

Glenville State College Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: November 30, 2021

I. Call to order and Roll.

- President Brian Perkins called to order the Glenville State College Faculty Senate at 12:26 p.m. via Teams.
- Senators present: Jeff Bryson, Duane Chapman, Wenwen Du, Kevin Evans, Maureen Gildein, Tim Konhaus, Ken Lang, John McKinney, Brian Perkins, and Kandas Queen.

Also in attendance: Mari Clements, Cheryl McKinney, George Panzak, Mark Sarver, and Kristen Tunno Mullins.

II. Approval of Minutes; Reports

Motion to approve the minutes for November 9, 2021 meeting by Tim Konhaus; seconded by Maureen Gildein. All voted; motion approved. Brian Perkins abstained.

- Reports:
 - Board of Governors (BOG): Kevin Evans noted a meeting was scheduled for December 10. He further commented that he will attend the board meeting but might miss some of the morning committee meetings due to other meetings and obligations.
 - Advisory Council of Faculty Representative (ACF): Jeff Bryson noted ACF had not met so there was nothing new to report.
 - Academic Affairs – Mari Clements noted there was nothing to report.

III. Old Business:

- Overload Pay Policy – Brian Perkins noted that he had previously shared feedback from BOG and asked if anyone had any thoughts. Kevin Evans noted that the BOG was ready to vote on this in the upcoming meeting because they had not gotten any feedback from Faculty Senate. He further noted that if feedback was provided at this time, he would share it with BOG in the upcoming meeting. Discussion followed on the changes made to document when it went to CLC and then BOG asked if those changes were what faculty really wanted. One of the big changes that was made to language was in the section that identified what course counted as the overload. Kevin Evans noted the suggestion from Brian Perkins to revise the language to reflect contact hours to match the GSC Catalog. Duane Chapman asked about the changes made by CLC on the overload language. Discussion continued centering on the three points (see below) that Kevin Evans mentioned in previous email (sent Nov. 3, 2021).
 - Brian Perkins referenced the first suggestion to add “beyond their contractual agreement” to the end of 5.3. Discussion resulted in no issues with adding that language.

- The next suggestion was to reference credit hour calculation based on contact hours in Section 3.1, which was previously discussed in Faculty Senate and thought helpful when calculating course that used lab hours and teacher training classes. Brian Perkins had suggested to change the wording to reflect credit hours rather than contact hours and to add “A faculty members” teaching load (credit hours) was calculated based on contact hours as shown in the Faculty Handbook. Maureen Gildein and Ken Lang noted no issues with this in Education and Criminal Justice departments. Other departments showed support.
- Brian Perkins referenced the third point and language deleted from 5.3 and whether it needed to be added back. Kevin Evans noted section 5.4 worked to eliminate some of the concern about the need to include that language and was fine with the current language. Kandas Queen questioned a conflict of language based on identifying the overload by semester when an overload could not be determined until the contractual 24 credit hours during the 9-month contract was met. Discussion followed on whether to add it back. Duane Chapman questioned if we make a decision to change the language again would it go back to CLC or to BOG. Brian Perkins noted it would go back to BOG. Discussion continued on whether or not to add the third point. Brian Perkins stated it looked like the consensus was to add that language back in.

Brian Perkins asked for a motion for Kevin Evans to take this feedback from Faculty Senate to the BOG. Maureen Gildein motioned that Kevin Evans take this Overload Policy feedback to the BOG; Duane Chapman seconded. Motion carried.

- Faculty Development Policy – Mark Sarver updated Faculty Senate on the committee. He noted in the first meeting he attended the chair resigned, and in the second meeting the chair (previous vice-chair) resigned, and at the third meeting he was elected chair. Mark Sarver referenced the committee bylaws and Policy 20 and alignment. He commented that based on the bylaws the duty of the Faculty Development Committee was to provide faculty development to help make faculty and teaching experience of students better. Mark Sarver noted the committee had two tasks; one was looking at external funding requests and doing internal faculty development. He presented an Assessment Cycle to show how the committee was addressing these tasks and the correlation of committee tasks to the bylaws and policy. It starts with the committee establishing the guidelines for approval and assessment of funding requests, which is submitted to the GSC President. The committee sets timelines for submitting requests and makes recommendations to the provost based on the funding guidelines that were developed. The provost determines the funding. Then the committee reviews at the end of the year. Mark Sarver further commented that over past couple of years, including this year, 100% of the requests had been funded. He felt the priority for the committee to on focus at this time was to look at developing the assessment for funding guidelines.

Mark Sarver raised the question of what kind of training faculty would like to have, including what kind of questions faculty still had related to Brightspace. He noted the committee would work on determining a training calendar and soliciting administration for funding. Mark Sarver further commented the committee was working with Academic Affairs to develop an overview of Faculty Development to share with faculty and to solicit input on training for faculty when the spring semester begins in January. Brian Perkins commented that the committee bylaws had been updated last year. Mark Sarver noted that he was using the 2020-2021 bylaws. Discussion followed on the wording of the policy and possible ways the money could be used, both internally and externally. This included seed money for grants to get larger grants. Mark Sarver stated the next steps for the committee were to determine what training they wanted to do for the rest of the year and lay out a training calendar for 2022 and develop the assessment guidelines. Maureen Gildein asked what the training days in January (5th, 6th, and 7th) would look like. Mark Sarver noted the first session regarding the Faculty Development Committee would be during the first week faculty were back and would center around the flowchart he had shared with Faculty Senate to help get faculty excited about using the faculty development funds, and to see what kind of internal training faculty might request. Brian Perkins asked if the committee was planning on taking a look at policy as well. Mark Sarver stated it was not the top priority but noted the Faculty Handbook and making sure it matched with Policy 20 and the new bylaws was something that needed reviewed. Kandas Queen noted that when the Faculty Senate reviewed the Faculty Handbook it was noted to update that section to align with the new bylaws.

IV. New Business:

- Vice President Election – Brian Perkins stated we needed to make nominations and elect a Faculty Senate Vice President. Kandas Queen nominated Maureen Gildein; Duane Chapman seconded. Tim Konhaus moved to close nominations; Duane Chapman seconded. Motion carried.
- COVID-19 & New Semester – Brian Perkins commented he had a faculty member ask about GSC plans for the new semester and gatherings that would occur noting this was often a time when COVID-19 cases spiked. The faculty member had suggested we try to limit the number of gatherings and formal student gatherings. Brian Perkins noted he had spoken to Gary Morris about this concern, but he was unaware if anyone else had concerns regarding it in their department. Maureen Gildein questioned what kind of gatherings the faculty member was concerned about. Brian Perkins responded in-person gatherings, such as new student orientation, and other required gatherings. Brian Perkins thought we might have to wait and see what happens with COVID-19 and whether or not we have any spikes in cases. Maureen Gildein asked Mari Clements if administration had discussed this topic. Mari Clements noted they had discussed it and that the president had expressed views on getting back to normal and

putting COVID-19 behind us, but the new variant could change plans. Discussion followed on communicating the concern with the GSC President and administration. Brian Perkins commented a basic function of the college was to keep people safe. He agreed that everyone was tired of hearing about COVID-19, but we needed to be able to respond quickly as things develop over break and to be prepared to take precautions.

- Academic Policy Committee catalog changes – Kevin Evans, committee chair, noted the committee had met over the semester and made some minor updates to the policies. Policies revisions had been sent (email Nov. 18) to Faculty Senate to be reviewed and make any comments before going to CLC. Brian Perkins questioned the change to remove the options for students receiving their first academic suspension to no longer be allowed to complete six hours of course work the following semester. Kevin Evans noted that was correct and that it had not proved effective and had resulted in the student acquiring additional debt and financial hardship. Tim Konhaus motioned to approve the updates to policies; Ken Lang seconded. Motion carried.
- Academic Appeals Bylaws – Brian Perkins noted Kandas Queen had previously suggested that each department be represented on the Academic Appeals Committee. Brian Perkins noted communication with Ann Reed to share the request with the committee to update the membership, but noted the committee meets infrequently. The bylaws have now been updated to include a member from each department, which was shared with faculty in email from Nov. 18, 2021. Additional change included Article 4, Section 4 noting that meetings are closed. Another change was Article 5, Section 2, which Marjorie Stewart had commented on the language, and that the provost was to notify the committee, the faculty, and the student in writing of the decision regarding an appeal. A final change included adding Section 3, which stated that if the provost overrode the committee’s decision, then the committee and the faculty would be notified in writing of the decision. Maureen Gildein noted a representative from each department and making the meetings closed were good changes. Jeff Bryson motion to accept the revised Academic Appeals Bylaws; Maureen Gildein seconded. Motion carried. Brian Perkins will send it on to CLC.

V. Departmental Representative Concerns:

Kandas Queen commented on missing department on FAR feedback. Discussion followed on feedback and that Brian Perkins would send out an updated version of the FAR. Duane Chapman suggested using bullet points rather than specific language but noted it should be what works for departments.

Next Faculty Senate meeting will be January 11, 2021.

VI. Adjournment:

Kandas Queen motioned to adjourn the meeting. Jeff Bryson seconded the motion. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.