

Glenville State University Faculty Senate – minutes

Meeting Date: Dec 10, 2025

Meeting Place: 319 MCCC

Meeting Time: 1:03 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, J. Wenner, S. Haynes, D. McEntire, D. Lewis, J. Bryson, M. Gildein, N. Nasser, S. Silva, M. Sarver, S. Beatty
 - c. Administrators: M. Clements
 - d. Others in Attendance: B. Hutton, JD Carpenter, K. Queen
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. The minutes of Dec 2, 2025 presented for approval. Gildein motioned to approve. Nasser noted the absence of his question on PEIA and the response, Bryson noted the absence of questions on Faculty Salary and strategic plan. Gildein motioned for approval with said changes, Bryson seconds. No further discussion, Haynes abstains, motion carries.
- III. Reports
 - a. President – S. Chapman
 - i. No report.
 - ii. Following up with HEPC regarding questions about Faculty Senate Constitution.
 - iii. BoG meets Friday, Dec 5 at 930 am at WACO Center. The meeting is before the faculty/staff luncheon.
 - b. ACF – J. Bryson
 - i. Met with Leslie Ward (Staff Adviroy council to HEPC) and Graylin Floyd (student government) and will meet in Jan with three legislators for the Glenville area.
 - c. BoG – M. Gildein
 - i. With upcoming BoG meeting, nothing to report.
 - ii. Nasser – a couple faculty members have questioned the expense reports attached in the last budget for 23-24 and 24-25 fiscal years. They would like it added to the Faculty Senate agenda.
 1. The operating expenses list a jump in salary expenses by \$2.3 million from Fiscal years 24 to 25 and an increase of \$3.2 million from Fiscal years 23-24.
 2. Benefit expenses doubled.
 3. Why are there significant increases? What are the details of these increases? No explanation is listed in the report.
 4. Other tables in the packet break information down into details like instruction, academic support, student services, etc. Instruction has only a 3% increase in salary. Institutional support has an 18% - 20% increase. Auxiliary expenses are up 154%, or \$4 million. Similar increases in student and financial aid.
 5. Where are the increases. It sounds like an increase in salaries, but its not actually an increase in instruction.
 - iii. Gildein – Could you email the details of your questions so I can ask those questions of the BoG.
 1. Yes. I was not sure if this was more for Senate or BoG.
 - iv. Chapman – for everyone’s sake. It is often unclear. Anything that is included in a packet that is circulated, specifically for a Board meeting, it is with in the purview of the Gildein as our representative to ask questions or raise concerns.

1. Nasser – if anyone has additional questions, please send them to me so that I can include them with what I will send to Gildein.
- d. Academic Affairs – M. Clements
 - i. People are receiving Spring enrollment tallies, and there are still a number of low enrollment classes that need to be pulled from the schedule. Enrollment is down, and so this is necessary.
 1. Wenner – are we prioritizing overload classes to be cut first.
 - a. All under enrolled classes are being looked at.
 - b. Why the rush to cut the classes in December, rather than January. We have previously cut courses that ended up being needed and had to be recreated
 - c. Chairs are included in the email and courses that may be needed are being held until a better determination can be made. We have 300 under enrolled classes.
 2. Gildein – Have we contacted Pioneer Support or investigated why so many students have not registered?
 - a. This is a combination of things. We do not have that many students remaining on our “did not register” list. We have been reaching out to advisors since before Thanksgiving, and that has had an effect. Some students are leaving. Hopefully the news of the new football coach will stem the exodus of the football players. But there are other reasons students leave.
 - b. We also had fewer students in Fall. Our enrollment has been on the increase, but this fall, it was down. The overall number of students is smaller and the schedule was based on similar or increased student body prediction models. That is not what happened this academic year.
 - ii. HLC visits complete
 1. Went well. Reflected recommended changes.
 2. We still need to have meetings regarding Strategic Planning, HLC site, visits and University organization and Calendar during prep week.

IV. Old Business

- a. Academic Integrity Policy
 - i. Time crunch. This policy is expected to take the most time. Chapman will email possible changes. Jumping ahead to clear other business.
- b. Milestone Initiative
 - i. This is something we already do. We are just establishing a policy for it.
 - ii. Grants students an Associates in Arts in General Education Studies without declaration. Earned along the way, as part of a Bachelor Degree. If declared will be awarded as well.
 1. Clements – Bachelor degrees require students to have a foreign language. Students awarded an Associated do not have to fill this requirement. We do not have foreign language instruction available, so this award alleviates that requirement.
 2. HEPC does not love this, but they have not discouraged this action.
 - iii. Wenner – This does occur at other institutions as well.
 - iv. Bryson – Recommend removing the sentence that says “meaningful for students who were admitted with curricular deficiencies” so it does not look like we are developing policy to forgo something.

1. Chapman- helpful that we award this as it does have impact the students, by awarding them degrees that they technical awarded
 - v. Sarver – AS in business students will still get a specialized degree?
 1. Yes, if they have declared. Possible to get both.
 2. Should be more clear in the document.
 3. Chapman – Fix
 - vi. Gildein – Should it say in recognition of our student’s Academic Achievements at the start.
 - ~~vii. Sarver – Does it benefit up financially?~~
 - ~~1. Predates funding formula. It has been in practice for sometime. Foreign language issue need be addressed~~
 - ~~viii.vii.~~ Wenner motions to recommend with suggested changes.
 1. Lieving seconds. No further discussion, no abstentions, no oppositions. Motion passes.
- c. Provost Eval
- i. Looks similar to Faculty Evaluations. I may share with Alex Lay from the BoG for possible reference for the President’s evaluation.
 - ii. Gildein – Suggestions for consistency. Agree strongly, or Strongly Agree, Strongly disagree.
 1. Question 10. “What do your view” should be “What do you view as”
 - iii. Chapman – 13 is a sentence, not a question.
 - iv. Lieving – remove “the” in #8
 - v. Wenner motions to recommend with suggested changes.
 1. Chapman – If all agree, with changes, we can publish it to Survey Monkey.
 2. Wenner motions we move forward with changes – Bryson seconds. No further discussion, no abstentions, no oppositions. Motion passes.
 - vi. Sarver – motions share with BoG/Alex Lay as example for President’s eval..
 1. Wenner seconds. No further discussion, no abstentions, no oppositions. Motion passes
- d. Chapman – Senate, and faculty through Senate can propose questions to BoG for President’s eval.
- i. Wenner – Is this as policy to happen on a specified timeline?
 - ii. Chapman - That would be policy, not academics. Should be President or BoG policy. With institutional timelines expectations. Should be policy along the lines of all evaluations. Personnel are evaluated annually. As per Policy 16 (I think)
 - iii. Personnel Policy 23 outline evaluating the president annually.
 - iv. Bryson – Policies cover Human Resource type evaluations. Faculty Senate can do a separate one for people within the chain. We may not need a policy to do our own. Senate can choose to do it.
 1. Chapman – not done if not stipulated, no one does it.
 2. Bryson – if we put it into policy, it becomes an HR issue. There is value to an evaluation by faculty as opinion. The second type may be hard to put into policy. We need to realize there are two different types.
 3. Sarver. If it falls under HR, it may have a prescribed way it must be conducted. If kept at Senate, we create and own it.
 4. Chapman
 - v. Sarver- Does timing need to be discussed.
 1. Chapman – I suggest 2 or 3 weeks into semester. Announce at welcome back department meetings.

2. Gildein – Week of Jan 26-30?
3. Bryson- Open Friday of Prep week and have it open for two weeks.
4. Chapman, might be a good plan. Reminders at department meetings.
- vi. Lieving - Are we on record about how the results will be used?
 1. Chapman - Records should be forwarded to Provost and President.
 2. Sarver – Should it be reviewed by a Faculty Senate Committee
 - a. Chapman -Last time people self-identified in the comments.
 - b. Committee would review to make sure nothing is added or deleted.
 - c. Fewer people between the survey results and the end production the better
 - d. Sarver – It is my understanding that the President’s evaluation gets scrubbed so there is no bad news.
 - e. Chapman – That is why I want Squires to download it and just send it off.
 - f. Bryson motions when we get results Faculty Senate Reviews and decide if there are any recommendations we have before we send on the results. Wenner seconds
 - g. Discussion.
 - i. Gildein - Squires makes sure that all responses are anonymous, unless they self-identify.
 - ii. Chapman – I do not think we should review it. The more eyes on it, the less functional the evaluation. I see it like the student evaluations. Other students do not need to know what classmates said.
 - iii. Bryson – I do not mean we need to redact anything. But before we send it on, the full senate should know what we are sending on.
 - iv. Chapman – Why?
 - v. Bryson – Because it is a senate issue, coming from us. I see this as different from student evaluations. This is not about a particular class, but the relationship with all faculty.
 - vi. Chapman – I do not see the need for all of the faculty to see what the rest have said.
 - vii. Gildein – to clarify – are we talking about he senate seeing the full results and the written comments? Or just the results?
 - viii. Bryson – the results and written comments.
 - ix. Sarver – Like Chapman, I can go both ways. We as a Senate need to understand how our faculty are feeling.
 - x. Wenner- Can we vote on this one and then go ito the other?
 - xi. Gildein – Sarver did you want to talk with your department about this?
 - xii. Sarver – as a body that represents the faculty, there may be value in us understanding the temperature of the campus.
 - xiii. Wenner – I feel that the overall tone perhaps we should review, but not the commentary. Gildein concurs.

- xiv. McIntire – If we see it and know that people are unhappy, great. We are shooting for a happy campus.
 - xv. Lieving – Do we need to know if everyone is unhappy with the provost? The president will get that information. We can't fire the provost as a faculty senate. We just designed an instrument and the results will be passed on to the people that can correct the problems.
 - xvi. Bryson- this is more than that.
- V. Chapman- I have another meeting in two minutes.
- a. Bryson – I say we table this until January.
 - b. Wenner – We should go ahead with the timeline and come back to this discussion.
 - c. Chapman – I will circulate the academic integrity form with my noted changes.
 - i. Gildein – The grammar and punctuation need to be cleaned up.
- VI. Adjourn – 2:58