

Glenville State University Faculty Senate – minutes

Meeting Date: December 13, 2024

Meeting Place: 319 MCCC

Meeting Time: 12:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

- a. President S. Chapman called the meeting to order at 12:27 pm.
 - i. Senators in Attendance: M. Sarver, G. Lieving, S. Silva, D. McEntire, M. Gildein, K. Queen, N. Nasser, S. Haynes
- b. Administrators in Attendance: none
- c. Others in Attendance: S. Beatty, T. Chenoweth, JD Carpenter, Robert Regalado, Jason Gumm

II. Approval of Minutes

- a. The minutes of Nov 12 presented for approval. Queen motioned to approve. Gildein Seconds. Perkins abstains. Approval – All remaining

III. Reports

- a. President – S. Chapman
 - i. No updates
- b. ACF - K. Queen
 - i. No updates
- c. BoG – M. Gildein
 - i. The board verbalized how committed they are to faculty housing, as is the city of Glenville. There will be a board for housing for maintenance, updates and new.
 1. Necessary to recruit and retain faculty.
 - ii. Queen asked about Faculty retention and perks.
 1. Free parking?
 - iii. Queen - there were questions on faculty overload form and some parts need clarification
 1. Gildein – There is a disconnect on prorating and offering courses a student needs to graduate
 2. Nasser – It puts the onus on the faculty in the decision to teach an overload when it could potentially force a student to stay and additional one or more semesters. The cutoff number seems arbitrary. Some courses have one section overfilled and one section short. Can these be averaged out for the purposes of pay?
 3. Chapman- This discussion is being continued in the administration. Prorating was not applied previously across the board.
 4. Nasser – Overload is already prorated to adjunct levels.
 5. Queen – Clements mentioned an increase in adjunct pay, but they should also look at overload.
 - a. Chapman- I think that was part of it. (See Dec 3 minutes)
 6. Gildein – met with Tim Henline to discuss poor reception of the overload form. Henline was not involved with the process. In the future, Business will work with Academics for a better plan.
 7. Queen – Overload form is still new. There are adjustments.
 8. Nasser – Academics used to send an excel file with course load and calculations that was very helpful in understanding how you were being paid.

9. Queen – They have a formula – but it was very small print
 10. Chapman – Faculty Senate can expect updates on this soon
- d. Old Business
- i. Salary and compression updates- none since the third of Dec
 1. Nasserri – What is the holdup
 2. Sarver we are waiting for data from other universities and colleges
 - ii. PEIA
 1. FS spoke on the possibility of alternate coverage on Dec 3, and it is still being worked by Dr. Manchin and Tim Henline. A proposal is expected by the beginning of the year.
 2. Gildein – The BoG is being very proactive on this
 3. Queen – AFC has other institutions interested in alternates to PEIA
 - iii. International Baccalaureate Policy from APC
 1. Changes to second paragraph
 2. Clarifies how credit is assigned to international students with baccalaureate credits. Credits will not be awarded duplicate credits.
 - a. Sarver- Do we need to vote or comment?
 - b. Chapman – motion to recommend or not recommend and/or with changes
 - c. Sarver – Motion to accept and send to ULC
 - d. Queen – Second
 - e. No Comments
 - f. No opposition, no abstention, Motion carries to accept policy
 - iv. Graduation (from APC)
 1. Revision- Substantial changes and alterations- details registrars practices and procedures for graduation, especially as it regards irregular situations. i.e students who apply for graduation after the deadline or who have applied to graduate but have not fulfilled degree requirements.
 2. Academic Policy requested the registrar’s office and alumni affairs reconsider the part of the policy specifying that a student who’s degree is conferred in the Summer or Winter will be considered part of the class graduating in the following Spring. Because this reconsideration is complex, and will require some time to work out, Academic Policy agreed to approve the policy as is, with the understanding that we will revisit the question of graduating class in the future. We did not want to delay getting the other important decisions in the policy into the next catalog by waiting to settle the graduation class issue.
 3. Clarification discussion.
 4. Lieving and Sarver requested language on specifying baccalaureate degrees and clarifying catalog options.
 5. Gildein motioned to advance to ULC with proposed changes/clarification. Nasserri Second. No opposition, no abstention, Motion carries to forward policy with change/clarification recommendations
 - v. FERPA (from APC)
 1. Revision - Existing policy revised to more thoroughly define FERPA practices at GSU. i.e what counts as directory information to be considered as access to student educational records.
 2. Chapman- First paragraph says Law ensures...is poorly written. The section is unchanged in this iteration, but affected by changed section.

3. Queen - 2nd paragraph seems to be missing a space
 4. Discussion clarifying FERPA Release forms and requests from athletics regarding student performance in class.
 5. Discussion regarding student FERPA passwords
 6. Queen motioned to accept the policy with changes in first paragraph and minor corrections in later paragraphs. Seconded by Sarver. No discussion, no abstentions. All in favor.
- vi. Diploma Policy – Graduate (from APC)
1. Explanation of policy. Question; Is there anything missing from this?
 2. Discussion regarding student diploma expectations.
 3. Motion to approve by Queen. Seconded by Nasser. No discussion, no abstentions. All in favor.
- vii. Diploma Policy – Undergraduate (from APC)
1. Motion to approve by Sarver. Seconded by Gildien. No discussion, no abstentions. All in favor.
- viii. Academic Integrity (from APC)
1. Discussion on change to department chair notification removed, only the provost is notified.
 2. Sarver – Procedures for handling cases and first offense second offense third offense, the term “particularly egregious” is not defined. Who determines if the act was “particularly egregious”. Also, what happens when a provost is teaching a class and has an academic integrity issue? They become judge and jury.
 3. Chapman- They do not. If a situation such as that were to occur, the provost would not be in a position of making that determination.
 4. Queen- at one point the provost was asking for a committee to help review cases of academic integrity violations.
 5. Chapman- This is a pertinent question that may require clarification. It is possible that in such situations, the case would go directly to academic appeals or to the president.
 6. Beatty – there is a stand in for that. If the provost were the instructor and there was a complaint, someone would stand in for the provost.
 7. Chapman – those steps do need to be outlined here. And “particularly egregious” needs to be defined.
 8. Beatty – question about process. Why is the Chair not notified if there is a question of academic integrity within the department?
 9. Queen- The policy committee asked the Chairs about the process and the chairs chose to be left out of the loop.
 10. Chapman – what is changing is when the Chairs are made aware. Currently the Chair would be notified when the provost decides in response to the instructor’s report of the violation.
 11. Queen- You can keep them in the loop, but they are not part of the official notification process.
 12. Explanation of process for reporting academic integrity violations
 13. Chapman – The changes to the policy make sense, but the other issues need to be addressed. However, there will be a policy in the catalog.
 14. Nasser – we have two different things we need to vote on. One on the document provided and one on the changes and clarification needed overall.

15. Chapman – The policy is in the catalog as written and will remain in the catalog.
 16. Sarver – why are we in a rush to approve this. Can we table this?
 17. Nasserri – We can vote to accept the policy and discuss the issues later.
 18. Chapman – This will not change the current catalog, but it would be in the next catalog. We should get it updated to the 5 days to respond, but the other issues need to be addressed before this goes into the next catalog.
 19. Continues discussion about policy and definitions
 20. Motion to kick back by Sarver.
 21. Chapman recommends sending a memo supporting the changes, but recommending additional changes.
 22. Additional discussion about Chair notification
 23. Sarver motions to recommend to Academic Policy supporting the changes, but recommending defining the term “egregious” and offering clarification on what happens if the provost is the instructor. Seconded by Gildein. No discussion, no abstentions. All in favor.
- ix. Tabled for next session in January
 1. Academic Appeal Policy (from APC)
 2. Administrative Procedure 1
 - e. Silva – the letterhead on the academic policies needs to be updates.
 - i. Noted by Chapman.

IV. Adjourn – 1:20