

Collin College Faculty Council
CHEC 139
May 6, 2016

1. **Lunch 12:30 p.m.**
2. **Call to Order at 1:00 p.m.**
3. **Roll Call – absences and proxies noted:**

Executive Council

President: Regina Hughes
Vice President: Amina El-Ashmawy
Treasurer: Kay Mizell
Secretary: Peggy Brown

Central Park

Cindy Briggs (15-17)	Absent
Tiffany Cartwright (14-16)	
Gina Perkins (15-17)	Absent
Kelly Reynolds (15-17)	

Preston Ridge

George Jackson (15-17)
Nick Morgan (14-16)
Kim Nyman (14-16)
Lupita Tinnen (15-17)
Kat Balch (15-17)

Spring Creek

Betsy Brody (14-16)	
Peggy Brown (14-16)	
Mike Cohick (14-16)	
Chris Grooms (15-17)	
Tony Howard (15-17)	
Joan Jenkins (15-17)	
Barbara Lusk Stern (15-17)	
Paula Miller (14-16)	Michael Phillips, proxy
Kay Mizell (14-16)	

Associate Faculty

Ashok Kumar (14-16)	Absent
---------------------	--------

4. **Approval of April Minutes:** Professor El-Ashmawy moved and Professor Balch seconded to approve the minutes. Unanimous approval by the FC. Minutes stand approved.

5. **Treasurer's Report:**

Scholarship fund for 2016:	\$8,444.00
Sunshine Fund:	\$167.00
Collected	184.00
Disbursed for gifts	(260.00)
Sunshine Fund Balance:	\$ 91.00

6. **Vice President's Report:** Amina El-Ashmawy.

- CFO Ken Lynn approved an increase in the FC budget for the year ending in August and added the same amount to the budget for 2016-17.
- Campus meetings by the FC president and vice president are scheduled for August 16 and 17, 2016 and January 10 and 11, 2017. Meeting schedule is posted on the Faculty Council website.

7. **President's Report:** Regina Hughes

- Update on the LMS: Canvas was selected to replace Blackboard.
 - User accounts number 1396, and 381 users have logged in—President Hughes encouraged faculty to log in to familiarize themselves with the new LMS that will be the system in place at the beginning of the fall semester. There will be no Blackboard shells for the fall; the contract with Blackboard ends on September 31, and all courses now loaded on Blackboard will be gone.
 - Download courses off of Blackboard now.
 - 266 faculty attended training, and ELC appreciates the faculty's involvement.
 - 1800 sandboxes (practice courses) have been opened.
 - 4300 course shells have been created for Fall 2016 and are now available. If you don't see your fall courses when you login to Canvas, contact Web Services.
 - Services offered by Canvas are more than those offered by Blackboard.
 - Clean-up workshops and Canvas training tutorials and workshops will be conducted from May through August.
- For the problem of college announcements going into the clutter mailbox, Hughes alerted the faculty as to how to disable this automatic function by changing the settings. The eLC will help.
- **BOT Report**
 - The April BOT (Board of Trustees) meeting was rescheduled to May 3.
 - A new Collin College Vision Statement was approved: "Delivering a brighter future for our students and communities."

- A sabbatical was approved for Professor Larry Stern (SP2017). The title: *Robert K Merton: The Pursuit of Social Justice and the Production of Knowledge*.
 - The next BOT meeting is May 24.
8. **Committee Reports: See Appendices for detailed committee reports.**
- **Committee on Technology** – Andrea Szlachowski, Raja Khoury, Mervat Karout, Co-Chairs: Report submitted as attachment.
 - **Committee on Policy** – Nick Morgan, Chair.
 - Lee Struble travels among universities to work out problems with implementation of the new guns-on-campus law. He has been hired by the college as a consultant to help us navigate through this process and comply with legislation.
 - Phones can now be used as a “panic button.” Morgan will provide a report on his committee’s findings.
 - **Committee for the Common Good** -Toni McMillen and Kat Balch, Co-Chairs.
 - Annual report submitted.
 - **Committee on Faculty Council Procedures and Nominations** – Dan Lipscomb, Chair.
 - Elections were held for FC positions for the upcoming year.
 - Regina Hughes was unanimously elected President for a second term.
 - Amina El-Ashmawy was unanimously elected Vice President for a second term.
 - Kelly Reynolds was unanimously elected Secretary.
 - Kat Balch was unanimously elected Treasurer.
 - **Committee on Teaching and Learning** – Marti Rosenfield, Chair
 - Hughes commended the Committee and recognized the importance of this organizational work.
 - Kelly Martin announced the Summer Institute for Learning Subcommittee activities. There will be three sessions in Summer I and three sessions in Summer II for faculty to attend.
 - **Committee on Academic Freedom** – Joan Jenkins, Chair – No report.
 - **Committee on Associate Faculty** – Ashok Kumar, Chair – No report.
 - **Committee for the Common Good:** Toni McMillan, Chair
 - The committee prepared narratives and presented them in a ceremony honoring all faculty members who will retire before September, 2016:
 - **Kathleen Mixson**, Professor of Nursing (14 years)
 - **Warner Richeson**, Professor of CAD (17 years)
 - **Shirley Terrell**, Professor of ESL (19 years)

- **Bill Blitt**, Dean of Academic Affairs (21 years)
- **Mary Milford**, Professor of Real Estate (26 years)
- **Cathy Cotter Smith**, Professor of Art (31 years)
- **Tom Mobley**, Professor of Math (19 years)

10. District Committees

- **All College Council** – TBD – No report.
- **Council on Excellence** – Mindi Bailey, Chair.
 - Peggy Brown reported that COE has determined the finalists for Professor of the Year. They were recognized at the BOT meeting on May 3. They are Selena Brody, Emily Henderson, Sherry Rhodes, Greg Sherman, and Jerry Smith
- **COAT** – Mike McConachie, Co-chair
 - No Report
- **SOBI** – Gian Aryani
 - No report

11. New Business:

- Hughes: Next FC meeting will be on August 26 at CHEC.
- Presentation: gifts of appreciation
- New faculty will be honored at a dessert reception in September.

12. Motion to Adjourn: Professor Howard moved and Professor Balch seconded that the meeting be adjourned. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Peggy Brown, Secretary

Minutes approved: Faculty Council President Regina M. Hughes 7/2/2016

APPENDIX A: Committee and Subcommittee Reports



Faculty Council Special Committee on Distance Learning

2015-2016 End of Year Review

- **Charge of Committee:** Examine all facets of Distance Learning at Collin College. Make recommendations regarding the Learning Management System, quality assurance as well as current and new markets.
- **Members:**
 - Kimberly Harris, CPC, Chair, Music, OAB
 - Martha Tolleson, CPC, English
 - Pat Pierson, CPC, Health Sciences, OAB
 - Rich De Rouen, CPC, Humanities, OAB
 - Shawna Masters, CPC, Math, OAB
 - Amber Allen, CPC, Polysomnography, OAB

 - Meredith Wang, SCC, Communications, OAB
 - Deborah Cardenas, SCC, Biology, OAB
 - Millie Black, SCC, Government
 - Steve Stallings, SCC, Psychology, OAB
 - Rosemary Karr, SCC, Dev. Math
 - Mark Garcia, SCC, Biology

 - Mindi Bailey, PRC, Humanities
 - Elizabeth Pannell, PRC, Workforce, OAB
 - Aaron West, PRC, Music, OAB
 - Brett Adams, PRC, History, OAB
 - Kelly Putnam, PRC, PE, OAB
 - Andrea Szlachtowski, PRC, Tech

 - Regina Hughes, Faculty Council President
 - Amina El-Ashmawy, Faculty Council Vice President
- **Face-to-Face Meetings:**
 - Thursday, October 8, 2015 4:15 PM-5:15 PM, CHEC -407
 - Friday, October 16, 2015 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM, CHEC – 223
 - Friday, November 6, 2015 2:00 PM -5:00 PM, CHEC – 407
 - Tuesday, January 12, 2016 All day, CHEC Board Room (Vendor Presentations)
 - Thursday, January 21, 2016 -3:00 PM – 4:30 PM, CHEC – 407
 - Friday, April 22, 2016 12:00-5:00, Off campus

- **Sub-committees and work completed through email:**

The committee consists of three campus-based sub-committees. The committee and sub-committees completed a great amount of work through email. Most of this work centered on the Learning Management System (LMS).

- **LMS:**

LMS vendors gave presentations during Faculty Development Week. Presentations were open to all faculty. The LMS sub-committee created a series of questions and scenarios for the vendors. The sessions were recorded and made available to all faculty. The eLC distributed a survey asking faculty preference of LMS. Canvas received an overwhelming majority of votes. The committee then made the recommendation to move from Blackboard to Canvas. The BOT adopted Canvas at their April meeting. Much work is being done to get Canvas up and running with all of the amenities the committee requested. Currently, faculty have access to a “Sandbox.” Canvas course shells are forth-coming.

- **Quality Assurance:**

The committee continues to discuss quality assurance. Discussions have included, incentives, faculty load, experience, and professional development in the form of a “Virtual Teaching Institute.” The committee requested that class observations and peer-reviews be included in any course evaluation. Faculty engagement in the “plug-n-play” (courses that rely heavily on publisher’s materials) have also been discussed. The committee agrees that most Collin faculty work diligently in order to make publisher materials suitable for specific learning outcomes.

- **Current & New Markets:**

Distance Learning continues to grow at a rate much higher than other modalities. The committee continues to look at the best ways to expand in this area while continuing to offer excellent, rigorous and engaging online courses.

Report submitted by Kimberly C. Harris, Chair – May 1, 2016

Summer Faculty Institute Subcommittee

Minutes from April 8, 2016 meeting from Kelly Martin, Chair

Members in Attendance:

Julia
Sukanaya
Sudha
Sharon
Kelly

General theme of the meeting: collaborating with eCollin to offer summer sessions related to Canvas training and workshops.

Some recommendations of the committee:

- Design a survey for faculty to complete; the survey will focus on faculty needs as related to training sessions. For example, the survey might ask faculty for which features of Canvas they would like to have devoted workshops, i.e., a workshop on working with PowerPoints, so forth.
- Intermix Canvas sessions throughout Summer I and Summer II—offer sessions at various times throughout the day and the week.
 - Throughout the summer, offer Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced sessions
 - Continue to offer course-build sessions/workshops into June and July
- Faculty Summer Inst. committee members will collaborate with eCollin to help faculty during training sessions/workshops.
 - Early training for to help assist eCollin members during summer training sessions.
- Offer an *in-person* session/workshop that only explores the differences between Canvas and Blackboard and explores the unique features of Canvas.
- Sessions for special features/tools (creating and/or uploading media, working with discussion threads, copying/creating quizzes; using the canvas grade book; PowerPoints).

- Canvas course-building boot camps: other trained faculty and eCollin team members will further assist faculty in building their courses (there would be dedicated spaces and computers for faculty to use). These boot camps would be in addition to the two-hour sessions co-sponsored by eCollin and the Summer Institute.
- ****Recommendation for Faculty Council: post instructions, perhaps through the eCollin website and/or a new channel in CougarWeb about how to disable clutter and junk email.

Ad Hoc Committee on Large Group Instruction

The purpose of this report is to present the work completed by an ad hoc committee primarily tasked with an analysis of a large group instruction (LGI) compensation proposal put forward by Deans Hardesty, Hodge, and Neal. This committee included the following faculty: Joshua Arduengo (chair), Lynn Jones, Keith Volanto, Rebecca Orr, and Carroll Bottoms. The committee completed the following work:

- Meet via email in November, 2015 to discuss our task for evaluating the LGI compensation proposal.
- Gathered thoughts, Ideas and suggestions on the proposal from 5 LG instructors.
- Joshua Arduengo generated an amended version of the original LGI compensation proposal and gave all participating faculty 2 weeks to read and comment on the proposal.
- Joshua Arduengo modified the proposal as needed to the satisfaction of the committee.
- On December 3rd, 2015, the committee submitted its recommendations via email to Dean Gary Hodge and Faculty Council President Regina Hughes.

The LGI proposal submitted to the Deans and Faculty Council President is included immediately below. Note: This is not the final proposal. *The final LGI compensation agreement is included at the end of this document.*

The LGI compensation ad-hoc committee, tasked with evaluating a proposal by Deans Hardesty, Hodge, and Neal, met, via email, and exchanged ideas on how to fairly compensate instructors in the LGI format. What follows are recommendations by this committee, synthesized from individual member recommendations, regarding three aspects of LGI: 1) the compensation proposal, 2) expectations the committee insists should be stressed to any LGI instructor, and 3) suggestions for a venue change for the LGI sections at the Spring Creek Campus.

Should the Dean of Academic Affairs leading a division designate a course section for large-group instruction, compensation for that course would be warranted according to the following schedule (assuming a 3-contact hour course):

- 0-35 students – 1 section = 20% of load
- 36-49 students – 1.5 sections = 30% of load*
- 50-70 students – 2 sections = 40% of load

- 1) The committee proposes that the compensation structure, as originally proposed by the Deans, should be changed for at least three reasons:
 - a.) This committee feels that going above 70 students in any LGI section would compromise the educational goals put forth by Collin College, such as keeping class sizes small and maintaining a high level of one-on-one student-instructor interaction.

- b.) Two committee members that are teaching in disciplines outside of Social and Behavioral Sciences were asked to teach in the LGI format, but the section had as few as 45 students and the instructor was compensated at only 1 section or 20% of load. The committee proposes that such compensation is unfair to instructors, such as those teaching Biology, because no instructor in Social and Behavioral Sciences, a division in which most classes are capped at 35, would overload a section by 10 students with no additional compensation. There should be some incentive for attempting the LGI format and going above the traditional class sizes.

Additionally, LGI classes in the Social and Behavioral Sciences division have historically been no smaller, on average, than 51 students. Therefore, while it would appear that an instructor with only 36 students is unfairly and overly compensated for that 1 extra student above 35 students, such a scenario is highly unlikely to happen regardless of discipline.

Finally, there are always going to be instances in which inequity exists. Our aim is to reduce inequity to the smallest amount possible. Given that learning communities, which run at 40% of an instructor's load, have recently run with as few as 12 students, this committee feels that the perceived amount of inequity in 1.5 sections at 36 or so students is, in reality, rather small and acceptable.

- c.) LGI compensation at 2 sections should be made commensurate with compensation for online courses. Currently, online sections are considered a double section at 50 students. While online courses come with a significantly greater amount of grading and assignment management than traditional face-to-face classes, online classes do not require 'classroom presence and command'. Additionally, 15 students constitutes a section and we propose that 50 students is in effect 2 viable sections and thus deserving of 2 credits.

2) Expectations that should be stressed to all LG instructors teaching in this format: The general expectation for LGI sections is that instructors will treat those sections the same as individual sections capped at 35 or fewer students in terms of:

- a.) standards of scholarship
- Instructors are expected to require their LGI students to engage in careful study of course material. The LGI format tends to lean towards online quizzes, multiple choice assessments, and a lecture-heavy instruction format. LGI

instructors must engage the LGI students, whenever feasible, as if they were no different from students in smaller sections.

b.) standards of assessment

- Instructors are expected to continue their dedication to improving student's writing across the curriculum. LGI sections, especially those in the Social and Behavioral Sciences division, should have the same standards for writing as smaller, more traditionally-sized sections. Writing assessments come in various forms depending on the discipline, and, in the interest of academic freedom, the committee leaves it up to the instructor to decide the nature of their writing assessments. However, the committee stresses that the expectation for writing and critical reflection remains. Having multiple choice tests as the only assessment method, while not prohibited based on academic freedom, is considered minimal and unable to meet all of the goals of academic scholarship, especially effective communication skills.

c.) standards of classroom management

- Students become easily distracted in lecture-heavy instructional formats for many reasons. It is imperative that the LGI instructors be strong in classroom management and be capable of commanding the classroom. This trait becomes especially necessary when instructors step outside of the lecture format and engage students in discussion or small group activities, which is entirely *within* the realm of possibility for the LGI format. Additionally, students must be required to follow required standards of conduct, as outlined by the student code of conduct, and the instructor must be able to enforce these standards.

3) Specific to the LGI classroom on the Spring Creek Campus, L201:

This room is unfit for large group instruction. Originally, it was designed to be two classrooms and the dividing wall was simply removed. L201 is too wide for being only one level causing students problems in being able to see the entire projector screen. With every student seated at the same height, sight-lines for students at the back of L201 become blocked by the student's bodies in front of them. L201 also makes classroom management more difficult than it should be. If the room were constructed similar to classrooms

that are designed for a large number of students, i.e., graduated seating and one screen or focus point, these problems would be minimal. Rooms C103 and C104 at the Spring Creek Campus are designed more appropriately for LGI as they have graduated seating and would hold no more than 70 students; however, when asked, every instructor that has taught in C103 or C104 mentioned the poor acoustic and light quality. Often, students seated in the back get lost due to echo and low lighting. This committee proposes that we put up the wall that was originally intended for L201, making it into 2 classrooms, and renovate C103 and C104 such that the acoustics and lighting do not interfere with effective teaching and learning. One committee member expressed a desire to convert L201 into a collaborative learning classroom and the idea has the full support of this committee. Perhaps this suggestion is a great candidate for an Innovation Grant proposal. Until such changes can be made, L201 will have to suffice.

*Figure 1 (below) includes the average number of students per LGI section for the past 9 semesters in the Social and Behavioral Sciences division on the Spring Creek Campus. Out of 45 total sections, the average enrollment was always above 50 students. It would be rare for an LGI section to go below 50, but if one were to fall below 50, history suggests that the section would likely be closer to 50 than 35. Therefore, while compensation of 30% of load for 36 seems unfair, it is extremely unlikely to occur. Additionally, LGI instructors in disciplines other than Psychology, History, and Government are being asked to teach sections with 40-50 students in them, but are only being compensated for 1 section or 20% of their load.

COURSE	FALL 2011	SPRING 2012	FALL 2012	SPRING 2013	FALL 2013	SPRING 2014	FALL 2014	SPRING 2015	FALL 2015
GOVT 2301	n/a	n/a	n/a	87	59	75.5	58	70.5	89
HIST 1301	n/a	n/a	n/a	54	53	74	51	65	88
PSYC 2301	57	60	64	60.25	65	75.2	58.66667	56	87

Committee Members:
 Joshua Arduengo, Chair
 Rebecca Orr
 Lynn Jones
 Keith Volanto
 Carroll Bottoms

Final LGI compensation agreement – January 22, 2016

Deans Recommendation for Large Group Instruction (LGI) classes:

- 1.) To be eligible for LGI compensation, a course must be taught face-to-face by one faculty member, and a single section of the course should have a cap of no less than 30 students. (Face-to-face courses capped at less than 30 are not eligible for LGI.)

Online courses are NOT eligible for LGI compensation. Team taught courses are not eligible for LGI compensation).

2.) Load Progression based on student enrollment:

a) 30-40 students = 1 section = 20% of load (assuming a 3 contact hour course)

b) 41-55 students = 1.5 sections = 30% of load

c) 56-70 students = 2 sections = 40% of load

3.) Individual class meetings with more than 70 students per instructor are viewed as inconsistent with the Collin College experience.

Additional comments:

1. LGI classes at the Spring Creek Campus will be scheduled in C103 and C104.

Faculty concerns related to lighting and acoustics in these rooms will be addressed.

2. If a faculty member agrees to teach a section for 30% of load as part of their regular load, we recommend that it be possible that the additional 10% of load (1/2 section or 1.5 instructional units) be compensated as overload pay (i.e. Associate Faculty Pay Rate) using (effectively) the same procedure in faculty load that we use to pay faculty members for more than 25 students in an online class. This is recommended so as not to discourage faculty members from taking a chance with teaching an LGI class.

Collin College Faculty Council

Year End Report 2015-2016

Committee: College Policy

Submitted by: Nick Morgan

Last Meeting Date: In-person as a group November 20, 2015 and online thereafter.

Active Members: These members attended the last meeting or gave committee update to FC. Other members were active in the working sub-groups:

Joshua Arduengo	Kat Balch	Joe Janyes
Charlene Green	Kimberly Head	Lorena Rodriquez
Nancy Megarity	Mary Owen	Aaron West
Jerry Smith	Andrea Szlachtowski	Rachel Bzostek
Giant Aryani	Pete Brierley	Survey
Karen Hanvey	Audra Heaslip	Susan Kamath
Nick Morgan	Michael Phillips	Marti Rosenfield
Jerry Sullivan	Linda Thompson	Lee DeBoer
Michael Baker	Mike Broyles	Kathleen Kayes-Wandover
Jessica Hargis	Sharon Hirschy	Diana Sage
Kim Nyman	Charles Ring	John Glass
Alaya Swann	Dean Wallace	Meredith Martin
	Laura Bucila	Diane Schull

Summary of Discussions/Activities:

- A. This major work of this committee was the subcommittee on the issue of Campus Carry and Campus Safety. A request for committee members yielded 36 members. Nine working groups were formed to cover the issues from a faculty perspective.
- B. The working group Concealed Handgun Policy for Faculty is led by Aaron West. Consolidated information from other working groups and made policy recommendations to the FC.
- C. The working group Syllabus Statement is led by Alaya Swann: A draft statement was created, edited, presented and approved to the full FC.
- D. The working group Faculty Coordination with First Responders led by Nancy Megarity. Met with the new Chief of Campus Police and continues to coordinate with Campus Law enforcement
- E. The working group Legislative Intent led by Giant Aryani. Created and presented an extensive report on legislative intent of the Campus Carry law. The results are reflected in the committee recommendations.

- F. The working group Proposed Restricted/Gun Free Zones led by Michael Phillips. Gathered information and draft policies from other colleges and universities. This research forms the basis of the committee recommendations.
- G. The working group Faculty Survey led by Rachel Bozstek: Created, edited and submitted a proposed survey to FC which was approved. Upon consultation with District Leadership, the decision was made to convert the survey to a district-wide survey rather than to faculty only.
- H. The working group Safety: Building Information & Room Number in Classroom led by Kat Balch crafted recommended policies regarding interior signage for each room in the district.
- I. The working group Safety: Classroom Door Locks led by Meredith Richards Martin created a list of recommendations forwarded to District Leadership.
- J. The working group Safety: Panic button in Classroom led by Karen Hanvey created several hardware and software safety concepts. It was determined by the security review that the existing phone systems could be programed with a single button warning system.
- K. On 4/23/16 met with FC President Regina Hughes, FC VP Amina Khalifa El-Ashmawy, Committee Chair Nick Morgan, President Neil Matkin, Executive VP Brenda Kihl, and VP Lisa Vasquez and covered the following items:
 - 1) Recommended formation of a district-wide working group for Campus Carry/Safety Policy
 - 2) President Matkin recommended that a safety consultant to conduct a week-long, district-wide review to make recommendations On April 28, the consultant presented some of his preliminary results to several members of the committee.
 - 3) Discussion of gun-free zones: child care center, counseling/mental health areas, employee grievance meetings, faculty grievance meetings, labs with radioactive materials, sporting events, student conduct hearings, and testing centers. Most of the recent university policies have focused on gun-free zones with the majority of the zones not directly dealing with faculty.
 - 4) The recommendations of the safety working group regarding classroom signage are under review. This may be combined with other emergency situation information (weather, threat, fire) into a poster with includes the building and room information. A poster method would make information easier to update and distribute across the district.
 - 5) The recommendations regarding panic buttons in the classroom may be combined with enhanced device interactive applications. The idea is to move the panic button to portable devices which would have wider uses in more situations. This idea was later supplanted by the security review.
 - 6) There was discussion about Collin adopting a Campus Carry policy sooner rather than later. The Texas Tech policy is an indication of the institutional limits in policy formation. There was input that Collin adopting a policy ahead of the community college curve would yield benefits to our institution. Therefore there should be consideration for the early policy adoption to obtain potential long-term benefits given the mandatory nature of the campus carry requirement and the apparently ever shrinking set of institutional policy options. The thinking is there is little downside to early adoption and a larger potential upside in being the state community college leader.
 - 7) The survey instrument was reviewed again and will likely be used a basis for a district-wide survey administered by the administration. There was additional discussion about anonymous vs non-anonymous survey administration. It was pointed out that a current

survey was offered up as anonymous. The current position is that the Campus Carry/Safety survey will not be anonymous.

Summary of Action Items:

- A. Committee was created and organized to generate recommended policies concerning the implementation of the Campus Carry legislation. Committee members included FC members, full and part time faculty members.
- B. A draft Syllabus Statement and draft Survey instrument were created and approved by FC.
- C. Draft polices of other Texas colleges and universities were reviewed and formed the basis for committee recommendations.
- D. After meeting with District Leadership, it was recommended that the Campus Carry portion of the FC committee become part of a larger district-wide policy task force.
- E. Members of the committee met with security consultant to provide faculty perspective on both Campus Carry and Safety issues.
- F. The Safety issues will remain in the FC committee and continue to recommend policy enhancements.

Collin College Faculty Council

April 2016 Year-End Summary Report

Committee: Procedures and Nominations

Submitted by: Dan Lipscomb

Last Meeting Date: (list date of last physical meeting or the dates of e-discussions)

- No physical meetings occurred for April 2016.
- e-discussions occurred as needed throughout the month.

Active Members: (in order of last name, list all members who attended meeting and/or contributed to work listed in this report)

- Peggy Breedlove
- Amina El-Ashmawy
- Laura Hicks
- Dan Lipscomb
- Sammer Tekarli

Summary of Discussions/Activities: (list the current items your committee is addressing, status update on those items, action items completed, any subcommittee work, person(s) responsible for each action item, etc.)

A. August 2015

1. The committee discussed a number of needed changes and updates to the FC procedures manual.

B. September 2015

1. Documents needed to perform the annual assessment of proportionality of representatives by campus were requested from HR and secured. The analysis was completed and prepared for presentation at the October 2015 meeting.
2. The committee engaged in a series of lengthy email discussions regarding needed changes and updates to the procedures manual. Most of the proposed changes were necessary to reflect the continually evolving duties performed by FC officers and campus representatives, as well as changes regarding standard proceedings for FC meetings.
3. The committee chair investigated options for moving the FC election from the current email ballot format to a fully automated digital ballot format.

C. October 2015

1. At the October 23 meeting, a report on the proportionality of representatives by campus was presented. With the current 18 member council, the proportionality of representation by campus was found to be within an acceptable range, and largely unchanged from the previous year. In response to a question at the August 2016 meeting regarding possibly expanding the number of campus representatives, additional information was presented with scenarios for a 20, 22, 24 and 25 member council. Of the four alternative potential council configurations presented, the 25 member council scenario yielded the best overall balance in proportional representation by campus.
2. Eleven proposed updates to the procedures manual were presented for consideration at the October 23 meeting. The proposed edits dealt with such issues as the roles and duties of officers, the role of the immediate past president as ex-officio, how vacant representative seats will be filled, how votes on motions will take place in meetings, and how meeting dates and times should appear in the manual, and who is eligible to attend FC meetings. With one exception, the proposed updates were approved by the council. A proposed change in wording regarding the role of the immediate past president as ex-officio generated a lengthy discussion, was not approved, was eventually tabled and returned to the Procedures Committee for further discussion and recommendation.
3. At the October 23 meeting, details regarding the possible use of a fully digital ballot format for the FC election were presented. The ballot would be issued using the Snap Survey app, a secure email invitation ballot format administered by the Collin Institutional Research staff. The council discussed the proposal, and voted to approve moving forward with the new electronic ballot format for the 2016 election.

D. November 2015

1. The committee discussed options on how to reword the procedures manual statement regarding the role of the immediate past president as ex-officio. Several options were discussed and refined by the committee and presented at the November 20 meeting. Following a lengthy discussion and several potential edits to the options presented, one of the original suggested options [B2] was approved by the council.
2. The chair provided information on proportionality of representation by campus to a campus representative in preparation for a motion to expand the number of campus representatives. The motion to expand the council from 18 to 25 campus representatives was presented at the November 20 meeting, and after some discussion, was approved by the council.

E. December 2015

1. The chair (also serving as Election Judge) met with representatives from Institutional Research to begin the process of moving to the electronic ballot format for the spring 2016 election.

F. January 2016

1. The committee discussed options for phasing in the additional 7 new campus representatives while maintaining a staggered balance of candidates on each campus ballot per year. Two main options were presented at the January 22 meeting. The issue was returned to the council for further discussion.
2. In early January 2016, updates to the procedures manual approved at the October and November 2015 meetings were forwarded to the FC webmaster. The webmaster incorporated the approved edits and the updated manual was posted to the FC website.

G. February 2016

1. The committee discussed possibility of moving up the dates for both the self-nomination process for officers and campus representatives, and also the dates for the election, in order to allow more time in April and May for the newly elected executive committee to integrate and take over in June. Moving the election up would also help avoid an overlap with the Council on Excellence election in April.
2. At the February 19 meeting, the chair proposed shifting the nomination period for officers and campus representatives to open no later than February 20 and continue through no later than March 15, and the election to begin no later than March 18 and end no later than April 1. The proposed changes to be reflected in the procedures manual were discussed by the council and approved.
3. Following a committee discussion of the issue, at the February 19 meeting, the chair proposed a rationale for phasing-in the additional 7 new campus representatives while maintaining a staggered balance of candidates on campus ballots each year. The proposal was to elect all 7 new members this year, but in order to achieve a balance of candidates on the ballot for subsequent years, newly elected representatives would draw lots to determine which two of the elected SCC representatives and one of the elected PRC representatives would serve one-year terms in order to achieve an appropriate staggered balance of candidates on campus ballots in subsequent years. The proposal was discussed, voted on and approved by the council.

H. March 2016

1. Final preparations for the 2016 election and shift to the new electronic balloting format were made. Following the close of nominations, there was one candidate for president, one candidate for vice president, 6 candidates for the 3 open CPC seats, 10 candidates for the 5 open PRC

- seats, but just 8 candidates for the 8 open SCC seats. The issue of only 8 SCC candidates for 8 open seats was presented for discussion at the March 18 meeting. The council discussed the issue and confirmed by motion and vote that there was no need to reopen the self-nomination process, and that the 8 who opted into the election would be considered elected by acclamation. While there were no contested races on the SCC ballot, it was recommended by the committee chair / election judge to distribute the SCC ballots as a matter of record. This recommendation was not voted on but received informal support from council members.
2. Election ballots for full-time faculty were distributed via email invitations on Tuesday March 22. Reminder messages were sent to those who had not yet cast votes on Monday March 28 and Thursday March 31. The ballot closed on Friday April 1 at 5:00 p.m. On Monday April 4, the Office of Institutional Research provided a formal report containing the election results to the election judge, and the report was forwarded to the FC executive committee. 58% of the full-time faculty voted in the election. Results of the election were reported to full-time faculty via email.
 3. Election ballots for the Associate Faculty representative were distributed on Tuesday March 22, and the ballot closed on Friday April 1. Six associate faculty opted into the election. Results of the associate faculty election were included in the report provided by IR on Monday April 4. Patricia Coble, who has taught with Collin for 18 years, was elected to a 2-year term as Associate Faculty representative on the council. The results of the election were reported to the associate faculty in an email message.

I. April 2016

1. In determining which of the newly elected campus representatives would serve the one-year phase-in terms, all were contacted and offer the option to choose a one-year term. Of the campus representatives elected for PRC, one opted to serve the one-year phase-in term and therefore it was not necessary do draw lots. Of the campus representatives elected for SCC, all 8 opted to draw lots to determine which would serve the one-year phase-in terms. A random number guessing process was used, and two of the eight were chosen to serve the one-year terms with the option of potentially serving two additional two-year terms if elected in subsequent elections.
2. An updated table detailing campus representatives serving on the 2016-17 council was sent to the FC webmaster in order to update the FC site for next year.

Summary of Action Items: (list action items current under way)

- A. In passing, some committee members also briefly discussed a question regarding proxy members filling in for elected members at monthly FC meetings. The procedures manual does not currently address a maximum number of meetings an elected campus representative may miss while sending a proxy to fill in. Next year, the committee will discuss proposing a maximum number of meetings an elected representative may miss using a

B. proxy representative.

Next Meeting Planned:

No meetings are planned at this time.

Collin College Faculty Council Year-end Report

Committee: Mindfulness and Well-Being

Submitted by: Marti Miles-Rosenfield

- Meeting Dates: (list date of last physical meeting)

01/08/2016 – Impromptu get together after Faculty Development Day

02/05/2016 – Face-to-face meeting

04/01/2016 – Face-to-face meeting

Email discussions – throughout the Spring 2016 semester

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 at 3:15 (SCC-room D-155)

Active Members: (in order of last name, list all members who attended meeting and/or contributed to work listed in this report)

Brooks, Jennifer

Evans, Susan

Goussack, Frozina

Harmon, Diana

Kearns, Shannon

Miles-Rosenfield, Marti

Moore, Marta

Muyyson, Linda

Pasani, Whitney

Ramsey, Traci

Rynbrandt, Ryan

Warren, Jenny

Letha Robinson will join the group at the May 11th meeting.

Linda Muyyson (requested to join the committee on 4/1/2016)

Summary of Discussions/Activities:

- Created a mission statement
- Created a LibGuide . Librarian Mindy Tomlin put the LibGuide under the discipline of psychology, but we are in the process of creating a new page and making it more visible to faculty, staff and students.

- For the past three months, some of our members have met for mindfulness/meditation sessions each week at SCC. A few students have joined us as well as two faculty members not affiliated with the group.
- We divided a list of tasks, research projects, etc... to members and will be collecting that information at our May 6th meeting.
- We set the date of June 1, 2016 as the deadline to complete/submit an Innovation Grant. We will not meet that deadline unless all the needed information is available. This information includes pricing for training for committee members and furniture and equipment/accessories for a designated space on campus.
- Jennifer O'Loughlin Brooks and Marti Miles-Rosenfield presented a session on Mindfulness at the January 2016 Faculty Development Day. This session was well-attended. **"Facilitating Mindfulness Practices: Cultivating Awareness, Attention, and Acceptance in the Classroom"**
- Jennifer O'Loughlin Brooks presented the same session on February 20th at the "What's What" Associate Faculty Development Day. **"Facilitating Mindfulness Practices: Cultivating Awareness, Attention, and Acceptance in the Classroom"**
- Marti Miles-Rosenfield presented "The Mindful Student" as a part of the Developmental Education Study Skills Seminar series. Approximately 20 students attended.
- Marti Miles-Rosenfield presented a session on Mindfulness to the Psi Beta student organization on Thursday evening, April 14th.
- We continue to move forward and gather resources. UT Austin 's new Mind Body Lab (website) provides great information, including a resource page for breathing and meditation exercises. UNT, UTD, SMU, and TWU all address the subject of mindfulness in various ways with an online presence.
- <https://cmhc.utexas.edu/mindbodylab.html>

Collin College Faculty Council
February 2016 Report

Committee: Trends in Legislation and Higher Education

Submitted by: Cindy Briggs

Last Meeting Date: February 28, 2016

Active Members: Cindy Briggs, Mary Sue Owen, Joe Jayness, Toni L. McMillen, Sally M. Hans, Alaya Swann, and Alena Miadzvedskay

Summary of Discussions/Activities: (list the current items your committee is addressing, status update on those items, action items completed, any subcommittee work, person(s) responsible for each action item, etc.)

J. Monitor the legislation at both the state and federal levels as well as current research in higher education in order to determine and report trends and developments effecting the community college.

Areas to Monitor:

- SACS (1 Volunteer)
- THECB (2 Volunteers)
- State Legislation (Joe; more volunteers wanted here)

Journals and Publications to Monitor:

- TEA
- NCTE
- NADE (Sally)
- NCTM (Alena)
- Inside Higher Ed. (Mary Sue)
- The Chronicle (Alaya)
- TCCTA Legislative Meetings (Toni; one more volunteer needed)
- Coordinating Board Updates
- State Capitol

Other Political Responses:

- Responses of other institutions
- White papers and responses
- Syllabi trend responses posted on the web

Repository for links or a collaborative space

- One Drive
- All of our reports are shared with faculty and what platform would be best for us

General Discussions on Current Topics:

- Dana Center for mathematics pathways
- Performance based funding
- Competency Based Courses

K.

Summary of Action Items: (list action items current under way)

C. Create OneDrive space to share documents with committee

D. Follow up with other members to have them sign up for area of research.

Next Meeting Planned: TBD

Collin College Faculty Council
April 2016 Report

Committee: Faculty Council Ad Hoc Student Code of Conduct

Submitted by: Cathy A. Donald-Whitney

Last Meeting Date: (list date of last physical meeting or the dates of e-discussions) 1-18-16

Active Members: (in order of last name, list all members who attended meeting and/or contributed to work listed in this report)

Committee members: Cathy Donald-Whitney & Kat Balch (Co-Chairs), Tiffany Cartwright, Mary Weis, Alaya Swann...

Summary of Discussions/Activities: (list the current items your committee is addressing, status update on those items, action items completed, any subcommittee work, person(s) responsible for each action item, etc.)

- A. Our initial charge was to review the student code of conduct 7.2.2, student handbook-we reviewed the student code of conduct section and made recommendation initially to FC. Post the FC meeting and discussion, we devised the final report sent to FC and Cheri Jack on 12-7-15.

Summary of Action Items: (list action items current under way)

- A. Final Report submitted to FC and Cheri Jack on 12-7-15 (included in this report, starts on page 2)

Next Meeting Planned: N.A. –We have completed our task as noted... **Please find a copy of the final report sent on 12-7-16 attached with this form**

FACULTY COUNCIL AD HOC
RECOMMENDATIONS
STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT
FALL 2015

Committee members: Cathy Donald-Whitney & Kat Balch (Co-Chairs), Tiffany Cartwright, Mary Weis, Alaya Swann...
Report by Cathy A. Donald-Whitney-12-7-15, Final Report

STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT SECTION 7-2.2

CURRENT: SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY SECTION:

7-2.2 Scholastic Dishonesty

Every member of the Collin College community is expected to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity. All work submitted for credit is expected to be the student's own work. Collin College may initiate disciplinary proceedings against a student accused of scholastic dishonesty. While specific examples are listed below, this is not an exhaustive list and scholastic dishonesty may encompass other conduct, including any conduct through electronic or computerized means. Scholastic dishonesty shall involve, but is not limited to, one or more of the following acts:

General Scholastic Dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, statements, acts, or omissions related to applications for enrollment, credit or class work, research, and/or the award of a degree; falsifying academic records; using annotated texts or teacher's editions; using information about exams posted on the Internet or in any electronic medium; leaving a test site without authority; and/or failing to secure test materials. Students are expected to record honestly and accurately the results of all their research. Falsification of research results includes misrepresentations, distortions, or omissions in data or reports on research.

Plagiarism is the use of an author's words or ideas as if they were one's own without giving credit to the source, including, but not limited to, failure to acknowledge a direct quotation or patchwriting, even when a source is cited. In the preparation of all papers and other written work, students must distinguish their own ideas and knowledge from information derived from other sources. The term "sources" includes not only published primary and secondary materials, but also information and opinions gained directly from other people. Whenever ideas or facts are derived from a source, the source must be indicated by the student.

Cheating is the willful giving or receiving of information in an unauthorized manner during an examination or to complete an assignment; collaborating with another student during an examination without authority; using, buying, selling, soliciting, stealing, or otherwise obtaining course assignments and/or examination questions in advance; unauthorized copying of computer or Internet files; using someone else's work for assignments as if it were one's own; submitting or resubmitting an assignment (in whole or in part) for more than one (1) class or institution without permission from the professor(s); or any other dishonest means of attempting to fulfill the requirements of a course.

Collusion is intentionally or unintentionally aiding or attempting to aid another in an act of scholastic dishonesty, including but not limited to, failing to secure academic work; providing a paper or project to another student; providing an inappropriate level of assistance or unauthorized collaboration; communicating answers to a classmate about an examination or any other course assignment; removing tests or answer sheets from a test site; and allowing a classmate to copy answers.

In cases where an incident report has been filed for an alleged violation of scholastic dishonesty, the faculty member is requested to delay posting a grade for the academic work in question until the case is final. Students found responsible for scholastic dishonesty offenses will receive an authorized disciplinary penalty or penalties from the Dean of Student Development Office. The student may also receive an academic penalty in the course where the scholastic dishonesty took place. The faculty member will determine the appropriate academic penalty.

Task/questions from Dean of Student Office:

1. Is the scholastic dishonesty policy meeting the needs of the institution?
2. If not (see #1), what does the group see missing?

Ad Hoc committee comments per specific sections:

- **Action Item**-Section: submitting or resubmitting an assignment (in whole or in part) for more than one (1) class or institution without permission from the professor(s); or any other dishonest means of attempting to fulfill the requirements of a course.
This section needs to be clarified. Are students required to get permission from one professor or both? Should students get permission from all instructors of the classes the student plans to use the paper?

Action Item-Section: plagiarism-Perhaps a clear and concise procedural statement would clarify the importance of faculty reporting cases of severe plagiarism... Thoughts about Faculty reporting (may not be something for this section of the student handbook but here are some thoughts-**For example should severe cases be reported to the Dean by the faculty member...? There was some debate regarding this as maybe being more**

appropriate in the Faculty Handbook.... Regina shared the following with the committee post the meeting where our initial thoughts were discussed with FC (addresses the issue of concern by some committee members that students need to be aware of the scope of consequences: **In this class, if any scholastic dishonesty is detected, the matter will be referred to the Dean of Students Office for further inquiry and disciplinary penalty. If the student is found responsible for academic dishonesty, the academic penalty can range from an automatic zero for that assignment to an automatic failure for this course.**

Procedural recommendation: The committee recommends that the Dean of Students staff be invited to a FC meeting to discuss the Dean of student procedures in handling student code of conduct violations. There is some concern by faculty regarding outcomes and lack of information etc_Regina has already contacted Terrance in this regards (Terrance is scheduled for the Jan 2016 FC meeting).

Lab Sub Committee Proposal Report

Committee: Faculty Council Lab Sub committee

Submitted by: Byrd Williams

Faculty Council Lab Sub Committee Spring 2016 Summary

In Fall of 2015, engaged faculty initiated an informal discussion regarding Laboratory operation, possible ergonomic management overview and faculty compensations for lab sections.

Smriti Anand, Peter Calvin, Gezahegn Chaka, Luz Escobar, Karen Hanvey, Fred Jury, Kathleen Kayes-Wandover, Bridgette Kirkpatrick, Elizabeth Mellott, Tanya Sanchez, Carole Twitchell, Vijaya Velamakanni and several other faculty members from a diverse sampling of disciplines across the county comprising a variety of lab types, confabbed to flesh out shared systemic issues.

We addressed the following:

- Official Laboratory Definition. Comprehensive parameters for inclusion into our recommendations. All Labs are not structured the same.
- Lab Management and Its Impact on the Quality of Labs and Student Learning
- Equity in Lab Compensation. Some are compensated at 1.0, some less such as .8
- A balanced recommendation for the design of an ergonomic laboratory management system that maximizes student educational advancements while *providing for faculty input*.
- Discussion of a system based on a *democratic faculty committee vote* where pertinent lab issues and classroom needs are discussed by full time faculty with input from adjuncts and then presented directly to lab personnel for scrutiny and implementation.
- Discussion of a hierarchy for management implementation.
- Discussion of a Lab staff evaluation system based on '*Qualitative vital signs*'
- Suggested an outline for a Lab staff evaluation instrument.
- Suggestion of equal faculty compensation for all laboratory professors of record that fit into the requisite laboratory parameters regarding
 1. Student supervision
 2. Face-to-face interaction
 3. Homework
 4. Grading
 5. Lab safety

The informal faculty group organized and formed this committee with the

intention of defining all systemic lab problems and making reasonable recommendations to supervisory administration that would provide a lab environment that maximizes student learning outcomes.

Our goal is to design an ergonomic laboratory management system that maximizes student educational advancements while providing for faculty input with quality control supplemented by traditional evaluation methods. In addition, faculty compensation was re-evaluated.

I want to stress that there are no individuals or particular positions that are directly responsible for the long-term inefficiencies. In the course of 3 decades, programs based around laboratory complexes have been through many different deans, staff manager/personnel configurations, multiple faculty generations and the same problems persist. The malady is systemic and based on inefficient management protocol and outdated compensation ratios.

The most detrimental aspect to efficiency is the present system for planning, managing and operating laboratory service for students and faculty. The lab staff manager answers to the Dean only which means everything from capital equipment/supply acquisitions to lab hours and operations is primarily between these two factions. There is token communication from faculty but evidence indicates a rapid erosion of order once staff realizes the intangibility of this connection.

It is a tattletale system and is not anybody's fault. If faculty needs something for class preparation, we are required to go to a Dean whose remote location and unfamiliarity with operations promotes unclear strategies and solutions. The lab manager is then called to the division office and told what the situation is (as if they are being called on the carpet). It never fails to engender a confrontational air to simple daily operations.

We want to suggest a system based on a democratic faculty committee vote where pertinent lab issues and classroom needs are discussed by full time faculty with input from adjuncts and then presented directly to lab personnel for scrutiny and implementation. Any disagreements or problems that cannot be worked out can then go up the chain to deans. Faculty is in the lab and classroom daily and indeed the educational outcomes are dependent on lab operations. Adequate input by a faculty contingency is crucial. Checks and balances will be provided by student/faculty evaluations.

Last Meeting Date:

February 5, 2016 met in BB128

Email correspondence/discussion:

February 8-12

February 15-19

22-26
May 2-4

Active Members:

Smriti Anand, Peter Calvin (absent), Gezahegn Chaka, Luz Escobar, Karen Hanvey (absent), Fred Jury, Kathleen Kayes-Wandover, Bridgette Kirkpatrick, Elizabeth Mellott (absent), Tanya Sanchez, Carole Twitchell, Vijaya Velamakanni

Summary of Discussions/Activities: (list the current items your committee is addressing, status update on those items, action items completed, any subcommittee work, person(s) responsible for each action item, etc.)

B. Define laboratory

C. Lab Management and Its Impact on the Quality of Labs and Student Learning

D. Equity in Lab Compensation

Summary of Action Items:

B. Definition:

A lab is a place for practice, observation, and/or testing, where either faculty or support staff directly supervise and help students apply course concepts with hands-on experience, materials, and equipment. It is a component of any courses described as laboratories or those that require a laboratory component.

C. Lab Management and Its Impact on the Quality of Labs and Student Learning:

The lab subcommittee recommendation is to design an ergonomic laboratory management system that maximizes student educational advancements while *providing for faculty input.*

The committee suggests a system based on a democratic faculty committee vote where pertinent lab issues and classroom needs are discussed by full time faculty with input from adjuncts and then presented directly to lab personnel for scrutiny and implementation.

This will require differentiating between labs with full time staff and management as opposed to those that have no supervisory personnel or merely student assistants. Our goal was to create a more efficient management system that would better address student-learning outcomes as defined by course curriculum. In other

words, large laboratory complexes are managed by an autonomous staff/manager who answers only to a Dean with little or no cross referencing with the people who actually are in contact with, and in control of, learning outcomes: the faculty. Any disagreements or problems that cannot be worked out can then go up the chain to deans. Faculty members are in the lab and classroom daily and, indeed, the educational outcomes are dependent on lab operations. Adequate input by a faculty contingency is crucial. In addition, a system of checks and balances will be provided by student/faculty evaluations.

Action Item #1: Management system

For labs with managers, the dean will establish discipline-specific full-time faculty committees where pertinent lab issues and classroom needs for the discipline are prioritized by the full time faculty with input from associate faculty, as appropriate. These priorities would then be communicated directly to the lab director and staff for implementation.

In the event that issues brought forth by the faculty committee are not dealt with satisfactorily, a summary of unresolved issues will be brought to the dean's attention for final resolution. In addition, a method of checks and balances will be provided by faculty evaluations of the laboratory personnel.

Action Item #2: Lab personnel Evaluations

Faculty is evaluated from the top *and* the bottom. We all agree that this is an essential element of our system if we are to keep the academic bar at a satisfactory level. *It comprises 'Qualitative vital signs' so to speak.* It does not make sense that a crucial element such as laboratory operations has almost no checks and balances or corrective measures built in.

Give full-time faculty who are teaching labs the opportunity to complete evaluations of lab personnel and the lab manager at least once per year, if not each semester. Completed lab personnel evaluations will go to the lab manager for consideration. Completed lab manager evaluations will go to the dean for consideration. Evaluations of lab personnel and the lab manager at least once per year, if not each semester. Completed lab personnel evaluations will go to the lab manager for consideration. An addendum to these evaluations should cover paid, part time student assistants.

Suggested Lab Personnel Evaluation Survey

1. Required equipment was available and working. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
2. Materials for my lab were ready when needed. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
3. Materials for my lab were ready in sufficient quantities. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
4. Lab personnel were available during my lab time. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
5. Laboratory was properly stocked with essential materials (paper towels, bactericide spray, soap, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
6. Lab personnel prepared specific requests in a timely manner. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
7. Lab personnel were respectful, professional, and courteous. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A

8. Please comment on any issues not addressed above. (open-ended question)

Lab manager evaluation should be similar in content and tone to the annual library survey. Some suggested survey questions follow.

Lab manager:

1. Was responsive to faculty and student needs. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
2. Was respectful, professional, and courteous. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
3. Was helpful. 5 4 3 2 1 0 N/A
4. What are the strengths? (open ended question)
5. What are the areas needing improvement? (open ended question)

D. Equity in Lab Compensation

There are some disciplines that do not receive 1:1 compensation for FTEs while others do. Currently, pay scale is not equitable for science faculty as they are paid less for teaching lab than lecture.

There should be consistency and fairness in compensation of laboratory teaching.

Action Item #1

It is recommended that all laboratories be compensated at 1:1 FTE across the district and across disciplines. (1 FTE = 1 contact hour)

Justification:

Health sciences, nursing and science labs are paid at 0.8. Student Remuneration and financial aid do not treat these hours separately. It is Reported that associate faculty may be reimbursed at full rate. This will Require confirmation with HR.

Most labs require more preparation and planning, more hands on work by the faculty member, and more work is involved in grading. In other words, the work done by a faculty member in a lab setting is either equal to or more than what is done in a lecture setting.

Common committee member response, *"The equal pay issue is important- I teach 5 classes for my teaching load, but 3 of them are labs. Each lecture meets a total of 2.5 hours a week, but each lab meets a total of 3 hrs. And 40 minutes a week. So I'm teaching 16 hours a week and making the same amount of money as someone making load teaching 5 lectures (12.5 hours)."*

The instructor performs the same professional activities in teaching labs that are equivalent to or in excess of teaching lecture. These activities include, but not limited to:

1. Student supervision
2. Face-to-face interaction
3. Homework
4. Grading

5. Lab safety

Collin College Faculty Council
Year end Report

Committee: Faculty Online Commons Sub committee

Submitted by: Smriti Anand

Meeting Dates: (list date of last physical meeting or the dates of e-discussions)

01/11/2016 – Face to face meeting

02/11/2016 – Face to Face meeting

Email discussions – 2/19, 4/12 – 4/14,

Active Members: (in order of last name, list all members who attended meeting and/or contributed to work listed in this report)

Smriti Anand, Dulce deCastro, Wendy Commons, Lisa Hull Forrester, Sharon Hirschy, Melissa Johnson

Jonathan Evans (requested to join the committee on 3/22/2016

Summary of Discussions/Activities:

E. Sub Committee came up with a mission statement

F. Members took a closer look at the FOC website and changes to the FOC website were suggested. John Leonard (Librarian PRC) helped the committee in making changes to the website. Members reviewed the changes and have made further suggestions.

G. The next steps will be to finalize the changes and promote/market the new and improved FOC website.

Summer Faculty Institute Subcommittee

Minutes from April 8, 2016 meeting from Kelly Martin, Chair

Members in Attendance:

Julia

Sukanaya

Sudha

Sharon

Kelly

General theme of the meeting: collaborating with eCollin to offer summer sessions related to Canvas training and workshops.

Some recommendations of the committee:

- Design a survey for faculty to complete; the survey will focus on faculty needs as related to training sessions. For example, the survey might ask faculty for which features of Canvas they would like to have devoted workshops, i.e., a workshop on working with PowerPoints, so forth.
- Intermix Canvas sessions throughout Summer I and Summer II—offer sessions at various times throughout the day and the week.
 - Throughout the summer, offer Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced sessions
 - Continue to offer course-build sessions/workshops into June and July
- Faculty Summer Inst. committee members will collaborate with eCollin to help faculty during training sessions/workshops.
 - Early training for to help assist eCollin members during summer training sessions.
- Offer an *in-person* session/workshop that only explores the differences between Canvas and Blackboard and explores the unique features of Canvas.
- Sessions for special features/tools (creating and/or uploading media, working with discussion threads, copying/creating quizzes; using the canvas grade book; PowerPoints).
- Canvas course-building boot camps: other trained faculty and eCollin team members will further assist faculty in building their courses (there would be dedicated spaces and computers for faculty to use). These boot camps would be in addition to the two-hour sessions co-sponsored by eCollin and the Summer Institute.
- *****Recommendation for Faculty Council: post instructions, perhaps through the eCollin website and/or a new channel in CougarWeb about how to disable clutter and junk email.**

REVISED PROPOSAL: EMERITUS PROFESSOR AT COLLIN COLLEGE

1. That Collin College creates the position of Emeritus Professor.
2. That Collin College confers this title on retired/retiring Collin College full-time and part-time professors who have served the college over a period of 20 years.
3. An emeritus professor must be willing to consider fulfilling the following obligations to the college:
 - a. Identify oneself as Emeritus Professor of Collin College in professional activities and in service to the college.
 - b. Be available for service to the college, if called upon: committee member; repository of college experience for the department, division, or district-wide; participant in college sponsored activities.
 - c. Adhere to the highest academic, civil and ethical standards.
 - d. Understand that there is no remuneration to be received by the holder of this title.
 - e. Serve as an ambassador of the college in local, state-wide, and national settings.
 - f. Consider being a mentor to active professors.
 - g. Desire to participate in college activities and ceremonies.
 - h. Help and inspire students.
4. An emeritus professor may receive the following benefits of the position:
 - a. Retain a Collin College Identification card.
 - b. Continued access to all Collin College facilities, both physical and electronic.
 - c. Continued use of a Collin College email account.
 - d. Access to office (bullpen) space, mail drop, and basic administrative support.
 - e. With the approval of the department and the division dean, teach courses, retaining priority of choice after full-time faculty and before adjunct faculty.
5. Nomination and approval process for Emeritus Professor:
 - a. A retiring/retired faculty member may be nominated by the Dean or may nominate themselves.
 - b. A retiring/retired faculty member would be eligible after 20 years of teaching at Collin College, having served the college with distinction during that time.
 - c. The Dean (or the self-nominee) forwards a one page application to Council on Excellence (CoE). CoE reviews the application and, if they recommend approval CoE sends it to the District President, who retains final approval.
 - d. The District President confers the title of Emeritus Professor at an appropriate college function.