

# **Collin Faculty Council**

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **August 31, 2012**

#### **I. Call to Order**

President Mike Cohick called to order the scheduled regular meeting of the Collin College Faculty Council at 1:05 PM.

#### **II. Roll Call**

Roll was called and all representatives or their proxy were present and accounted for.

#### **III. Approval of May 4, 2012 Minutes**

Minutes of the May 4, 2012 meeting were approved as distributed.

#### **IV. President Cohick introduced the new officers:**

Tiffany Harper, Vice President

Peggy Brown, Secretary

Lorena Rodriguez, Treasurer

**V. President Cohick introduced Kandice Denison, AXA, an approved benefits provider at Collin.** She spoke of optional retirement plans, one of which is 403 B. She wants to help the faculty understand what it is and how it operates. She emphasized that our professors have other options and offered to meet with anyone who would like more information. President Cohick offered to receive cards from anyone interested after the meeting.

**VI. President Cohick introduced Michael Rose with an overview of SACS.** Michael showed a link for faculty to learn about SACs regarding SACS Compliance. He asked about previous involvement, and many faculty members confirmed that they have been through the evaluation process. Michael said that the review will be in 2015. He spoke of the QEP that will be available soon. He also reported that SACS Compliance is a voluntary process and discussed SACS' role in the southern states. SACS has established the requirements for what the college needs for accreditation, and if SACS finds problems in the review, they give us a couple of years to fix those problems; however, he emphasized, "We won't have problems. We will be compliant." This process, he said, prevents the state and government from telling us what to do. So long as we are successful, we will be in charge (to a point). To ensure that we retain accreditation, this process is essential; we have to go through the process to discover whether we are in partial or complete compliance. We will fix partial, if that's the case. We'll have to develop a defense.

SACS formed in 1895, so colleges have been regulating themselves for over one hundred years. Mike gave a map of our region and reviewed the different types of accreditation

organizations. The programmatic ones, like nursing, have a special review process. Our general college efforts will show that we have the resources and the programs to meet the demands of our student body, that we have appropriate programs and process. In the process, we will: 1) examine our mission statement; 2) review goals and how we are meeting them; 3) establish appropriate goals for future; and 4) evaluate all programs. All of the above challenge us to move beyond the status quo and allow us to make sure our databases are up to date and accurate. We will make sure we discover what we are doing wrong. But we can also brag about what we are doing well. We can demonstrate our excellence and publish the results to the community.

If professors go to My Workplace on CougarWeb, we will see re-accreditation posted there. If there is anything we want to see added there, write to Michael and he will see about getting it in.

Questions from the faculty: What are our expectations and where are we going?

Answer: Dani Day, Tom Martin, Michael Rose, Kimberly Harris, Brenda Kihl, and others are on the committee working on the compliance, and they should produce some of the core writing by next month. He encouraged faculty to send an e-mail informing him about what we should be doing, and he will respond. Committees are forming, and he will get us information about them. He gave contact information.

## **VII. Treasurer's Report – Lorena Rodriguez**

During All College Day we collected \$1,125 towards the Full-Time Faculty Scholarship fund. Since that day, we have added \$20 more in donations, bringing the total to \$1,145.

## **VIII. Committee Reports**

- A. College Policy** – Mary Milford reported that none of the policies that have passed have negatively affected the faculty. She did point out that student-on-student harassment of a personal nature was included. She informed the FC that if they have any reason to believe that one student is bothering another, we are required to report the offense. Under our definition of duties, we must file a report with Kim Davison.
- B. Faculty Council Procedures** – Dan Lipscomb: Nothing to report.
- C. Teaching and Learning** – Regina Hughes: Nothing to report
- D. Collin Community** – Julie Turnbow: Nothing to report.
- E. Academic Freedom** –Kemal Moula – Would like to have a co-chair. Contact President Cohick if you are interested in serving.
- F. Technology** – Elizabeth Pannell reported the date of the first meeting was September 7 and asked if anyone is interested in being on the committee. She acknowledged that IT had recently experienced problems. The faculty voiced a complaint about IT shutting down Blackboard on the last day of the semester. This procedure created a disadvantage to teachers and to students, who could not access professors' comments. In effect, professors wasted time giving feedback when Blackboard was shut down and students would never see those responses. Elizabeth will address this problem.

## **IX. Updates from District Committees**

**A. Council on Excellence** – Martha Tolleson reported that COE met with Dr. Colleen Smith asking for clarification on Board reports content.

1. The Board report will need to be limited to professional activities, e.g., presentations, conferences attended, etc. If faculty attend lectures, they should show the connection with their discipline or classroom performance. Therefore, attendance at the auteur series, workshops for the Board report, PTK, Emerging Scholars, and other such events should not be included on the Board report.
2. Martha encouraged faculty to e-mail her for any questions. She reminded us of the importance of self-evaluations. All professional activities belong there for COE's information.
3. Faculty asked if the student roundtable participation at orientation should be included, and Martha said it would be allowed. Moreover, anything that is part of a formal, systematic process does belong; she gave daily advising as an example of a disallowed activity. But volunteering for one hour a week as advisor should be included.
4. Faculty commented that it is important for professors to support our students by attending their events. Martha agreed that it is important and will pass along the information when she gets the opportunity.
5. A discussion ensued about the proposed reduction of the length of the Board report to one page instead of two. Behind the suggestion was that important contributions have been hidden in the lengthy inclusion of all activities. However, the proposal has been tabled by the Board due to time-management concerns. That means the form remains the same for now.
6. Martha emphasized that the Board report is considered an important contractual document. It is the signature page for the multi-year contract.
7. Another faculty concern was about publications. Would a professor be able to include a publication in a top-ranked journal if it was out of the professor's discipline area? In the discussion that ensued, the faculty voiced a concern that the Board be informed about the need to research broadly if we are to bring in various perspectives on topics introduced in our particular discipline during lecture. Martha said she would explore the idea with administration.
8. Another faculty member asked how the Board would know if something a professor does is pertinent to his or teaching. As professionals, faculty should know what is best for our discipline and its expression in the classroom. We need to have the academic freedom to be responsible for our discipline, particularly when professionalism in teaching demands that we be receptive to emerging ideas.
9. Mike reported that he and Paula had introduced the change in the Board report to one page. President Israel took it to the Board. There, the members indicated interest but tabled the proposal for now. He also encouraged the faculty to remain engaged and to list all activities on their year-end evaluations. COE has asked if a COE member could meet with the Board committee when they discussed the proposed one-page Board Report.

**B. All College Council** – Lynn Jones: first meeting is next month.

**C. Curriculum Advisory Board** – Tom Ottinger is chair. Judi Wohead reported that CAB will meet twice a month this year and will be charged with core review, SLOs, core compliance, and mandated core objectives. Discipline leads will have a meeting in September, and the SLOs will be due October 5. Amina asked if the discipline lead would supply the SLO information. Judi responded that sociology had, as a group, decided on SLOs. Judi said this model could work as an example. Each discipline should decide what SLOs to use.

**D. SOBI** – John Glass: nothing to report. Meeting is in two weeks.

## **X. President's Report**

**A.** Faculty Council Scholarship Recipients

- i. Simei Le
- ii. Alicia D. Frey
- iii. Antoinette I. Fisher
- iv. Jenna Starr
- i. Erica L. Winters

**B.** Board Report – Spoke about one-page board report. Hopes we'll have something definitive by the end of the year. COE will get back with the Faculty Council.

**C.** SACS – Advised faculty to try to get on the committees. We need faculty involvement. Urged efforts.

**D.** Wage increase – 3.5 % raise.

**E.** Tuition Increase – Approved \$3 per semester hour in the spring, \$5 for out-of-county. There was also a decrease in the tax rate for Collin County. In contrast, Dallas approved a \$5 increase and another increase in three years, along with a tax rate increase. Dallas citizens are irate.

**F.** Shared Governance – President Cohick talked with President Israel about shared governance, and they agreed that a faculty group of four would meet with President Israel to decide on that role. His people will meet in Nov. to discuss shared governance, then the two bodies will get together. The objective: have faculty involved before decisions are made.

**G.** Systematic faculty advising – The term, part of the strategic plan, states that faculty will be part of the advising process. President Cohick advocates that a faculty member be part of advising within his or her area of expertise. The CPC pilot advising effort did not work when faculty had to address questions outside their area of expertise. President Cohick will work with Student Development to figure out a way for faculty to volunteer to spend time as advisors within our discipline focus. President Cohick added that he is working on a solution to the problem. He will report back with results.

**H.** Certifying rosters – President Cohick alerted us that we have to certify students next week. Reason: financial aid issues. This step is designed to help the college

avoid losing up to \$850,000 (the amount lost last year) in the future. Monday is the deadline. One faculty member announced that DE is piloting an administrative withdrawal this semester. They will drop students who miss 20% of class in a certain period of time. Some added that such a policy would be ideal for online classes.

**XI. Old Business**

Upward evaluations: As a result of a resolution, an ad hoc committee was formed, although the named chair, Tanya McMillan, has resigned. President Cohick asked for a volunteer to chair. Tiffany Harper “volunteered” and will head the committee.

**XII. New Business**

**A.** Bryan Rasmussen will be parliamentarian again. He set out some basic rules and urged members to voice concerns, but he asked that professors send an e-mail to President Cohick if they want to contribute so as to keep the meeting on track. We need to respect the process.

**B.** The question of COAT was raised, and the chair said there would be a three-year rotation and replacement. She asked for volunteers to serve on COAT.

**XIII. Next Council Meeting** – September 28, 2012. CHEC, after the President’s luncheon on the patio.

**VII. Adjournment.** President Cohick adjourned the meeting at 2:30 PM.

Minutes submitted by: Peggy Brown

Preliminary approval of the minutes by: Mike Cohick

Final approval of the minutes on:

## **Appendix A – Resolution presented in the Spring, 2012**

### Resolution

The Faculty Council's Committee on Academic Freedom resolves that the Council create and administer an annual upward evaluation document for all administrators (Deans, Provosts, Vice-Presidents, Associate Vice-Presidents and the President). The Faculty Council would conduct the evaluation each spring semester, resulting in an annual summary report. The Faculty Council would then submit this summary report to all full-time faculty and provide a copy to relevant college administrators.

### Process

The upward evaluation instrument would receive review for content and organization, based on both the design of previous institutional surveys and current full-time faculty input. After such review and revision, the Faculty Council would vote to accept, reject, or further revise the upward evaluation instrument.

### Outcomes

The upward evaluation instrument further ensures that the college administration and faculty work more closely together to maintain a successful and dynamic academic environment for students and that the college practices the core values and meets all SACs requirements.

### **Suggestions received:**

#### Purpose

The purpose of an upward evaluation process is to enhance communication and development. Integration of a two-way evaluation system that affords feedback from faculty to administrators offers a three-fold value: opens communication between faculty and administration, provides administrators with input on how they are doing and areas where they might improve, and demonstrates that faculty opinions matter and thus, may be used to positively shape the college environment.

Addressing the process:

I think the proposed "summary document" for evaluations of administrators should be distributed in a comparable manner. The administrator and his/her supervisor should certainly review them, and I would like to have a limited set of faculty (perhaps Faculty Council) also view them. Please note, however, that even allowing the Faculty Council to review them is more extensive than what is done for student evaluations of faculty.