

McLennan Community College
Faculty Council 2018-2019

MEETING DATE: The McLennan Community College Faculty Council met **Friday, November 2, 2018**, in MAC 304. President Andrew Clayton called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

ATTENDEES: Bob Ammon, Amber Bracken, Deborah Brock, Dennis Clark, Michelle Davis, Elaine Fagner, Melody Flowers, Jarred Hankhouse, Kent Hoeffner, Brian Johnson, Jeremy Lehman (secretary), Reid Makowsky, Donna Mendoza, Becky Parker, Deanna Robinson, Bonnie Sneed, Holly Towns, Brad Turner, Otsmar Villaroel, Michael White, Gail Woodward, Jessica Zbeida, and Ashley Cruseturner

MEETING NOTES

I. Committee Reports

- a) Bookstore Committee – Lumen presented available OER programs for classes to match with Brightspace. Prices are affordable (one example, the book is \$10.00 and the online platform quizzes are \$25.00). The bookstore will make some of these available to pilot. The meeting from last Friday was uneventful – departments and instructors need to send along book orders. Departments struggle with this as some sections are still being staffed. Committee also reported a way that Follett can connect with Web Advisor, which would then order the books automatically. 90 percent of problems come when classes are added at the last minute, which forces the bookstore to adjust, which can cause problems. If these are linked, all of the information is automatically sent to Follett. IT worries this might give too much information to Follett (FERPA). Committee initiated discussion with VP Benson. Follett has offered to pay for the patch to make this happen. Contention that this process more closely links the student to the bookstore. FCP to discuss with VPI Fred Hills.
- b) Policy Committee – Committee recommends no change to distance teaching policy, as they a change in policy might well aggravate a situation that still requires elasticity and flexibility and the need for staffing.
- c) Professional Development Committee – The committee continues to study the issues and craft a policy to address faculty concerns and needs. Faculty clearly prefers a program in which the four-year clock is not reset every time faculty meet PD requirements. Faculty definitely want to see less cumbersome paperwork (preclearance and otherwise). Committee also aware that deans are willing to give up much responsibility to chairs and directors. Committee envisions a system in which faculty and supervisors are much more autonomous, empowered, and communicative when crafting a PD plan—and structured around a yearly update between a faculty member and division chair (even with the concern that division chairs are overburdened). Faculty asserted need to make explicit the idea that step-credit will count for professional development in all cases. Faculty voiced concerns regarding a lack of definition for professional development requirements. Some faculty asserted that a return to the previous four year policy (with a set four year window, not a window that resets) might solve this entire issue. Faculty also gave voice to the problem that professional development is different across departments. Should we try to define what constitutes professional development? The Policy Committee noted that this discussion should at some point become the purview of the Policy Committee. Faculty raised the need for faculty to do a better job offering classes for PD day. The Committee will continue to meet and discuss the issue.

- d) Student Evaluation Committee – the student evaluations need to be rewritten to match our upcoming college mission. Questions need to be written following research towards best practices. A consultant hired by the college might be helping in formulating a workable evaluation process. Rather than the committee trying to figure this out, there are professionals who might be hiring outside analysis. There is still work to be done. The committee will share the best articles used for evaluation. Also, it is very difficult for division chairs to evaluate in the way the policy calls for (because of the time constraints). Dean Hills wants a process that we trust – there is an opening where we can make changes. There is also the possibility of peer evaluations.
- e) Student Success Liaison Committee – this seems to be a successful committee. The meeting also discussed ADA and different problems that arise. Federal law prohibits registration of service animals per campus. If you have questions on this (testing center, ADA, financial aid, student success), please end this to Andrew Clayton, Debbie Brock or other members of the committee.

II. Open Issues

- a) Student printing options or lack thereof – to be discussed in January.
- b) Access to instructional material for nighttime classes (e.g. Scantrons) – to be discussed in January (referred to Bookstore Committee).

III. New Issues

- a) Vending Machines on campus (FCP to discuss with VPI Hills)
- b) Upward evaluations – the official policy will be clarified in conversation with Fred.
- c) Mongoose – the charge of student success was to use Mongoose as a student texting service, and to get faculty to use this. Many are opposed to this.

IV. Adjournment

<p>Abbreviations: FC = Faculty Council FCP = Faculty Council President FCVP = Faculty Council Vice President</p>
--