

March 2024 Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

3/15/2024 @ 11:00 am via Zoom: <https://mclennan.zoom.us/j/83234880049>

Any Faculty concerns or feedback can be shared with your FC representatives, FC leadership, or submitted Anonymous Feedback Form Link:

https://mclennan.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6Pt85J2daPWiwfc

PARTICIPATING/ATTENDING MEMBERS:

- Elizabeth Grassman: LLC
- Jeremy Land: LLC
- Danny Rodriguez: LLC
- Stephen Swanson: LLC
- Ken Walker: LLC
- Kelli Nehring: LLC (adjunct)
- Cynthia Soll: Library
- Holly Webb: Mathematics
- Cindy Burns: Mathematics
- Mary Sides: Science
- Sholly Gunter: Science
- Laura Wright: Science
- Jimmy Kessler: Science
- Larry Salazar: Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Cynthia Morris: Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Tammy Thompson: Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Marc Nicholas: Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Jon Fox: Visual & Performing Arts
- Mandy Morrison: Visual & Performing Arts
- Kathleen Laundry: Visual & Performing Arts
- Kelly Parker: Visual & Performing Arts
- Kayla Willis: Human Services & Education
- Natalie Oliver: Human Services & Education
- Shelley Blackwood: Health Professions
- Tiffanie Elbrecht: Health Professions
- Becky Slonaker: Health Professions
- Linda Rynearson: Health Professions
- Bobby Patterson: Health Professions
- Donna Mendoza: Health Professions
- Deborah Williams: Business Programs
- Jacob Sammaron: Business Programs
- Steve Greathouse: Business Programs
- Jan Robertson: Business Programs
- Jarred Hankhouse: ESEC
- Michaela McCown: Faculty Council President
- Amy Antoninka: Faculty Council Vice President

NON-PARTICIPATING/ABSENT MEMBERS:

- Andria Ramon: Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Samantha Buerger: Health Professions
- Mario Dominguez: Health Professions (adjunct)
- Laurel Shrawder: Health Professions
- Zachary Cleere: ESEC
- Bob Ammon: Health/Physical Education

Guest Attendees:

- Ashley Cruseturner
- Clint Dennard
- Richard Driver
- Melody Flowers
- Susan Spooner

I. Call to Order – 11:01 am

II. Review and Approval of February 2024 Minutes (Michaela)

- a. Motion: Kayla Willis
- b. Second: John Fox
- c. Approved: 100%

III. Committee Updates:

- a. **Bookstore Committee:** Have not met this month.
- b. **Policy Committee:** Policy Committee met on March 12. At this meeting, Elaine Fagner shared in detail the work flow of the Tenure Committee, Hearing selections, and Due Process. The committee started the work of making suggestions to the Tenure policy to cover all categories of full-time faculty members on campus. More discussion took place during this meeting due to the complicated nature of the policy. Work was completed from the document shared in July of 2023 and accessible through this [link](#). You can find the full meeting notes [here](#).
 - i. Policy committee is not done with the tenure policy. It's been a monumental task defining everything and we are giving it the time it needs. We will meet at least once more. All of these updates have to be in place by September, so there is some sort of urgency here.
 1. It will go to administration, be reviewed by the lawyers, and then to Board.
 2. Policy Committee has included the legal part in their draft; please review their work and provide feedback.

- c. **Student Success Committee:** The counseling center is moving into a new location (the old math lab) but are still in the same building. Once the renovation is complete, the old location will no longer be used. Jeremy's class will be working on a poster to help assist students, and a triage sheet is in the works to help faculty refer students. There are a lot of events going on in the next few weeks: JC Penny Suit Up Event, Career Fair, Library Learning Commons Workshops, and Registration Rally.
 - i. Just-in-Time resources will be available this summer.
 - ii. Minimester & Summer I course shells will be available by April 1. They are holding off on SII and Fall course shells for now.
- d. **Elections Committee:** The Elections Committee worked hard to conduct the nomination and election process since our last meeting. The new nomination process for all committees led to 500+ nominations to sort through and reach out to. It has been a laborious process but seems to be very meaningful. The initial election round is going on right now; please make sure to vote and encourage others to vote as well.
- e. **Book Cost Committee:** The Book Cost Committee, led by Rachel Kramer, has been meeting to evaluate the effectiveness of Equitable Access compared to Inclusive Access and OER. The Committee will shortly be providing recommendations from their work. The Committee is also looking into recommendations for how to best utilize excess funds from the bookstore that have previously been used for employee/dependent book scholarships.
- f. **Workforce Committee:** The Workforce Committee has not met. If you have any issues, please reach out to Bobby Patterson.
- g. **Compensation Committee:** Committee chair discussed percentages, stated they will have a cost-of-living proposal before the next meeting. The college has set its own max and wondering how much consideration the compensation committee report is given.
 - i. Board looks at different scenarios that are recommended from administration and they make the decision before they send it to the Board.
 - ii. The Compensation Committee was surprised about how many times no cost-of-living increase was given. A cost-of-living raise is needed to make sure we aren't making less.
- h. Be sure to vote in current elections. It will close at 5PM on Tuesday. Next, the committee will take the top vote-getters and there will be a run-off election. The Committee will hold FCVP information session every year – it went well this last time.

IV. Faculty Evaluations: Discussion & Concerns

- a. A request was made to have an open meeting regarding faculty evaluations; all faculty were invited to today's meeting to honor that request.

- b. Context regarding Faculty Evaluations: Last Spring, Dr. Hills reached out to Michaela McCown and Elaine Fagner to start a more detailed evaluation that would mimic staff evaluations more closely. An *ad hoc* committee formed and helped improve a draft that was provided to the committee. There were a number of items that the committee recommended that were not adopted in the final version, and the committee also emphasized the need for training of evaluators, evaluates, and NeoEd. There was a desire from administration for the tool to mimic the staff evaluation, which included the five-tier system and the value section. There was a very brief discussion in the fall about it happening, then rollout very quickly in February. And rather than involving the committee throughout the rollout process, they were asked to review the tool the week before it went live with minimum time to provide feedback. From a faculty perspective, the execution did not occur as recommended nor suggested. There have been problems with the rollout. Category I's should have been evaluated by now: mixed results on whether evaluators got appropriate results, which have led to frustrations.
- c. Open floor discussion
 - 1. One individual had people in her department concerned about how the data is being used. In previous meetings, there was a discussion about leaning into the data. We have been told again and again that it won't be used against us, but now we need to write a narrative based on the data. Concern that this is not what was promised.
 - 2. Another concern was how rushed the process felt. An email went out saying NeoEd was not working and to hold off on using it, but a follow-up did not occur when the system was working. It was a lot of work, and not having the confirmation it was working, people did not want to work on it and not have input be saved. Then, immediately before the deadline a subsequent email went out reminding faculty to complete the process, and it was even more rushed at that time.
 - 3. Some evaluators were told to review, even though they haven't been given approval to do so from HR.
 - 4. The process felt very haphazard. More training is needed and it was not implemented in the way the committee recommended.
 - 5. Who is on HR task force?
 - a. Elaine Fagner, Mike Campenni, & Jan Robertson. They are still serving on that committee and still working on how they serve. The HR Task force did not have a direct part in the faculty evaluation; it was

a different committee, though the HR taskforce did get to see the staff evaluation form.

6. Why wasn't the old instrument good enough?
 - a. The new tool allows faculty to have their voices heard and to share challenges and success that might affect evaluations. And it was to mimic the staff's evaluation.
 - b. One member noted the old form had a response.
7. The problem is that you get to respond to data that isn't supposed to be used against us and to defend ourselves. The data is now freely being used against us.
 - a. One evaluator noted they received no training. They told people to fill it out the best they could and did not look at the data. Everyone has that one student. You can't judge people by data that has too many variables. There is not enough parity between professors.
8. Several expressed their concern with labeling anyone other than "competent"; okay with new people, but not with seasoned faculty; it seems insulting. "Competent" was misspelled in NeoEd which was not professional.
9. This process needs more faculty input. Communication, integrity were not upheld by administration. Now's the time to bring it up.
10. A number of individuals voiced their opposition to anyone not in the chain of command evaluating them; even with training, if they aren't in the chain of command, that is not the coordinators' job.
 - a. One coordinator refused to evaluate their peers, because they are a scheduler.
11. One individual asked if values should have the same weight as teaching?
 - a. This was supposed to be a part of the training, and the committee pushed hard to have a detailed training in order for this to roll out properly for everyone involved. To date, there is still no training. We (evaluators and evaluates) need training—every year – and we need to continue pushing for that.
12. Faculty felt like by getting the input from the committee administration can now say this is FC approved and what FC wants, even though the committee did not approve the tool and the committee and FC have concerns about the tool. Multiple individuals expressed hearing from several sources

that they were told this tool was approved by FC (to clarify: it was not).

13. The committee was told the faculty evaluation needed to look like the staff evaluation. Several FC members expressed that Faculty and Staff are not the same and it is ok for the tools to look different. The workload is similar between groups, but the workflow is different.
 - a. As a prior staff member, one individual never really worried about the evaluation from the staff side; as faculty, the worry is different and they may not get the feedback before the evaluation; and they can still just not renew my contract.
 - b. Dr. Hills knows that this year's evaluations were rough and they plan to improve the process and the tool.
14. The number should not appear, and it makes it look like everyone is just doing what's required and no more. How does one even move up?
 - a. The idea of "competent" means that they don't constantly need to be improving and to make it too competitive.
 - b. If you work hard and are "competent" that leads to everyone doing "C" work and lowering everyone's standards; no one will try to excel.
 - c. If numbers are attached, it looks like a GPA and becomes a rank.
 - d. Our raises aren't based on the evaluations. So, there is no function to the 5-scale system; this is more of a business model. The committee suggested 2 categories but that recommendation was not included.
15. FC needs to correct the impression that FC has approved the evaluation tool. FC is very unhappy and would like an immediate conversation.
 - a. What about a coffee and conversation style/listening session meeting about this issue?
 - b. Need to make sure as many faculty as possible are involved.
16. This is the most demoralizing and unmotivational evaluation ever.
 - a. Because it was done in summer, they aren't getting faculty input and are working behind the scenes.
 - b. This grading system doesn't feel right.
 - c. It used to be a conversation—now it is a business driven model.

- d. This instrument doesn't reflect what we do. We are being evaluated on standards that don't fit faculty.
 - e. This is a top-down move.
17. Faculty Council is not the mouthpiece of administration. It's a conversation. We need to let administration know that there is a lot of concern before a coffee and conversation.
- a. The Category I's may not want to speak up in front of administration. Non-tenured faculty often don't want to directly express concerns either due to fear of retaliation.
 - b. FCP&VP can ask questions on their behalf.
 - c. It should be face-to-face. Friday's may be best and can offer a Zoom option. April 19th might be the date to meet-after Scholar Day.

V. New Business:

- a. **Discussion of Microsoft Teams as FC Repository Tool**
 - i. This could provide continuity so documents could be shared year after year; chat with one another; etc. Concern with consistency.
 - ii. What do people think?
 - 1. Jan Robertson and Jarred Hankhouse think it's good because it lends continuity.
 - 2. Motion: Jarred Hankhouse motions to take a vote;
Jan seconds: Approved
 - iii. May have a short training in April meeting, it would be best to get that done by the end of the year.

VI. Next (and Last) Meeting Date: April 26 @ 11:00 am via Zoom

- a. Even more worried about tenure policy now; need a cultural change at MCC where more courageous conversations happen.
- b. When wiggle room or ambiguity, we rely on people and their character; we may not have benevolent leaders in the future. So, our concerns need to be met and followed through within policy so it can't be manipulated.
- c. Admin will retire eventually; we need a process in place to ensure protection of employees no matter who is in positions of power at the college.

VII. Adjourn

- a. Motion Jon Fox;
- b. second Kayla Willis; Approved.
- c. Adjourn 12:21 pm

Additional Updates:

8 Week Classes: There has been some discussion regarding additional 8 week classes. The push is not to switch completely to 8 week classes, but to instead ensure that students are able to take a full “set” of classes in the 8 week format. For example, if the first semester of a course is offered in the first 8 weeks, to ensure the second semester of the course is offered in the 2nd 8 weeks. This will allow students to have a more logical set of classes rather than trying to take three 16 week classes with only one 8 week class – it would allow for more equal loading across the semester for students.

Upward Evaluations: We have been told that upward evaluations will be happening this year! More info to come!

Referrals for Student Success Coaches: Student Support Services have updated their Insight referral form and process. You now receive updates when cases are referred and closed. Please refer students from your roster if you think they could benefit from visiting with a success coach!

Comment from Anonymous Form:

Alternative Fuel Parking Spots: There have been some concerns about the usefulness of having alternative fuel and parking space designations. Administration is looking into removing these signs since they are hard to police and enforce. Additionally, the Sustainability Committee made a recommendation to administration to remove the signs due to the difficulty in monitoring and enforcement, and to improve inclusivity on campus. The Sustainability Committee instead recommended focusing on developing one or two charging spots/stations on campus that could be used to encourage EV adoption and help fill a need for additional charging locations, particularly for students/employees that live in apartment buildings which tend to not have charging infrastructure.