

# **Glenville State College Faculty Senate Minutes**

August 27, 2013

## **I. Call to Order and Roll**

President David O'Dell called to order the Glenville State College Faculty Senate at 12:30 p.m. on August 27, 2013 in the Mollohan Center Conference Room, Room 319.

Senators present: Larry Baker, Liza Brenner, Cinda Echard, Art DeMatteo, Joe Evans, Kevin Evans, Rico Gazal, Megan Gibbons, Ida Mills, David O'Dell, Paul Peck, Shelly Ratliff, Rebecca Swisher, John Taylor, Kelly Treece, Milan Vavrek and Dennis Wemm

Others present: John Peek, Gary Morris, Sara Sawyer

## **II. Approval of Minutes**

Motion to approve minutes by K. Evans / Ratliff (m/s). Motion passed unanimously.

## **III. Reports**

### **ACF/Board of Governors Representative Paul Peck**

The retreat was held at Blackwater Falls during the end of July. An agenda for the school year was drafted. Much of the discussion at the retreat focused on Senate Bill 330. There is an on-going salary study at each college for all three groups affected by this bill (classified staff, non-classified staff and faculty). This study should eventually produce a percentage figure for each of the above mentioned groups at each institution (for the relevant market group to which they belong). For example, the faculty percentage would be for faculty at peer institutions. Presidential salaries will, understandably, be excluded in the non-classified group. The bill would require that the difference between the highest and lowest groups not be greater than 5%. West Virginia is the first state to try to implement this concept of "relative market equity." All institutions would be given three years to close the gap. This would make pay raises highly unlikely for the highest group. There was discussion of whether 20% would be a better figure, but ACF recommended not to include a specific percentage to replace the 5%.

The HEPC meeting also included a report from the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Mark Toor, about Senate Bill 330. Classified staff are not currently interested in any action that would change the 5%.

Peck informed the Senate that he had invited Mark Toor, HEPC Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, to campus to participate in a panel discussion dedicated to bill 330. He is awaiting President Barr's approval. He also stated that he was hopeful that perhaps the panel discussion could be videotaped and the video uploaded to the GSC and the HEPC websites.

#### **Other Officers**

Larry Baker requested that the subscription to Survey Monkey be renewed. This would cost \$225 of the Senate's \$600 budget. Motion to renew Survey Monkey by Baker / Peck (m/s). Motion approved unanimously. Baker also announced that the last week of September has already been reserved, so no other surveys can be conducted then.

### **IV. New Business**

#### **2013-2014 Committee Appointments**

O'Dell and Peck spent considerable time working on these, since this year they received many more responses than last year.

Gibbons requested to be appointed to the Diversity Committee. She is a member of the International Committee, which has now merged with Diversity. Motion to replace Dr. Yu with Dr. Gibbons by K. Evans / Baker (m/s). Motion approved unanimously.

Chuck Batson has replaced Brad Reed on Academic Policy.

O'Dell announced that President Barr did not sign the bylaws for the Enrollment Management and Retention Committee.

Baker asked if anyone knew why the President did not sign off. Peek explained that the President wishes to ensure a vibrant and purposeful shared governance system. In this regard, he has requested a review of the current governance system in an effort to align the charge and membership of standing and ad hoc committees/task forces with achieving the mission, vision, and strategic goals of the College.

At the request of the Senate President, Wemm will consult with Academic Affairs about other possible committees and appointments. This information will be useful

to new faculty members who wish to become involved but may not know what all of their options are.

The question was raised as to whether there should be more committee appointments, since numbers were determined when the Faculty totaled 52 and it now totals 70.

Motion to approve all remaining committee appointments by K. Evans / Wemm (m/s). Motion approved unanimously.

### **Strategic Plan**

K. Evans updated the Senate. The group met 2/3 times this summer and has another meeting scheduled for next week. President Barr has requested a working document with specifics. The group has begun to outline specific objectives, and K. Evans has emailed the faculty the current draft of the plan. Many of the suggestions he has received thus far concern new programs and compensation for research. All faculty members can email K. Evans at any time, since faculty input is key to creating a plan that is agreeable and applicable to the entire College. Peek stated that other individuals may need to be brought into these discussions as they move forward and that some open meetings may be necessary as well. Wemm thanked K. Evans for the clarity of the document and said that it accomplishes all that the subcommittee had hoped for. He called it aspirational. Morris asked what exactly is a strategic plan. In addition to outlining specific goals for the future of the institution, it should also (said Peek) serve as a basis for future fundraising and for establishing priorities for departments. It should be specific without undermining our ability to dream.

### **Compensation for Supervising Research**

Mills spoke on behalf of her department. There is a growing interest in exploring the business of offering some form of compensation for supervising student research and for conducting independent research. Compensation could include course reductions in addition to remuneration. Defining "research" may prove to be difficult and may require further committee work.

O'Dell reminded the Senate that we are not a research institution. Nonetheless, research should be encouraged. Care would need to be taken to ensure that compensation did not turn into a kind of reward.

DeMatteo mentioned that Faculty Development funds are used for this already.

K. Evans supports research 100% but the question is always what can we do that this college can afford? Compared to Division I institutions, we bring in very little grant money.

O'Dell added that when looking to find money to support our students, we may be competing with larger, Division I research institutions.

Peek wanted all to know that despite the difficult budget year, the faculty and summer grants will remain the same as they were last year.

Baker shared that he liked the idea of release time or class reduction. We don't currently have this mechanism in place.

Mills suggested that it could be written like a sabbatical application.

Baker also said that this could make it less of a financial burden for the College.

Gazal also liked the idea of support for research. He mentioned that they teach 499 but don't get any credit for it.

Mills added that we all know that we are a teaching college. But if there is no incentive to support research, then the attitude will likely be "why bother?" If I have to find a grant, write it and do this all on top of a full course load, then what is my incentive? Another problem that may be easier to resolve is that we are not often aware of the research that our colleagues are conducting/engaged in.

Treece supported this idea of not knowing of colleague's accomplishments. When you look at our website, all you see are faces. Many of us don't have bios. This is something that should change, since it is also an important recruiting tool.

O'Dell reminded all that IT can hyperlink the name under the photo, which would take you to a bio page. Leslie Ward is the one who can do this for you.

### **News Stories for Website**

Are we underreporting? Yes, this is definitely the first area to address. But the wait time is another area that needs improvement. It took four months for a story to

appear for an event that happened in April. Part of the problem may be determining where news stories should be sent. Is it Annette? Dustin? Someone else? O'Dell offered to look into this matter and into the business of creating some sort of standard format for faculty bios.

#### **Timing of Professional Development Funds**

There was first some debate as to how quickly (or not) faculty members get responses from the Professional Development Committee. Peek confirmed that the current year budget sometimes hampers future planning, and that it is the bridge time here that is problematic. K. Evans agreed, noting that with only two dates to submit requests, it is difficult to plan for new opportunities that may arise between those dates. Taylor wondered if perhaps the Professional Development Committee could meet earlier in the semester? He also wondered if they would consider multiple submission dates?

The Senate recognizes difficult decisions are made here in an effort to help as many faculty members as possible, especially since there are always more requests than funds.

#### **V. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn by Baker / Taylor (m/s). Motion approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.