

# Glenville State University Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: April 25, 2023

## I. Call to Order and Roll

- a. President Elizabeth Matory called the meeting to order at 12:22 pm in MCCC 319 and via Teams.
- b. Senators in attendance: Liz Matory, Maureen Gildein, Schuyler Chapman, Leslie Ward, Pai Song, Donal Hardin, Kevin Evans, Josh Squires (online), Nabil Nasser (online), Jennifer Wenner, Kristen Mullins, David Lewis (online)
- c. Others in attendance: Duane Chapman, Tim Konhaus, David O'Dell, Larry Baker, Shalika Silver, Mari Clements, Luke Bendick

## II. Approval of Minutes

- a. Wenner moved to approve the meeting minutes from the 4/11 and 4/14/23 meeting. Gildein seconded.
- b. All voted in favor of accepting the minutes for both meetings except Song, who was absent in the previous meeting. Motion passes.

## III. Reports

- a. Officers
  - i. Liz Matory
    1. ULC is adding another meeting next week (finals week).
      - a. The main point of conversation is a 2.00 requirement for admission.
  - ii. Maureen Gildein
    1. We have not received all final reports. Gildein will update when received.
  - iii. Pai Song, Josh Squires, and Schuyler Chapman
    1. No updates
- b. Board of Governors (Kevin Evans)
  - i. BOG met remotely on 4/12 for committee meetings. They will have their public meeting on 5/3. At the conclusion there will be an opportunity for Faculty Senate to meet with BOG at 1 pm on that day. BOG meeting opens at 10 am.
- c. ACF (Kristen Mullins)
  - i. ACF will meet on 4/27 for its next meeting. Mullins will update via email after that point.
- d. Administrative/Academic Updates

- i. We have 14 searches open, not including administrative posts. Institutional research and CRJU positions are having difficulty; same is true of FCI Gilmer and Huttonsville positions in BUSN.

#### **IV. Departmental Updates**

- a. Business
  - i. No updates.
- b. Criminal Justice
  - i. CRJU will have an event 11:30-1:00 on Thursday.
- c. Education
  - i. No updates
- d. Fine Arts
  - i. No updates
- e. Land Resources
  - i. Land resources golf tournament appeared successful
- f. Language and Literature
- g. Science and Math
  - i. No updates
- h. Social Science
  - i. No updates
- i. General Updates

#### **V. New Business**

- a. Tim Henline Introduction
  - i. Henline has stepped into the CFO role. He has served as an instructor and director of institutional research at GSU previously.
  - ii. He sends his regrets but cannot attend.
- b. Curriculum Committee By-Laws
  - i. Senate sees it as appropriate and Matory will draft a memo to recommend to ULC.
- c. Senior Lecturer/Lecturer & Personnel Policy 24
  - i. Wenner asked what the changes were made.
  - ii. O'Dell had made some changes that were not substantive; they were attending to redundancies.

- iii. Ward agreed that it is repetitive. Ward asked about supervision and mentoring.
  - iv. Chapman agreed. The supervision/mentoring language is confusing.
  - v. Gildein asked if lecturers can work on it. Wenner, Ward, and Mullins agreed.
  - vi. Chapman asked if we should be doing the edits or kicking it back to Academic Affairs.
  - vii. Gildein said all lecturers were asked to meet with Academic Affairs.
  - viii. Clements said the handbook doesn't have as hard a deadline. She said we can work on it and send it back.
  - ix. Wenner, Ward, Gildein, Tunno will work on it.
    - x. Wenner said the pay raise part of Personnel Policy 24 is okay (15% once vs. 10% twice for tenure-track)
  - xi. Faculty Senate will recommend Personnel Policy 24 to ULC (separate from the language re: promotion of lecturer to senior lecturer)
- d. Overload Survey Feedback
- i. Ward asked about what the origins of this was: Was it just to gather the information at the request of Dr. Manchin?
  - ii. Matory asked if we could write an overview/summary and then send it on to Dr. Manchin.
  - iii. Wenner said we should draft an overview based on the numbers.
  - iv. Matory asked if someone else could handle the interpretive memo on it (not Ward).
- e. Provost Evaluation Taskforce Report
- i. Gildein mentioned that we met with Dr. Morris to go over the procedure of the evaluation and its content.
  - ii. Dr. Morris was happy with the number of respondents.
  - iii. Scheduling, communications, and faculty development should be highlighted as areas to work on.
  - iv. Suggestions for future surveys would be:
    - 1. to introduce Boolean questions so that not everyone had access to questions not for them
    - 2. Names would be redacted
    - 3. Provost job description would be included on cover page
    - 4. Using the top three categories would be used in a manner similar to the president's annual survey
  - v. Wenner asked about the distinction between the provost and provost's office—do we need to differentiate between the two? She also asked about emotional responses from provost and a fear of reprisal. Should we address a question towards fear of reprisal?
  - vi. Matory asked whether there were other comments or questions on comments in the provost's evaluation.

- vii. Matory asked whether we would like to enter into executive session or publicly discuss a matter related to the provost survey. Wenner said she was open to discussing the matter publicly.
- viii. Matory informed that there was an email automatically flagged by the IT system which related to a relationship between the provost and someone over whom he had a supervisory role. Matory and/or Wenner (source unclear) noted that discussion would not identify the person supervised by the provost, though information was shared that could identify this individual. That information has not been recorded in the minutes. Matory went on to explain that BOG policy 6.6 says a relationship between a supervisor cannot have a relationship with someone in a supervisory position. Matory said that the matter had been reviewed by HR and the Office of the President and the provost was removed from a direct supervisory role.
- ix. Matory said she was very upset by this information and did not want to return from Spring Break because she does not feel safe on this campus. Matory said she addressed this issue with the provost publicly and he asked her to direct her concerns to the other party involved in the relationship. The situation has created a division within the faculty, Matory said.
- x. Gildein went on record to note that this is a personnel matter according to the university's general counsel. Evans also asserted that this is a personnel matter.
- xi. Ward said there can be a difference between how one feels about something personally and how the situation should be addressed professionally.
- xii. Someone (unclear who) said they had an email from one of the involved parties corroborating the events. It was unclear whether this email was among those flagged by IT or a separate email.
- xiii. Much debate occurred; it was not really feasible to track the conversation in the minutes because there were many people talking, often at the same time or in rapid succession.
- xiv. Baker spoke about serving on the Senate and said that he believes we're going down a dangerous slope; we should review legal matters.
- xv. Baker asked Chapman to read back the minutes to make sure that necessary information was being recorded. Chapman recorded the following as a result:
  - 1. Matory showed two emails between herself and the head of IT requesting emails related to this matter from IT; the emails indicated the request was denied.
- xvi. Evans affirmed again that this is a personnel matter. Evans moved to adjourn the meeting. Gildein seconded. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at approximately 1:10 pm.

- xvii. **Nota Bene:** The internet cut out for much of the meeting leaving those who were attending remotely via Microsoft Teams unaware of the conversation and unable to participate.