those expectations, take straight from the faculty handbook.
  - ii. Beatty—Carpenter and I show up on those days plus.
  - iii. Sarver- At Mountain state, it was a big deal when the online students came to campus for graduation and finally got to meet those faculty they had seen on video. They would come a couple days early and we would have events for them.
  - iv. Clements- I do need to point out that our online enrollment this year is down. What I would request of the Senate is that they think about this and make a recommendation. Also look at the expectations of remote faculty in the faculty handbook and think about what those expectations should be in addition to what is listed there.
  - v. Silva- Funding for the travel to and from the university
  - vi. Clements- We have a fund to help with remote travel to campus once a year. But in many cases this is a choice, and we are better if they are on campus.
  - vii. Chapman- take it back to your department. There needs to be some standard. Like up to a number, a percentage, or based on the percentage of online students. This is definitely a by-department issue. Some classes work best in person.
  - viii. Clements – I do not want us to hold out false hope that this would help us to recruit more tenured professors. The salary to people not living here might be laughable compared to what they make where they live. It does afford us flexibility in hiring, but we need to remember that Glenville is not an expensive place to live.
  - ix. Lieving – Are you bringing this up because you are getting pushback? You are having difficulty hiring people because it might push us over that cap?
    - 1. Clements – no that is not the rationale. I think its time to revisit it. There have been over time sporadic questions from existing faculty about could they move online due to family or health

reasons. But overall its time for us to think about this.

- x. Gildein – Do we need to differentiate between synchronous and asynchronous.
  - 1. Chapman – that’s usually a discussion for the faculty member. Gish teaches online synchronously and asynchronously.
  - 2. Clements- student drop online synchronous classes at a much higher rate.
  - 3. Bryson – The advantage of online education is that you can work full time and don’t have to be in class and spend time on the drive, so it is more flexible.

V. New Business

- a. Provost Evaluation (from Office of Academic Affairs)
  - i. Addressed earlier.

VI. Old Business (Tabled)

- a. Academic Appeals Documentation
- b. Faculty Webpages GSU

**VII.** Adjourn – 1:24