

Minutes were adopted by the GCC Faculty Senate on August 27, 2024 at 12:00 per Senate Operating Rule 1, "Electronic Approval of Meeting Minutes."

**Glendale Community College: Faculty Senate Meeting
8.22.24
2:30pm SU104**

- I. Open Comment Period (up to 15 mins)
 - A. No comments

- II. Guests:
 - A. Doug Deiss- Employee Satisfaction Survey Work Group (10 min)
 1. ACES group work has wrapped for now- Dr. Hernandez given data and will bring in the admin team.
 2. Now referred to as the ESS Work Group- Employee Satisfaction Survey Work Group.
 3. The work group is made up of 5 champions- Dean Deiss is one; each advocating for a specific component of the ESS.
 4. Dean Diess's subgroup is accountability.
 - a) The way staff view accountability across the college, NOT accountability for faculty.
 - b) Current members- Graciella Serrano from Financial Aid; Dr. Jason Beckerman from student affairs; and Dean Deiss..
 - c) Asking for faculty volunteers to join his group.
 - d) Hoping to build on the question- What is GCC's way of managing accountability.
 - (1) He'd like to move to "ownership" of responsibilities as opposed to to "accountability", and ensuring everyone is on the same page with regards to what each faculty and employee group on campus has "ownership" of.
 - (2) Keeping the executive level accountable; review what was past administration concerns and whether or not they've been handled satisfactorily.

- (3) Managers holding faculty employees accountable in the same fashion across employee groups and departments.
 - (4) He doesn't want to lead any effort around accountability without the involvement and support of the Faculty Senate, or any faculty involved.
 - (5) Goal to look at ESS responses and work on campus culture conducive to knowing what part of each job faculty/employees have ownership over, and how to use the data on their areas of responsibility.
 - (6) Hoping for a culture shift, not just data collected with no action taken- data driven action steps taken.
 - e) Hoping for at least 2 volunteers from faculty.
 - f) He will be asking the Employee Representative group to recruit staff to participate in the group.
 - g) Will then reach out to the adjunct faculty to see if anyone would like to serve.
5. Discussion of perception vs actuality in accountability.
- a) Reminders that we do not track faculty time the way other employee groups do. Perception of accountability can be influenced by that, and we need to communicate the amazing things our faculty do to the broader campus community. Gaucho Globe nominations used as a possible strategy.
6. Senator Kadel moves to extend another minute; seconded by Senator Hulihan.
7. Question- Would it be possible to create a numbers only, fully anonymized dashboard to report annually that would simply show numbers of department and HR level actions being taken to support accountability?
- a) Response- Dean Deiss did not seem to think this was an option, or would need to be vetted for confidentiality concerns.
8. Dean Deiss- if no one volunteers, he will consider it OK to ask the larger faculty group for assistance.

III. Call to Order- 2:46 pm. Motion from Senator Kurtz; seconded by Senator Gergus.

- A. Senators Present- Aaron Fried, [Nina Garguilo](#), [Erik Gergus](#), [Chuck Hulihan](#), Christine Jones, Steve Kadel, Nathan Kurtz, Ed McKennon, Chris Nielson, Jillane Ocano, Alex Patrick-Rolando, Todd Polansky, Jena Remy, Sergio Rivas, Angela Schwendiman, Aubrei Smith, [Karina Sokol-Tinsley](#), Mike Strong, Lisa Worthy
- A. Approval of the Agenda (2 min)- Unanimous
- B. Quick round table of introductions- name, department, how long you've been with Glendale.
- C. President Sokol-Tinsley - another call for feedback at any point. Thank you all senators for your service.

II. Reports

- A. President (Sokol - 2 min)- [LINKED HERE](#)
 - 1. Mentions that IBN, while moving slowly, is working. Discussions with OIT have been productive and focusing on balancing faculty needs within IT security parameters.
 - 2. Question- Does Academic or Student Affairs have data for possible causes of the retention problem, not just that one exists?
 - a) Response-
 - (1) In the absence of 4DX, a clear goal needs to be set.
Unclear if we have the answers to why it is an issue; more a discussion of what we can do to move the needle.
 - 3. Question- Are we able to ask IR to pull data for students who didn't come back and review it for a common experience from that last semester?
 - a) Response-
 - (1) Yes, [Raechel Dillehay](#) in IR says that is something we can do.
- B. Secretary (Smith - 2 min)
 - 1. Website updates completed
 - 2. Recording/AI transcription
 - a) Question- What are the Senate's thoughts on using a personal recording device or AI transcription to record the meetings? These will be reviewed by the Secretary to ensure accurate minutes are captured. The recordings will not be disseminated, and are only for the secretary to review for minutes. Will be deleted after minutes are approved.

- b) Response- No to use of AI, but recording on personal computer is not of high concern. No vote or decision made.
 - 3. Completed Documents on Senate Website
 - a) Question- What are the Senate's thoughts on adding a link to Completed Documents on the Faculty Senate website? For documents such as Votes of No Confidence, formal statements or resolutions, etc.
 - b) Response- general approval.
- C. Treasurer (Jones - 2 min)-
 - 1. Current account balance of \$8561 balance; all treasurer files transferred to Senator Jones.
- D. CFSAC (Sokol -2 min)
 - 1. Raechel Dillehay in IR pulled data for CFSAC decisions this year
 - 2. Concern raised- when is the data pulled? 45th day? 1st day? Late start classes will not be accurate at those same points. Raechel figured out how to pull the first day from every class as they start. She did it by faculty service areas for Chair review.
- E. CPTF (Sokol)- No report
- F. PRRC (Gergus/ Ocano/ Hulihan/ Smith/ Schwendiman/ Polansky- 2 min)
 - 1. No report
- G. T.A.C. (Rivas- 5 min)
 - 1. First meeting is Sept 6
- H. Constitution Committee (Strong- 2 min)
 - 1. No report
- I. Shared Governance Council (Sokol/Kadel - 2 min)
 - 1. Retreat only, no meetings or minutes yet. No employee representatives yet, just President Sokol-Tinsley and VPAA Konopka so far.
 - 2. Clarification that this group is not a decision making committee, but gathers input and puts forth suggestions and proposals.
 - a) Question- Why do those proposals that have already been run through shared governance need to be submitted to the Council to repeat the process. Concerns that this committee can pass or veto a proposal, even if all stakeholders have already agreed. Are we just doubling up our process? President Sokol-Tinsley will ask for clarification at the next meeting.

J. Compliance Committee (Worthy - 2 min) - [LINKED HERE](#)

K. FEC / Councilors at Large (Kurtz / Rivas / Strong/ Sokol - 5 min)

1. Retreat on 8/9 and summer meetings. Meeting during the Week of Accountability.
 - a) Retreat- lawyer presentation on how to pursue issues for change. Governing Board updates- candidates running unopposed. FA supported.
 - b) Goals discussed- Increase membership; regain SuperPac status
 - c) Expenditure limit and discussion of debt ramifications.
 - d) Brown bags- FA Lawyer led; all faculty encouraged to attend.
 - e) Sense of FEC outcome regarding travel (motion started at GCC)- removed policy change for Alaska and Hawaii travel
 - f) Discussion of benefits changes being discussed at FEC.
2. Senator Gergus moved to extend by 2 minutes; second by Senator Kadel
 - a) Question- has there been discussion of incentivizing retirements to offset the costs?
 - (1) Response- the state requires us to prefund anyone eligible early, incentivized retirement, not just the ones who choose it.
 - (2) Suggestion made to possibly explore incentivization via healthcare bridge-to-Medicare only. This would not encumber the ASRS or require pre-funding by District because it would not involve any change/earlier than already established access to the ASRS.

III. Old Business- None

IV.

V. New Business- None

VI. Information / Discussion

a. Senate/Teaching Schedule Issue (Sokol- 15 min)

- i. Brought up Senator Strong's teaching schedule conflict- due to a shift caused by common course scheduling times, Senator Strong has a

conflict on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and will miss the first hour of Faculty Senate and FEC meetings. This is only for Fall Semester

1. Concern- we won't have our normal representation and will be short a voice consistently for the first hour.
- ii. Question- What's the precedent? Has this happened before?
 1. FEC President Goth offered two possible solutions-
 - a. Appointment of a proxy for this semester. Discussion of whether or not this would be a voting member, or just in Senator Strong's place until he arrives.
 - b. Senator Strong will be informed in advance of a vote. He may read the provided materials, and send his vote to the FEC President prior to the vote.
 2. General support for the proxy option if it for the entirety of the meeting. Points made regarding the value of presentations made in the first hour of FEC in ability to vote appropriately.
- iii. Gergus- advocate the proxy option. Important to have discussion before a vote.
 1. General support for a proxy for meeting for the next 3 months; schedule resolves in spring so it'll be a non issue. Fall semester only.
- iv. President Sokol-Tinsley calls for volunteers to proxy or serve as substitutes for all 3 FEC representatives.
 1. Proxy will not need to relinquish their Senate seat.
 2. Volunteers told to email President Sokol-Tinsley. She and Mike will work to resolve the proxy.
- b. Senate's Priorities (All- 30 min)
 - i. Academic affairs reorganization
 1. Phoenix College went through a reorganization. Some departments and prefixes were moved and/or combined with others. Idea floated of whether or not we would benefit from this.
 - a. No commitment to action, just exploratory
 2. Question- Is there a framework or list of goals? What is the purpose?

- a. Response- none. It would be appropriate to ask for. We don't want to take something on without a guideline.
 3. Point- The model should be built first, then we apply the model to the departments. If we choose to tackle it- make a subcommittee to come up with the goals and metrics. Then we apply it to the departments on campus.
 4. Questions as to what is the driving force behind this- budget; student feedback; etc. We want to be sure we're committing to the right actions, and that we have clear guidelines and expectations.
 5. Discussion of the varying sizes of the academic departments on campus and their staffing needs. Discussion of some prefixes seeming to be "out of place" in their current departments.
 6. Discussion of possible issues- Are we creating a problem to solve, or is there a problem already? Potential problems if chairs take on disciplines they don't have experience with.
 7. Question- has this been brought to the chairs? Are they part of this process?
 - a. Response- it has been brought up to chairs and they have been encouraged to discuss and set priorities, but not in detail and official discussion.
 8. President Sokol-Tinsley will reach out to PC for more information.
- ii. [Grade inflation](#)
1. Report that was sent presents questions about data validity as it was pulled by a private individual. Calls to have IR pull our data for comparison.
 2. Discussion- is this really an issue of inflation, or an increased awareness of student mental health and basic needs. We're more inclined to provide a W. Our campus is getting the highest amount of BIT involvement and being proactive. What if recognizing student needs means a W or alternative strategies. The data and report doesn't demonstrate these. If we weren't doing these things, we would see higher amounts of non-passing grades.

3. Discussion- our goals have been to increase student success.
How can we ascertain what is a successful implementation of new strategies, and what is grade inflation?
 4. Discussion- this is a department priority, not a Senate priority.
More of a discipline assessment discussion.
- c. Operating rule or bylaw addition that notes who would run a meeting if the current president could not (Sokol- 5 min)
- i. President Sokol-Tinsley requested former president, current senator [Erik Gergus](#) to run the meeting as she needed to leave earlier.
 - ii. It was pointed out that we have no process in our bylaws for when there is no president-elect; Robert's Rules of Order state it should be the secretary to preside over a vote to who leads the meeting.
 1. Discussion of what is the best policy when there's no president-elect.
 - iii. Senate agrees to allow Senator Gergus to run the remainder of the meeting.
 - iv. Suggestion to create an operating rule allowing the president to appoint a designee when there is no president-elect. Request for this to be put on the next senate meeting agenda.
- d. [Meeting agreements](#) (All- 15 min)
- i. Meant to be guidelines as we shift to virtual meetings for the remainder of the semester.
 - ii. Discussion and revisions of linked Agreements draft.
 - iii. Discussion of what belongs in the bylaws "best practices" vs the constitution vs a separate document.
 - iv. Senator Jones volunteered to monitor chat for tenure as treasurer.
Collective approval.
 - v. Senator Kurtz- move to extend 2 minutes; second by Senator Fried
 - vi. Discussion of revisions and voting next meeting after senators are given the chance to review and add comments.
- e. Constitution Committee suggestion- Rename to Operations Committee (Strong- 10 min)
- i. Items to address
 1. Senate Committee Responsibilities

2. Clarification of FEC role in local GCC Senate
 3. Role has expanded beyond the Constitution to include oversight of guiding documents, procedures, policies, bylaws, etc.
- ii. Senator Strong will create a formal motion to outline charge and purview for ad hoc committee to be presented next meeting.
- f. All- Employee Picnic (Kadel- 10 min)
 - i. 135 responses (a majority of faculty)
 - ii. Supportive of the idea (Strong majority- 88% approval per the survey sent by Senator Kadel). Moving forward to ask FEC for funding prior to soliciting faculty.

VII. Adjournment- 4:48