

Glennville State University Faculty Senate – minutes

Meeting Date: Jan 13, 2026

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. Nasserri, S. Silva, M. Sarver, S. Beatty
- c. Administrators: M. Clements
- d. Others in Attendance: B. Hutton JD Carpenter, Jason Gum

II. Approval of Minutes

- a. The minutes of Dec 10, 2025 presented for approval. Corrections – Sarver- Old Business – B. vii. – Does it benefit us financially. Gildein motioned to approve. Sarver seconds. No oppositions, No abstentions, no discussion further discussion. Motion carries.

III. Reports

- a. President – S. Chapman
 - i. Salary Compression Committee
 1. Forwarded to T. McIntire in HR availability of committee, S. Chapman, M. Gildein, M. Petry. Followed up after no response. McIntire has been out of office and will schedule as soon as she can.
 2. Handing out and will forward 16.8.3. BoG policy.
 3. Sent to T. Sterns in President's Office to establish language to instantiate a standing committee that falls under both Senate and Staff Council, what it does and how it proceeds.
 - a. Will need to establish by-laws for this committee. Not sure if we instantiate committee or establish by-laws first, as by-laws cover membership.
 - b. Will establish both and seat committee to move forward.
 4. As it will be a BoG policy, it will be sent out to campus community for comment.
 - ii. Overload Pay Task-Force
 1. Meetings are in the process of being scheduled.
 2. Sarver- We deduct pay when a course is under enrolled, but we do not add compensation the class is oversubscribed. They do not pay you for the excess students. I would like the committee to address that.
 - a. Chapman – I think this has been brought up as a way of thinking about this issue. If you have classes and one is overenrolled and one is under enrolled why are we being paid less.
 - b. Nasserri – I think I brought it up. If 10 is the cutoff point, and I have one class that has 6 and another class of 20 and a class of why can't 4 of the 20 be counted as toward the under enrolled class. It comes back to compensation
 - c. Sarver – the other side is even if I don't have an under enrolled classes, I have a class of 24 and 3 on the waitlist. Historically, I have said just send them on in. But if they are going to start punishing us financially on the other side, then, as a couple of us have said in the Business Department, we are not taking the waitlist

students. They are senior classes, good luck finding someone to teach it.

- d. Nasseri – In my first semester here, that happened. I had two students more than they compensated me for.
- e. Chapman – I don't remember that ever happening to me, but we will mention it. For various reasons, our department is not admitting students above our caps because we have situations where we have students flocking to certain sections of classes and not taking other sections. It creates issues with distribution of students across classes. We probably have enough students enrolled in all of our sections to warrant holding a bare minimum of what we are supposed to be, but because of them flocking to certain sections, it creates inequities. So we say no.
- f. Beatty – Questions. How do we determine, or who determines what the cutoff is for each class?
 - i. Chapman – There is some math involved, and I don't remember if its been distributed ot the rationale. The way that it is stated in the handbook for a GenEd, the minimum threshold is supposed to be 15. But I also know that, going back to the previous CFO, Burt Jedamski, the breakeven point is 8 students, so we would like to see about 10 students in a class. But the handbook says 15 for GenEds, but I do not know the rationalization for that is.
 - ii. Clements- The Handbook actually says 15 for lower division courses and then it says courses under 10 will be prorated. That has not been our practice in the last 2 semester and is not going to be our practice going into this semester. Only classes under 5 have been prorated. So classes between 5 and 8 the university is technically losing money on. There is the issue that M. Sarver brought up that some classes are well over that limit, but all of that is on the table and all of that is Course Overload Committee discussion. Just as you said earlier.
 - iii. Beatty – I wasn't asking about pay, although it is very important.
 - iv. Clements- Right. I thought that when you raised the question. There are some classes that have lower than 24 and that is because the department itself has brought forward that they think that there are pedagogical reasons that 16 is the right number for an English Class that requires support; Why 18 is the right number for an introductory Math class. Is that the question that you are asking?
 - v. Beatty – Yes.
 - vi. Clements – Those are requests by the departments and they have to be obviously accompanied by “why do we think this is the case” not just. “Hey, I'd like to have a smaller class.” In one case, “Hey, I'd like to have a bigger class”. So there are some classes that have higher levels.

The lecture section for biology is big, but the lab sections are smaller. Music 200 has a much higher course limit than most of our courses. If a department has said this needs to be the limit, obviously we are willing to entertain that, and understand why you think that's the case.

- vii. Beatty – And we bring that to you?
- viii. Clements – In your discussion of the summer-fall-spring-summer schedule, which you will be doing very soon in your department, if there is a change that's needed on the enrollment limit, make the change and then provide a rationale for why. Those will be coming soon and it will be 5 semesters to allow students to plan for what may be coming in future years. You can get Summer 2026 back sooner, but we need all of it back, so people can plan and we can hopefully get around some of these low enrollment courses because we simply can't afford to continue to have so many low enrollment courses.
- g. Chapman – Other questions on that? No.
- iii. CFO meeting
 - 1. Gildein, Nasserri and Chapman were emailing about this. Nasserri brought it up at the last Senate meeting. Tim Henline's response was that they were good questions and I cannot answer them off the top of my head. We have invited him to Senate February 10, because our next meeting is Jan 27, GSU day at the Capital.
 - 2. I was asked to cancel Senate the last time, and I believe it was cancelled the previous two times. If we want to have a senate meeting on the 27th, we can. But I do not know if Henline is going to be available that day. So I invited him on the 10th.
 - 3. Should we cancel the Faculty Senate meeting the 27th?
 - a. Clements – All of the President's council members have been directed to the capital that day.
 - b. Chapman – Does that include me?
 - c. I do not know, but the president feels strongly about a good representation in Charleston.
 - d. Chapman – I have an FCI class that day that meets once a week.
 - e. Clements – I will make the argument that missing your class presents an undue hardship on your students.
 - f. Chapman – I will cancel the Senate meeting Jan 27.
 - 4. Sarver in preparation of Nabil's question (hands out questions for CFO). It covers the questions Nasserri asked at the Welcome back meeting that Dr. Manchin answer appropriately.
 - a. Nasserri – Dr. Manchin spoke to me after that meeting. We had a misunderstanding about the use of the word bog for the Board of Governors. He was not sure what I was talking about. We had a really good talk afterward and cleared the air on that, but I appreciate it.
 - b. Sarver – If you look at these numbers from salary increases year over year, again these are from the financial statements, faculty salaries did not go up 3%. Academic support went up 150%,

student financial aid 50%, auxiliary enterprises 52% I don't even know what auxiliary enterprises are and why they go up. And if you look at the corresponding supplies, our supplies, services and miscellaneous instruction was actually down 21 %. Again, the numbers by themselves, it would be great for the CFO to explain what is going on here.

- c. Chapman- I believe the questions Nabil asked Gildein to ask have been sent to the CFO via email. So he has them to read, rather than just being asked verbally.
 - d. Nasserri – and I think that if he is not going to meet with us for another 2 or 3 weeks, to ask that not just Faculty Senate, but within your department, you can make a list of other questions to send to him so he can come prepared with those answers as well.
 - e. Chapman _ I will send an email to all senators to ask them to do that, and provide them at least a week out from the meeting on Feb 10.
- b. ACF – J. Bryson
- i. We have not met since the last Faculty Senate meeting. There has not been much activity in the email list serve. So, nothing to report.
- c. BoG – M. Gildein
- i. Everyone should have received an email this morning with the updates from the Dec 11 Board of Governors meeting.
 - ii. One thing Kathy Gilbert addressed was GSU's aquatic needs. She also let the board know that she would like to request warm water therapy and she approached Sue Morris about this. Morris could not commit at this time.
 - 1. Rationale for the warm water therapy included rehab, pain therapy, for both campus and community. Building strength, improving balance, joint stress relief. It was a good ask. It would be a good thing to have for our athletes and community.
 - iii. D. Chapman reported that retention was at 84%. As of Jan 12, it is at 86.2%
 - iv. Academic Affairs reported that they are still looking for a Director of Nursing and we will submit the Intent to Plan for Nursing approved by the Board on Jan 27.
 - v. Finance reported inflationary costs are continuing, as everywhere. We will have a 2% increase in tuition and we are looking at A 2% increase for the next 3 to 4 years.
 - 1. He reminded us we are always looking at income vs expenses, and there may be a time when tuition will have to increase more than that. There will come a time when we can no longer decrease spending, and we are close to that tipping point.
 - 2. The Auditors will attend the Feb 4th BoG meeting to discuss the audit.
 - a. Sarver – I thought there was a new one.
 - b. Chapman – There is a special meeting
 - c. Gildein – Right. On the 21st of Jan
 - vi. Athletics – new Football coach came and spoke to e BoG. He was in the Cafeteria today. He has his team together and it looks like it's going very well
 - vii. Dr. Manchin praised Rita Helmick for work and appreciated all of the work she has done over the years for GSU and for the State of WV.
 - 1. He also said that Health Sciences and the nursing programs are the highest priorities, getting the building completed, and the intent to plan
 - viii. Policy 33 University Credit for Higher learning is approved

- ix. Those are the highlights
- x. Nasseri – Are they planning to advertise for this position or post the position?
 - 1. Gildein – I do not know. Some of these duties have been farmed out to other people.
 - 2. Chapman – I believe it was stated at cabinet that the position is not being filled.
- d. Academic Affairs – M. Clements
 - i. Intent to Plan for Nursing has already been submitted.
 - ii. We are working to meet the Jan 27 deadline for the Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology. Its being discussed right now.
 - iii. Graduate Council have had a couple of oddball things come up that have stumped HEPC, like awarding the same degree with the same program in the same zip code
 - 1. I am currently waiting for a call back from HEPC and HLC
 - iv. We are still working on processing all of the feedback from the Welcome week discussions.
 - 1. Strategic planning – Will be sent out
 - 2. Campus reorganization – Will be sent out
 - 3. We are not changing the University calendar
 - a. Students were advised that the schedule would not change
 - b. Football coach on board with no-show policy and administrative dropping of athletes.
 - c. Please reach out to him to help with students struggling. Of course, reach out to students first.
 - d. First football coach I ever heard say to a board, if they do not show up for class, kick them out.
 - v. New volleyball coach – also academically minded. Hopes to pick up teaching in business department in future semesters. Masters in Sports Management. K. Tunno has a really big program and only one professor.
 - vi. We are working on scheduling everything, 60 + 60, Overload, Dean & Chairs. It is harder to schedule everything this semester than previously.

IV. Old Business

- a. Provost Evaluation
 - i. Unresolved on who sees the results of the evaluation.
 - 1. Received an email from a faculty member, expressing concern if the results were made more widely available that just the Provost and President.
 - 2. Very adamant that the result go to the person being evaluated and the President.
 - a. Propensity of the college to leak like a sieve
 - b. People being unaware that senate would see results and comments would be bad, and that who sees the results should be clearly stated up front.
 - 3. Senate voted to send out the survey before this was resolved. So this information, on who would review is not on the survey.
 - a. If Senate wants to review, it would need be halted and restarted.
 - ii. Survey went only to full-time faculty. Because Senate previously did not send to part-time faculty, and this question was not discussed in last meeting.
 - 1. This is less of an issue. We do not have to halt and reestablish survey. We can send it out to them in addition.
 - iii. Nasseri – Do we know how many have completed survey

1. Chapman – no
 2. Because people may have put time and effort into the survey, and may not complete it again, or will put less time into responses
- iv. Sarver- I talked to the Business Department. The consensus was either “I don’t care” or the majority “It should be released”, for a couple reasons”
1. Precedence - survey for Gary Morris was released
 - a. Chapman – arguably bad precedence
 2. Its not a performance evaluation, its an opinion survey of the faculty
 - a. Chapman – You called it an evaluation, not a faulty survey of the provost.
 - b. Sarver – but that is what it is
 - c. Chapman – then you have to call it that. An evaluation is for the purposes of evaluating a position as either a self-evaluation or the people above them. That is the standard understanding. If it is a survey of faculty that is an entirely different thing. And then I would ask what do we need the information for. Concretely, what would we do with the information if we get it?
 - d. Gildein – Discussion from faculty, why would I want to see this? Why would I want to see what’s wrong. This should go to the supervisor. I do not supervise her, why should I see the comment?
 - e. Sarver – Transparency, right?
 - f. Chapman – We have faculty evaluations from students that are not made freely available to all students. I would be fine with those evaluation results going out to all students, because that is what we are essentially proposing here. Please tell me the concrete thing that faculty will do with the information
 - g. Nasseri – I am in agreement with Gildein. I do not think the comments, which are the opinion part do not need to be released to everyone. Those comments are specifically from individual faculty members that are praise, criticism, critiques that need to go to the person being evaluated so they can work to improve. Much as we do with the teacher evaluations. As I tell my students, tell me what I did that was good so I can keep doing those things, and in the same way, don’t just say I was terrible, explain it so I can try to fix those things and be less terrible next time. And those don’t need to go to anyone else. No one else can do anything with that information. Besides gossip, taint opinion. The matrix and ratings can be sent out to get a general feel of what the faculty at large feel of what the provost is doing. I think it’s a compromise of the two to have transparency and what needs to be out there.
 - h. Chapman- I still want to hear concretely what the Senate will do with any information garnered from the evaluations.
 - i. Sarver – in the business word, we practice 360 evaluations.
 - j. Chapman- that is not what a 360 evaluation is, a 360 evaluation is to evaluate all the people around them not to necessarily make the results to those people.
 - k. Sarver - The purpose for doing it, as far as 360. You can keep it secretive. I think it implies that just people’s perception will suspect that we are hiding something. It will be out there. It will

leak. Everything in here does. Why not just be open and transparent with all of it. What is so horrible that we fear it coming back

- l. Chapman - Nothing is horrible. I just really want to hear an explanation other than this is something that I want to see.
- m. Nasserri – the only other reason I can think that would justify it would be if we were to have it just for faculty senate would be ;
 - i. We want to be in keeping with transparency but keeping these evaluations private
 - ii. This has to do with a faculty member who is also an administrator so have it as an executive session to have faculty look at it so that anything that needs to be fixed or addressed can be looked at.
 - iii. So that there is another body other, in addition to the provost and president who sees that these things are seen to.
 - iv. i.e. if you got a really bad review and had to meet with your Chair.
- n. Chapman- but this is like I got bad evaluations from my students, and then I had to meet with my students.
 - i. Nasserri- That is why I suggest it is reviewed in an executive session, just Faculty Senate
 - ii. Chapman- I understand that. I want to understand what Faculty Senate will be doing with the information
 - iii. Nasserri - I guess the other way to look at it as Faculty Senators, we represent Faculty at large, but we also represent faculty on an individual basis like in terms of a power structure. As a non-tenured professor you couldn't approach the president or the provost and say "I think I need to be better at this" or even if you can you don't want that. Like in terms of you having to meet with all of your students on these evaluations, no, but, likewise, if a student had an issue with you and they felt they couldn't address it with you for whatever reason, like letter of recommendation or other things. I am not saying Clements would be a person to hold a vendetta over you, but it provides a safe voice. We had this discussion with Gary (Morris) when we were talking about going into executive session and the purpose of faculty senate is to be that voice for faculty who might not be comfortable putting themselves out there.
 - iv. Chapman- I understand that, but that also is what our function is as senators.
 - v. Nasserri- That's what I am saying, but you are saying "I wouldn't meet with my students to go over evaluations", but that student could go to your department chair and say "I have so-and-so issues with this faculty, could you talk to them about that." Or your student going to their faculty

- advisor and saying “I’m having these issues”. It just provides that anonymity. Its another voice in the road, say.
- vi. McIntire- But if there’s an issue, good, bad, indifferent we don’t need to see that. Like your students, they like you, they hate you, they don’t need to see that together. They can talk amongst each other.
 - vii. Nasserri – The whole point of having the evaluation is either these are things that are going well need to be fixed, these are things that are going well. Maybe I’m misinterpreting the reason for making it transparent is to see that the things that need to be fixed are being addressed, not just...
 - viii. Chapman – But why is that our responsibility? Is that our responsibility?
 - ix. Sarver – But it has to be as faculty.
 - o. Lieving- I think we are getting close to it. Because the only thing I can think of as the practical use of this information would be what you are saying how it flows in that direction. With our power, as with any institution would be to justify a voice or vote of no confidence with an administrator. That would be the only possible use of this information I can possibly see. If we wanted to put forth a vote of “no confidence” for an administrator we could use this as evidence for why we did it. That’s the only thing I can think of.
 - i. Nasserri – It can also be used for a benefit to extend a contract or as a point
 - ii. Chapman – But those are not decisions that we make.
 - iii. Lieving - And we have no control over it.
 - iv. Sarver – But if they know the temperament of the faculty. Right now, the faculty that I’m around are frustrated. The faculty feel that they don’t have a voice. Look at the salary. Look at what’s happened to everything that we’ve brought forward to administration. It just gets derailed or nothing happens and, again, I’m not sure why the information or at what put the information out there. So again, I would ask the fact of, here is the heartbeat of the faculty. Here is what faculty are feeling. Hear what their frustrations are. Here are issues that as a nontenured faculty member, I can write anonymously but that I can’t say publicly.
 - v. Chapman- Which then goes to the provost and the president who are in positions of being able to adjudicate and manage these things. The position of the provost does not report to us. Neither does the president. The president reports to the board. The provost reports to the president. If anything about an extended contractor anything about here... We don’t have a stale, so to speak, if we don’t think the provost is operating appropriately, except, probably as Greg (Lieving) said, that’s out stake.

And if that is the purpose behind this. I think that maybe it should be stated out loud.

- p. Chapman- So, Jeff (Bryson) made a motion (in chat) that that we suspend the survey currently and that we rename it from evaluation to survey and that we add a question asking faculty to vote whether the report should be released to faculty, to the senate only, or only to the survey committee, provost, and president. And that we take the majority vote from the faculty. That is the motion on the table.
- i. Sarver seconds.
 - ii. Discussion- Gildein- I don't think its our place. I think we have to trust Dr. Manchin and Dr. Clements that when they see the results, he as her supervisor will have a discussion with her and knowing her, I believe that she would want to improve the areas that are deemed to be insufficient according to the survey. On the other hand, we have to have it in our hands to look at it and you know kind of make sure that they are going to do what they have to do with that evaluation by trusting the process.
 - iii. Chapman – Mark (Sarver) I think you are mischaracterizing the administration when you say they have done nothing. We have brought up issues to the administration. I would point specifically to the Administration Building. This was a thing that was brought before Tommy (Ratliff) and I am not going to say that the job was great but they responded to those questions and things were done to improve the conditions in the classrooms of AB. They are responsive at times. They may not be responsive in the way or to the degree that we want them to be, but I have not been told “No, we can't do that” to anything. We have, again, I know that it's not something that makes everyone happy that we have a Salary Compression Committee, that's doing this. It is moving along though, even if it's moving slowly. Ditto with the overload pay. These are not things that are being stonewalled or dismissed out of hand. I understand that faculty can be frustrated and I think that that is fine, and that is the purpose behind sort of an evaluation to record those. I agree with Maureen. I have no reason to not trust that these would be responded to in an appropriate way. I don't think that they would be dismissed out of hand. And again, I go back to the question of what authority do we have and I don't know what authority we have to respond to and hold people accountable for dissatisfaction among the faculty. We can express those things. And I will also say, as Senators, we are to be the voice of those people.

I do get information from faculty across the campus, because I'm the "at-large" member and not tied to my department. Jen (Wenner) does that. People are able to approach us and do and we have frequently as you know pertinent to the question earlier about the CFO questions. This was a thing that Nabil (Nasseri) said "I have been receiving questions from faculty about these things. Can we please bring him." There is a layer of anonymity, although I realize it may not be ideal anonymity because maybe somebody, I don't even know that this is the case, What the reason is that Nabil (Nasseri) is bringing this before us, maybe it the case that one of his constituents bringing it to him. There is a degree, there is a buffer. That is what we are here to provide. This is a representative body.

- q. Chapman- So we have a motion and we have a second. So we do have to vote on this. I would like to amend the motion to say that there could be a fourth option that the report is released to just the provost and president, not even the survey committee. I don't know that Josh needs to see this. He can download it, attach it and send it in an email. I would propose that as a fourth option. What do we have to do to amend the motion.
- i. Bryson – I would have to accept that as a friendly amendment. And I will accept that as a friendly amendment.
 - ii. Sarver – I will keep the second
 - iii. Chapman – Motioned, second for the amended language. Any other comment?
 - iv. Nasseir – I agree with Maureen (Gildein), and Chapman that we need to trust that Dr. Machhin and Mari (Clements) will handle it, and I think with putting it to vote is correct.
 - v. Gildein – Can we restate what the motion is?
 - vi. Chapman - Jeff (Bryson) made a motion (in chat) that that we suspend the survey currently and that we rename it from evaluation to survey and that we add a question asking faculty to vote whether the report should be released the faculty, to the senate, to the survey committee, the provost and president or released only to the provost, and president.
 - vii. McIntire – And what happens to those who have already taken it.
 - viii. Chapman – we stop it and we send it out again telling everyone to redo it even if taken already.
 - ix. Motion does not pass.
- r. Nasseri – That's why I wanted to amend that. Those are two very different ideas. The last part, in terms of putting in the last

question. Maybe it should be two different motions. One to halt the survey and reissue, and one to add the question.

- s. Lieving- Can I make one more additional comment? If we are renaming the evaluation to survey, we are potentially decreasing the value of it in the eyes of the president by changing it from and evaluation to just an opinion survey. I think he's less likely to take it seriously.
 - t. Chapman – you are saying we need to go piece by piece then?
 - u. Nasseri- Yes, there are three different topics there, if we add Greg's (Lieving) point. We are changing three things at once. So I move that we separate different motions.
 - v. Sarver- the way it stands now, the survey can go, and it can just be in a holding pattern until we decide what to do.
 - w. Chapman – except if we decide to do something other than...All we settled on is that we knew it was going to Dr. Manchin and Dr. Clements. That's it. If we decide to do anything else, it has to be restarted.
 - x. Sarver- I'm not sure that was the original intent.
 - y. Gildein – What were the three things? Suspend or not; Call it an evaluation or a survey; let the faculty vote on where the results go, or not.
 - z. Chapman- Correct
 - aa. Gildein – Can we do that real fast?
 - bb. Chapman – we can keep it in a holding pattern and the only thing is, where we knew that this was going, to Dr. Manchin and Dr. Clements. That has never been unquestioned. The question has always been, does it go anywhere beyond.
3. Gum – I would like to make a comment based on my memory, and I could be wrong. I seem to remember this with Dr. Morris, and this same argument went back and forth. And I do not know if this was the right thing, but I seem to remember him interjecting “It's my survey and go ahead send it out and let everybody see, everything.”
- a. Chapman- That is more or less how it transpired.
 - b. Gum- As Senate, would you hear Dr. Clements' opinion on this?
 - c. Sarver- We can let Dr. Clements decide whether to release it.
 - d. Chapman – We can.
 - e. Gildein – We are discussing a different point?
 - f. Sarver- and if she does not want it released, it stays between her and the president. That is the way it sits now.
4. Gildein- Can we or do we need to vote on the motions?
- a. Nasseri- We start the last one first.
 - b. Sarver- I don't think we need to do anything. Right now the survey is out there, and will be taken. There are results right now go to Dr. Clements & the president. Mari (Clements) decides if she wants to release it to all faculty, she can do that. If she decides she doesn't, she decides she doesn't.

