

Glenville State College Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: October 12, 2021

I. Call to order and Roll.

- President Brian Perkins called to order the Glenville State College Faculty Senate at 12:25 p.m. in MCCC 319 and via Teams.
- Senators present: Brian Perkins, Kevin Evans, Marjorie Stewart, Jonathan Minton, Kandas Queen, Wenwen Du, Duane Chapman, Ken Lang, and Maureen Gildein. Also in attendance: Mari Clements

II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

Motion to approve the minutes for September 28, 2021 meeting by Marjorie Stewart; seconded by Wenwen Du. All voted; motion approved. Duane Chapman abstained.

- Reports:
 - Bridgett Carr, Vice-chair of Staff Council, announced they were hosting a Halloween decorating door/office contest this year and invited faculty to participate. Areas need to be decorated by Wednesday, October 27 by 4 p.m. The judging will take place on Thursday October 28 and the winner will be announced on Friday, October 29. Bridgett Carr noted that one member from staff, one student and one faculty would be the judges. She then asked for a faculty to volunteer as a judge and Marjorie Stewart volunteered from faculty. Logistics will be set for the three to meet on that Thursday to do the judging. Decorations can include just the door or the entire area. They are trying to make it a campus wide event and get as much participation as possible. Bridgett Carr gave her extension (6154) if anyone has any questions. Maureen Gildein questioned if the department or faculty member needed to notify her if they decided to participate. Bridgett Carr noted an email would be coming out with more detail. There will be prizes.
 - Brian Perkins stated CLC nominations were Jeffrey Bryson, Ed Wood, and Megan Darby. The Promotion and Tenure nominations needed to exclude Amanda Chapman, Lloyd Bone, Ken Lang, and Larry Baker since they were going up for promotion and/or tenure and should not be on the ballot. Reminders to let your departments know this would be coming out and that they needed to vote. Discussion occurred on the process noting that any faculty going up for promotion or had served last year would be need to be excluded.
 - Board of Governors (BOG): Kevin Evans noted the next meeting would be Wednesday, October 20.
 - Advisory Council of Faculty Representative (ACF): Marjorie Stewart noted they had met that past Friday by Zoom. The draft of the brochure was available for review; discussion noted several typos. Marjorie Stewart noted the funding formula was an important issue right now. She further

commented on the CTC college tenure issues and that the law stated a maximum 20% of faculty could be tenured but there is no minimum set. She further noted ACF was not going to talk about campus carry again unless it was needed. Future meeting dates were tentatively set with everything but the retreat set to be in person or virtual. Great Teachers will be held in June, and Marjorie Stewart strongly recommended faculty attend the event. HEPC pays for the space. Individual institutions pay for representatives. Marjorie Stewart asked if we wanted to officially approve the ACF agenda. Marjorie Stewart made a motion to approve the agenda with typos corrected, Maureen Gildein seconded the motion. All voted; motion carried.

- Cabinet – Marjorie Stewart noted emails she had sent out with cabinet notes and that cabinet meetings were going to every other week. Brian Perkins asked about the \$500,000 needed for Starbucks. Marjorie Stewart commented they had budgeted \$300,000 and were looking for additional bids. Discussion followed regarding asbestos removal, costs, and funding for the project.

Marjorie Stewart stated the COVID-19 decision was another big topic regarding the plans for after Thanksgiving, which had already been shared the college community. Graduation will still be in person as originally planned. Kandas Queen asked if there would be any restrictions placed on the number of people who could attend, but it was noted that had not been decided upon yet. Maureen Gildein commented on questions from two students stating they misunderstood the communication that was sent out about students returning after Thanksgiving. Mari Clements noted it could be recommunicated to clarify.

- Administrative/Academic Updates (GSC President, GSC VPAA, Others): Brian Perkins asked Mari Clements if there were any updates, but she noted there was no formal report. Bert Jedamski was supposed to present, but he was unable to make the meeting.

III. Old Business:

- Faculty Handbook – Review of the Faculty Handbook resulted in the following recommended changes (Listed below):
 - The section of the Faculty Handbook up for review are pages 82-111.
 - Brian Perkins noted a comment from Jennifer Wenner was to add hyperlinks for all the standalone documents.
 - Page 86, Brian Perkins noted there was a more recent version of the shared governance diagram that needed to be updated and added.

- Page 100, Kandas Queen noted there needed to be an update to the section to reflect the current schedule for FAR (see last sentence FAR “due Spring”, now it is due in the fall).
- Brian Perkins noted we would follow up with Gary Morris on changes and make sure they were updated. Kandas Queen will create one document that shows all the changes recommended.

IV. New Business:

- Faculty Development Funds – Brian Perkins – Marjorie Stewart noted new plan for committee,
 - Marjorie Stewart noted the committee had met and had discussed the plan she submitted to Faculty Senate. This would involve the committee receiving applications at the same time as administration and review them to keep track of where money was going and to keep a record. This would also allow for those receiving the funds to be asked to share what they learned with other faculty in development training meetings. Marjorie Stewart noted the committee still needed to develop the criteria for receiving funds. Maureen Gildein asked if Faculty Senate would see the criteria before voting on it. Marjorie Stewart noted it was a separate process. Kandas Queen commented the criteria needed to be flexible enough to be relevant in all departments; she noted what served as professional development for the Business department could be very different from what might work as professional development for Math and Science for example. Discussion followed where it was noted that committee members, which had representatives from each department, present concerns and interest in professional development items. Brian Perkins noted historically it had not paid for membership in professional organizations and asked if anyone knew the history regarding that decision. Discussion followed. Mari Clements commented on the advantage of professional development funds to help faculty further their education. Brian Perkins asked if there was a BOG policy on professional development. Discussion followed. Kevin Evans noted there was a BOG policy (Policy 20) that pertained to professional development. Brian Perkins noted we need to review BOG Policy 20 to see what adjustments might be needed. Kevin Evans commented on a related topic about having funds to support students doing research and going to conferences. He further commented there was a small committee (himself, Kaitlin Ensor, and Connie O’Dell) who were working on a proposal to present to chairs and that realized faculty would probably need to attend these conferences with student and they were questioning how should they be paid, the

conference fund or professional development fund. This could be a line item in the budget for the upcoming year. Mari Clements commented on research funds and how that was different than department funds.

Discussion followed and it was noted that foundations was also trying to help with funding.

Maureen Gildein and Kandas Queen asked if senators were to bring feedback on the Professional Development Funds Committee document to the next Faculty Senate meeting. Brian Perkins noted that would be managed through the committee members to handle feedback for their departments. He further suggested that senators review of the BOG policy regarding professional development funds. Maureen Gildein asked for the names of the Faculty Development Committee: Marjorie Stewart, Donal Hardin, Jason Barr, Pai Song, Doyle (J.R.) Hupp, Gary Arbogast, Gerda Kumpiene, and Josh Squires.

- FAR – In discussion from departments, Brian Perkins stated his department was happy with the FAR as it was currently designed and they did not see a need to change it. He noted an additional comment was there seemed to be heavier weighting of the service section as it had more questions compared to the teaching section, which had only three questions. The current FAR is weighted to be 60% teaching, 20% scholarship, and 20% service. Discussion followed that the number of questions were not associated to any weighting of FAR sections, and it was further noted that one of the questions in the scholarship section had previously been discussed to remove as it was more goal (future) oriented than reflective in nature. Brian Perkins noted further concerns from his department regarding the language on “assessment of learning” located in the teaching and service sections. He commented this was addressed in Assessment and did not need to be revisited in the FAR. Marjorie Stewart noted a difference between assessment for her individual courses and assessment of the program that was reviewed by the Assessment Committee reports. Kandas Queen commented on changing the FAR towards a more reflective process. Maureen Gildein noted it to be a more forwarding/goal setting thought process, and show how was it helping you to move forward; viewed it more as a professional plan. Discussion followed on assessment and how it differed from program assessment and that it might need to be reworded to improve understanding. Kandas Queen noted part of the change to the FAR was to remove some of the redundancy of the current FAR to a more reflective process. Marjorie Stewart commented the new proposed FAR seemed to be more reflective and focused less on how faculty changed things. Kevin Evans commented the current FAR focused on what changed, when it truth there were times when no changes were required. He further added that he liked the reflectiveness of the teaching process in the proposed FAR much better. Discussion followed with agreement on the need to wordsmith some of the

questions to make them broader and more applicable. Kandas Queen acknowledged the subcommittee working on the new FAR were expecting some wordsmithing to occur, and asked if the overall direction of the new FAR, with the use of goals and reflection, was going in the direction that worked for everyone. Kevin Evans noted the use of the goal section was great from his viewpoint as a chair to have a conversation with his faculty. Marjorie Stewart noted she liked the direction of the new FAR and thought that with some wordsmithing it was close. Discussion followed on upcoming edits. Duane Chapman noted the subcommittee needed to have specific comments from departments they could use to redraft it. Brian Perkins noted we send him feedback from department representatives and he will send that feedback to subcommittee.

- Brian Perkins referenced email (10/11/2021) he forwarded from Melody Wise and the Assessment Committee updating the bylaws and noted we would discuss it at the next meeting. Discussion followed about the name change of the committee to Academic Assessment Committee. Wenwen Du (Assessment Committee Member) noted the name change occurred because there was a separate committee for Co-curricular Assessment. Mari Clements noted the Co-Curricular Committee had been around for a while and the name change for the Assessment Committee just reflected that it would just be for academic assessment. Kandas Queen noted the improvement this process could have for the Academic Assessment Committee to focus more on curriculum. Brian Perkins noted it would allow for more ownership for the Co-Curricular Committee and asked senators to review it for the next meeting.
- Kevin Evans questioned, as the chair of the Academic Policy Committee, whether Faculty Senate wanted changes to policy as they happened or to wait and send them all at the end of the semester? Brian Perkins replied to send them at the end of the semester as a bundle. He further commented on the bylaws of the Academic Appeals Committee and that they were not fully approved before. Brian Perkins noted this resulted in the changes to committee structure not including a representative from every department, which would part of the work the Policy Committee would complete to have them formally approved and then come back Faculty Senate for another review.

V. Adjournment:

Kandas Queen motioned to adjourn the meeting. Maureen Gildein seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 1:29 p.m.