McLennan Community College Faculty Council 2019-2020

MEETING DATE: The McLennan Community College Faculty Council met Friday, 10/4. President Ashley Cruseturner called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

LOCATION: MAC 304

ATTENDEES: Amber Bracken, Amber Leibold, Andrew Clayton, Anna Iushchenko, Anne Merchant, Bailey Cole, Bob Ammon, Bonnie Sneed, Brian Johnson, Cynthia Wagner, Deanna Robinson, Debbie Williams, Dennis Clark, Gail Woodward, Helen Moore, Holly Towns, Ivanna Campbell, Jarred Hankhouse, Jessica Zbeida, John Seawright, Justin Lawson, Kim McCoy, Larry Salazar, Otsmar Villarroel, Paula Unger, Scott Bryant, Stacy Kuehn, Susan Spooner, Tammy Thompson, and Yolanda Gonzalez

ABSENT MEMBERS: Amy Winslow, Jim Terry, Kelly Parker, Linda Ratliff, Michael White, Marighny Dutton, and Michele Davis

GUESTS: Elaine Fagner and Laura Wichman

MEETING MINUTES

1) ISSUE: Brief Remarks (Ashley)

DISCUSSION: The FCP discussed the process of FC balancing discussions and debates and sound decision-making. He recommended that FC members think about our work as a clearinghouse. Our main role is to disperse and dispatch information and make decisions often predicated on extensive research and discussion by committees informed by conversations with our constituents. He also emphasized his goal that meetings should be completed in one hour (whenever possible) as a commitment to value our busy schedules as faculty members.

ACTION: Be mindful of the purpose of this committee.

2) ISSUE: Discussion and VOTE on "Evaluations Matter" document

DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, FC unanimously voted to approve the following resolution: *Faculty Council recommends the formation of a committee of faculty, division leaders, and relevant staff to study and improve faculty evaluation at MCC. FC submits the following report, Evaluation Matters, as a framework to begin the process. FC envisions this instrument as an all-college committee.*

ACTION: Our FC ad hoc study committee will continue to support, monitor, and contribute to this new phase of re-evaluating the evaluation processes.

3) **ISSUE: CONCISE Committee Reports** (Policy, Compensation, Student Success Liaison, Bookstore, Elections, Workforce)

DISCUSSION:

- **Policy Committee**: Chair Jarred Hankhouse reported the committee's interest in reviewing the drop policy with an eye toward bringing it in line with current best practices. They also plan to review other campus policy issues.
- Compensation Committee: This committee is still coming together.
- **Student Success Liaison Committee**: Co-chairs Paul Hoffman and FCP scheduled a committee meeting for 2 pm Friday (October 11). This committee exists mostly for communication, but this group also develops policy from time to time.
- **Bookstore Committee**: This committee convened and met the new manager of the Bookstore. The Bookstore staff reported that book sales are down and are trying to figure out how to remain relevant and lucrative for MCC. FC appointed Susan Spooner and Ivanna Campbell co-chairs of the Bookstore Committee.
- Elections Committee: Chair Otsmar Villarroel reported the committee is working on several issues. First, the committee submitted last year's policy changes to Dr. Hills regarding the change of date for elections (the first Tuesday after the first Monday in April) and term of office for the president. In addition, the members are working on a comprehensive explanatory document regarding the operation of annual elections.
- Workforce Committee: This committee is scheduled to meet after FC meeting.
- ACTION: FC subcommittee members actively participate.

4) ISSUE: EXTENDED Committee Reports

DISCUSSION:

- Testing Center and Proctoring [Brad (FCVP) & Elaine]
 - Elaine Fagner began her report by reviewing how this process of evaluating our proctoring system began last year. SACSCOC

requires that our institution proctor students taking exams to insure the integrity of our classes. She described the committee's recommendations (below).

- **Proctored Exam Security Recommendations:** This committee requests that the Administration support the selection of a vendor(s) that could provide a more secure proctoring service for online student exams. The Committee recommends the Administration negotiate a contract that would allow three tiers of security as follows:
 - Tier I This tier is similar to Respondus Monitor's security for insuring a student's identity, testing environment before they start an exam, and recording the exam so the instructor can watch it on their own time to identify instances of potential scholastic dishonesty.
 - Tier II In addition to Tier I coverage, Tier II also includes asynchronous review by a live person or an artificial intelligence (AI) agent. The report generated by the reviewer, flags any instances of potential scholastic dishonesty and is reported back to the instructor within 48hours of the exam.
 - **Tier III** Tier III differs from Tier II in that this level utilizes a live proctor as opposed to AI or delayed video review of potential scholastic dishonesty during the assessment. The data is immediately available to the instructor upon completion of the exam.
- The pilot of Examity was conducted in the Summer 2019 semester with two instructors to review the security options for this proctoring service. These instructors noted that the top tier provided the highest level of proctoring security and information for the faculty members. As previously noted, a pilot proctoring program is being conducted for Proctor U. Regardless of which vendor the institution selects, this Committee recommends that a proctoring service perform the video review instead of faculty members.
- A survey is being distributed to faculty at noon today on this issue. These results matter because administration needs to know how many faculty are in need of these services. The Tier III, which is the most vigilant, is also the most expensive.
- Elaine met with Natalie James of the Testing Center and Natalie informed her that 70% of the students who test there are doing so for online classes. Right now, the Testing Center is overwhelmed and

does not have adequate staff to cover all of the testing needs. An FC member interjected the reminder that the primary purpose of the Testing Center is to meet the needs of ADA students and comply with those regulations.

- Several ways of paying for the proctoring services are being proposed: (1) an online student fee; (2) a course fee; (3) a testing fee; (4) specialized testing card (like buying an access code for a textbook); (5) technology fee for all students.
- The FCVP emphasized that the urgency of this issue is related to the college's budget process. President McKown has requested this information by the October budget workshop.
- The FCP encouraged members to talk with their constituents about this issue and also emphasize the importance of the survey.

ACTION: Please solicit feedback from your constituents. Our IR polling will provide part of the answer, but we also need to get a better sense of faculty opinions and concerns on this issue.

• Faculty-PD Procedures and Relationship with PD Day

• Former FCP and PD Committee Chair Andrew Clayton requesting that the deans offer a written clarification regarding implementation of the new PD policy. This committee will meet with Mikken regarding PD on 10/11.

ACTION: Stay tuned for further updates.

5) ISSUE: New Issues

DISCUSSION:

• **Graduation Regalia**: Jarred Hankhouse reported that some faculty members told him that faculty at many other colleges do not wear their mortarboards during graduation. FC members vociferously expressed a general desire to continue with our current protocol.

ACTION: None taken at this time.

• **Success Coaches:** Holly Towns reported that several faculty members have shared with her that they have NOT had positive experiences with success coaches. The FCP reported that this issue will be taken to the Student Success Liaison Committee, but that his personal experiences have been extremely positive. Several other FC members reported that the emails sent to their students after they submitted their names to Insight did not seem appropriate for the stated needs. Another FC member reported that in her experiences at other institutions, success coaches worked more intimately with faculty and students.

ACTION: FC to take up these issues with the FC-Student Success Liaison Committee. Please inform FC about any issues with success coaches.

Help for non-English Speaking Students Helen Moore reported as the nursing program has been evaluating itself to improve state board results, they realized that there seems to be an issue with students who only speak Spanish at home. When these students get to their state board exam, they are not passing, which is one of the significant reasons the nursing program was put on probation. FC member Jessica Zbeida suggested we consider developing an EAP (English for Academic Purposes) course or program specific to nursing. She also observed that we MCC could do a lot more for our ELL students as a whole. We have faculty in English with expertise in this area (including Laurice Jones, Wendy Hogan, and Jessica). The FCP stated that he and the FCVP will take this issue to the VPI. Laura Wichman added that Perkins grants can go specifically for students whose first language is not English. The FCP requested that Laura send him further data to support these efforts. One other FC member whose mother teaches medical Spanish at Baylor suggested that the nursing program offer these students a special course to help them succeed.

ACTION: FC to take up this issue with the FC-Student Success Liaison Committee and also bring it up with the VPI. We also invited Laura Wichman to lend her expertise to this conversation. Please inform FC if you have any experience or insight on these issues.

• **Brightspace Support Team** – Accessing Online Classes: Stacy Kuehn reported that a math faculty noticed that Richard Leslie, Kayla Willis, and others were listed in the Brightspace Assessment dropdown as the "support team" in a F2F class. They are not in the class list, nor are they in the gradebook. This faculty member is wondering why this is happening. Is she being monitored? If so, why has she not been informed?

ACTION: The FCP and FCVP will discuss this issue with Dean Eggleston, Division Chair Brad Christian, the VPI, Richard, and Kayla and then report back.

• VPI Initiatives -- Job Description for Faculty, Professional Development Sequencing for Faculty, and Faculty Evaluations: FCP reported that the VPI is interested in creating a job description for faculty positions. Several members were confused and asked why this is needed since HR uses these when new positions are posted. FC members also asked if the current descriptions are outdated. The VPI also has some suggestions on the evaluation process and PD sequencing. The FCP promised total transparency on this matter and will share more details as he learns them.

ACTION: The FCP will refer the evaluation suggestions to evaluation committee, and the FCP and the FCVP will engage the VPI and follow up on this for further clarification.

6) ISSUE: Announcements: VPI Forums Coming Up: PD & Evaluations & Faculty Sponsor Needed for Prospective Student Organization

DISCUSSION:

- The VPI is hosting a Faculty Forum regarding PD on 10/16 (Wednesday) @ 2 pm. In LTC 222 (Faculty Commons).
- Similarly, the VPI will host a Faculty Forum regarding Evaluations on 11/14 @ 2 pm. In LTC 222 (Faculty Commons).
- FC member Amber Bracken announced that a student requested to start a pro-life campus committee and asked her to be the sponsor. Her schedule does not allow for it now, so she wanted to see if any other faculty members would be interested.

ACTION:

- Look for emails from the VPI concerning his forums. Please attend, if you are able. Always good for VPI to hear from faculty on key issues.
- Contact Amber Bracken if you are interested in sponsoring a new prolife student group.

The FCP adjourned the meeting at 12:10 pm and announced the next meeting is 11/1.

Paula Unger, Faculty Council Secretary