

2017-10-13T12:16

Faculty senate minutes 2017 October 13

defer minutes till next time (forgot to attach)

President Wendler (guest)

Issue of pay raises:

Reviewed merit process as he understood it

Merit gets driven to point where all raises are same (st. dev.)

embedded cost of living increase

if all get it, what does merit mean? should get some sort of distribution. Horse got out of barn before was told rules.

Wants to take 2% bucket and put 1% across-board, then

other 1% (50% of pool) to some % of faculty (maybe 50%)

Merit must be meritorious. Have ended up with a system where everyone is reported as meritorious.

1% was distributed as meritorious, rest according to criteria from Shaffer. For all practical purposes same as before, remaining 1% was distributed by department criteria.

Babb: pointed out concern that handbook procedure wasn't followed.

Wendler: admitted didn't understand about handbook. Wasn't told about handbook. Next year will follow handbook exactly. Has happened elsewhere that nearly all faculty get rated meritorious.

Won't do this ever again, implores faculty to look at issue.

Is there a better way to do this?

Craig: there is language issue. In TP procedure, what is called "satisfactory" is actually unsatisfactory performance, etc.

Wendler: should we be more willing to trust a group of committee rather than a procedure.

DeButte: are admin evaluations done the same way?

Wendler: similar with rubric, etc. But great range 15-200K in salary.

Systems don't allow simple raises. Had 2% to work with as well. Could you set up task force, etc. to look at ways of allocating merit?

Wendler would be pleased to come often, discussed coming twice a semester or more, etc.

Ombuds position: Wendler would be willing to accept Ombuds office at choice of Senate.

Wendler would like to see way to encourage more leadership from senior faculty.

Blanton: including non-tenure track?

Wendler: leadership should lead to those with longer term connection.

Service work should be left to more senior faculty. tenure track should be teaching and research only for those working toward tenure.

Ingrassia: good idea, but tenure is often seen as freedom to say "no."

Wendler: could be part of expectation for merit raises, etc.

deButte: have seen opposite, where senior faculty take roles juniors want.

Pinkham: but also junior faculty want input, need diversity of viewpoints on committees, etc.

Wendler: for WT 125, had big need to get tenured faculty on committee.

Babb: issue of governance: there are many cultural variations among departments on when to serve on senate etc.

Wendler: wants to talk about core curriculum, in context of transferring in quality students from CCs. Somehow to identify a smaller number to present to CC leadership. Core for STEM, Core for fine arts, for example. So many choices that decisions are difficult to make. Would like to have discussion on simplifying core for transfers.

Babb: clarification: there is the THECB core, then most colleges or degree programs have a specified core. Which do you want us to look at?

Wendler: need to look at locally required, things we can influence.

Ingrassia: hear you are trying to streamline the core, but there are many faculty that feel it is important to teach core here. We feel we do it well here and are resistant to attempts to remove core teaching.

Wendler: comparing teaching effectiveness across courses. Variability in teaching could be large enough to overlap (?) Worried about debt load.

Na: in skill-based disciplines, student that are not prepared they simply can't go on. At CCs they are often in extremely large combined classes, not prepare.

Wendler: we are facing problems from expenses, student indebtedness, attention of legislatures.
 Ingrassia: concern that president is implying community college is cheaper but just as good. Cost of athletics, facilities, admin is much higher and the idea of outsourcing core courses to CCs is maddening.
 Ambrose: can we discuss this issue next time?
 Wendler: need some way to get at student debt. Facing possible suits on misrepresentation.

WT 125: DeArmond: come in with idea of communication with Senate, on steering committee for WT125. Idea is to bring viewpoint of faculty to steering committee. Meetings have encouraged diversity of thought. Discussed teamwork, template for deliverables have been developed, etc. When reached out to fac, staff, students noted that people who have been here 40 years had never been reached out to by the president. Personal touch was important. Blown away by amount of service by faculty, etc. Please let Ambrose know or DeArmond if you have any concerns.

Regular meeting:
 Ombuds officer applications need to select soon
 Changing ombuds selection process:
 History: previous time O'Brien wanted three, only got two applicants, had to restart process.
 Ambrose asked Wendler, and he would be willing to let senate choose. (there were handouts).
 Discussion?
 Lust: reason for limiting ombuds to 2 terms?
 Ambrose: wanted to avoid lifetime positions?
 Lust: but fac senate must re-elect them?
 Ambrose: also wanted to avoid that with president choosing from 3.
 King: could we change it Ambrose: is in hbook.
 Ambrose moves: we accept the proposed changes in appt reqs for ombuds officer and send to hbook committee King 2nd.
 Passed.

Ambrose: didn't meet with Shaffer due to illness. Only person who has received Piper award was Brasington, can re-nominate previous.

Ambrose: more meetings with Pres. Wendler?
 CC/core issue: obvious differences in Math, etc. Should take this up with him. Invite back in month>
 Ingrassia: suggested two meeting/semester is good.

Committee Reports:

T&P

Administrator T&P standard issue (handout with highlights)
 Meredith: idea is to put dept standards up front, and get supervisor to clarify.
 Lust: no magic bullet, trying to clarify language. Assignment to make soe statement about consideration.
 Ambrose: what about proportions?
 (Discussion of diversity among colleges)
 Babb: proliferation of levels of management. How much does supervisor's statement weight?
 Meredith: this removes smokescreen by requiring supervisor recommendation. Gets everything on table.
 (discussion of changing of annual review weight, by year, etc.)
 Burnett moved we accept proposal, Craig seconded, passed with one abstain

Appeal process:

Meredith: handout of changes
 DeButte: move to accept, King seconded, motion passed.

IT Babb/Meredith: did find out about emerging Division for Research Computing May be a place to allow research computing. Committee meeting to discuss it.

Promotion for instructors: have draft, but need more meetingL

XF issue: (Pinkham for Davis) If we change in Catalog->student

life->handbook

(Sent around on first step: Proposed caatalog change handout)
Meredith moved to accept, Ingrassia second, motion passed.

Piper nominations: must be in by Nov 10 meeting, for Nov 17 submission.

Ambrose: should we form committee on merit pay issue? (rewriting
distribution percentages, etc as suggested by Wendler)
Defer to next time.

New Business:

DeButte: issues raised by faculty:

- Study on retention rate for faculty over 10 yrs (Bartlett & Meredith may have it)
- Number of administrators over last years
- Audit of administrator raises
- How is parking allocated to administrators?
- Study of why faculty pay is so low compared to similar positions else

Adjourned.

DeButte: so many different standards in different colleges.