

Members Present: Stacey Deputy, Judith Gill, Sean LaCroix, Sarah DiCalogero, Maureen Cahill, Angela Bell, Robyn Browder, Kathy Buhner, Ellyn Hodges, John Krenzke, Dania Sinibaldi, John Williams, Katrina Dash, Sharon Waters, Lorenz Drake, David Kiracofe, David Ring, Libby Watts, Harlan Krepcik, Ruth Schumate, Wendy Buie

Guests Present: Matthew Gorris

- I. Call to Order -**at 2pm**
- II. Campus Motions* (See Appendix)
- III. Review and Approval of Minutes –**October Approved** and **November Approved** as amended
- IV. Guest. Dr. Kim Bovee. Director of Planning and Accountability. Will gather our ideas for engaging faculty in foundational scanning and preparing for the next strategic plan.
Dr. Bovee reviewed the history of strategic planning at TCC from 1998 to the present. There have been challenges in previous strategic plans with changing priorities, inconsistent messaging to faculty and staff, measurable outcomes, territorialism between campuses, and in targeting student progression improvements in a data driven manner. Future challenges and opportunities include performance based funding, new SACS-COC requirements for student completion reporting, new technologies such as EAB Navigate and Ad Astra, and declining enrollment. In the Spring of 2019 the college will begin an institutional scanning process to prepare for the next strategic plan. Ms. Bovee asked for feedback on how to best engage faculty, staff, and students in the process. Suggestions included: Requesting that college administrators spend time in campus departments (counseling, admissions, etc) and deans offices in order to gain a better understanding of the impact of decisions made. Target questions asked clearly to what you are looking for. (example: How do you feel TCC prepares students in your field.) Let faculty/staff/students know what changes are made based on what was learned from the feedback they provided. Be intentional to avoid stratifying student data by only using PTK/SGA students. Be sure to include nontraditional and disengaged students, perhaps by visiting libraries and student centers. Ask instructors about their former students, and they may well know why the students stopped coming./participating. Dr. Bovee asked if the faculty senate would be willing to go over some draft information and give feedback and we agreed to do so.
A discussion of the Great Colleges to Work For Survey results occurred with Dr. Bovee. As a result of this discussion Curt Aasen, Vice President of Information Systems and Institutional Effectiveness, and Beth Lunde, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, will be invited to the next faculty senate meeting to discuss the survey results.
- V. Chair Report – Stacey Deputy –**See Appendix**
- VI. Secretary Report – Judy Gill -**No Report.**
- VII. Treasurer Report – Tom Siegmund
Starting balance for this year / semester - started out at \$273.00 – minus Ellyn’s CFAC of \$182.72 leaves a balance of \$90.28. Contact information needed for FSVA to pay our dues. Sean LaCroix will email him with the information.
- VIII. Campus Reports – Campus Chairs –**See Appendix**
- IX. Committee and Representative Reports
 - A. Adjunct Committee –Elizabeth Harris-**See Appendix**
 - B. Faculty Development and Evaluation Plan – **No Report, due to meeting length and adjournment**
 - C. Professional Development – **No Report, due to meeting length and adjournment**

D. CFAC – Elyn Hodgis

Formal notes from the November 2018 CFAC meeting will be emailed to all faculty by Elyn Hodgis, when they are available. A quick review of some of the items discussed included: some localities contributing money to provide free tuition to local students, state initiatives under development to provide free tuition, NOVA's academic reorganization in which every campus has the same numbers of deans and in which faculty assistant to the deans have been replaced by associate deans, Direct Placement of students into courses without placement testing (Judy Gill is one of TCC's four representatives for this pilot), Parental leave possible availability to teaching faculty in the future, an alternate dispute resolution proposal, Turnitin as the plagiarism tool for Canvas, and looking at office hours to determine how they could be used better to support/help students.

E. ! FSVA – Sean LaCroix. **There have been no meetings held since our last meeting.**

F. ! PAPC – Ruth Schumate currently. Need to identify a new representative.

G. Rewards and Recognition & Awards-Sarah Dicalogero. **Work continues on constructing a digital nomination and application process.**

H. Parliamentary Rules Committee-Tom Siegmond

Working on special rules of order, that differ from Robert's rules. Will send to senate prior to the next meeting so that we can digest it and be ready to discuss/vote at our next meeting.

I. Ad-Hoc Committee to streamline the Evaluation process and improve the e-Portfolio tool. – Judy Gill. **No Report, due meeting length and adjournment**

J. ! Ad Astra-Deborah Edson and **see the Chair report**

K. ! Ad-Hoc Committee to Consolidate Faculty Suggestions/Concerns concerning the Academic Reorganization-Sarah DiCalogero. **No Report, due to meeting length and adjournment**

X. ! Initiative Updates

A. ! Academic Reorganization-**Update email from the CFS Chair on November 20th**

XI. ! Old Business

XII. ! New Business

A. Selection of faculty representatives for the Academic Council (one per campus). **The campus senates will select two individuals, one member of the Academic Council and one alternate.**

B. February Meeting-Dr. DeCinque cannot attend on Feb 7th. Discussion and voting determined that we will invite him to attend another month.

C. Academic Council Subcommittee for Class Scheduling Policy (Low Enroll Pay). Judy Gill attended as the faculty representative. Curt Aasen from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness attended the subcommittee meeting. Efficiency numbers were never meant to be used as a guide in scheduling policy. The subcommittee developed recommendations for changes to the scheduling policy (#2111), which will be presented to the full academic council for discussion. **These recommendations were: to suspend the use of percentages found in section 4.2 of policy 2111 for Spring 19 while the policy is under review, no conversion of classes to independent study for the purposes of bypassing enrollment ratios, that the schedule is to be created by the Dean as it is now, that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness provide efficiency reports for goal setting purposes only, and to identify two breakeven numbers for running a class. The first breakeven number would be the student enrollment needed to cover faculty compensation to teach a class. The second breakeven number would be student enrollment needed to cover faculty compensation plus college overhead. Any course with enrollments above the second breakeven number would run, any course with enrollments between the two breakeven numbers require scrutiny by the Dean to determine cancellations, and any course with enrollments under the lower breakeven number would require a discussion and approval by the Provost in order to run. There was no recommendation to adjust faculty load (pay) at this time, however faculty**

teaching a low enrollment class understand that there will be a negotiation with the Dean/Director regarding additional duties. (NOTE: These are recommendations made by a subcommittee of the Academic Council. The recommendations will be discussed by the full Academic Council. The Scheduling Policy (#2111) has not been changed at this time. Any change to the policy would need to be voted on and approved by the President's cabinet.)

- XIII.** Items for the Board-None
- XIV.** Other items – Motions from the floor, etc.
- XV.** Close –Next meeting February 7, 2018 in Chesapeake (Room TBA)

Appendix

Motions

The Chesapeake campus faculty senate moves to request executive administration hold a college-wide town hall meeting to provide the rationale for and to answer questions about the new administrative reorganization prior to the beginning of the Spring 2019 semester.

Discussion

-When to hold the town hall. -Want to have the opportunity to ask questions. -How does the restructure better support students? -Why are some of the pieces considered for changes and others not? -Concern that we will figure it out as we go. T- Concern about attendance. Discussion of separate campus based town halls. Discussion of senate not endorsing the new structure. -Town Hall is an opportunity to receive answers or identify areas of the restructure that need work. Mentioned the TCC board and having a few minutes to talk to them. -Concern about the lack of communication between technologies (ex. Prospect team program for advising appointments isn't compatible with SARS). -Need dots connected between EAB, Advising, etc.

Vote: 20 in favor, 0 nays, 0 abstentions. Motion carries.

Collegewide Faculty Senate Chair Report

A. Update on CFS Motions

The following motions, passed at the October meeting, were sent to Dr. McCray and Dr. DeCinque on October 19th:

1. ! Faculty Senate requests that faculty receive a minimum of thirty (30) days to review and respond to the faculty advising component of the faculty advising plan before it is finalized.
2. ! Whereas there are serious concerns about the way the ATD grant for Z-courses was administered and the selection process used, the TCC Faculty Senate requests a comprehensive report regarding the administration of the ATD grant for Z-courses.

3. ! TCC modify current Policy 2400 – Administration of Public Grant and Sponsored Programs, to ensure ! transparency and equitable campus participation. !
4. ! In light of the inequity between the ratio of students to deans for each of the four campuses in the proposed Pathway reorganization, we move that all four campuses be allocated proportional leadership based on campus FTE's.

The following motion, passed at the November meeting, was sent to Dr. McCray and Dr. DeCinque on November 2nd, along with a request for a status update on the October motions:

1. ! The Interior Design Program is a feature program with uniquely designed facilities solely based on the Chesapeake Campus. As such, the faculty senate moves that the Interior Design Program be reassigned to a campus or pathway that is located on the Chesapeake Campus.

Dr. McCray gave the following response via email:

“We have determined that any additional program changes to the pathways will not occur until we have fully implemented Wave II. As you know, we are working to establish a comprehensive process for such requests.

Additionally, I provided an update on the advising policy via email yesterday (***) and there was an update on the advising framework in the President's newsletter on last Friday. This was finalized after being reviewed by Senate leaders, Provosts, President's Cabinet and Counselors. The framework was required for EAB Navigate implementation.

As I shared with you on yesterday, the President and I would like to meet with Senate leadership in the coming weeks to share the revised reorganization chart.

I am looking into the ATD/Policy questions and will send an update in the near future.

Thank you”

***Dr. McCray emailed all faculty with an update on [policy 2213 Advising](#) on November 1, 2018.

B. Dean Evaluation Inquiry Update

At the November CFS meeting it was determined that the chair should ask HR about the timeline for implementation of the Administrative/Professional Faculty Evaluation. I emailed Beth Lunde and this topic also came up at the November 27th President's Cabinet meeting. Here is my summary of the discussion in that meeting:

Beth Lunde explained the [VCCS Policy 3.6.1](#) for evaluation of Administrator and Professional Faculty was created 3 years ago and that TCC adopted the model plan. She indicated that faculty senate had questions about the process, and I summarized the questions we asked. Our questions pertained to the part of the policy on formative feedback (copied below).

“Formative Feedback: Evaluation plans must provide for solicitation and analysis of formative performance feedback from a sampling of individuals supervised by the faculty member peers, individuals to whom the faculty member provides a service, and individuals with whom the faculty member has professional interactions. Such input must be gathered at least once every three (3) years for the primary purpose of assisting the faculty member in identifying strengths and developing strategies for self-improvement. Additional formative feedback, especially from the faculty member's supervisor, is expected to be provided by formal and informal means on an ongoing basis. “

We asked for the timeline of the implementation of the evaluation system at TCC and for details on how the sampling for formative feedback would occur. Beth responded that TCC decided to collect formative feedback on one third of the administrators/professional faculty every year, so that everyone would have formative feedback every three years. This begun when the policy was implemented in 2016. The administrators/professional faculty selected to receive

formative feedback the first and second years were chosen by random sample and the remainder were scheduled for the third year.

Beth also indicated that TCC is not prescriptive about how the sampling for formative feedback occurs (no percentages or numbers were given for how many individuals should be sampled from each group indicated by policy.) At the PC meeting, Beth said that the administrator/professional faculty's supervisor works with the employee to determine sample size for formative feedback. The supervisor can add to the number requested by the employee and is responsible for determining which specific individuals will be asked to complete the [formative feedback survey](#). The employee being evaluated gets a summary of the results but is never told who filled out the surveys.

For more information on this evaluation process, here is a link to the VCCS webpage describing the model plan: <http://www.vccs.edu/careers/administrative-faculty-evaluations-task-force/>

C. Initiative Update: Ad Astra

Debbie Edson is the faculty representative on the Ad Astra committee. She reports that the web meetings the last couple of months have involved looking at sample data and discussing what that data suggests. (As a reminder, this program looks at historical enrollment trends and degree audit data* to help determine when it might be appropriate to open additional sections of a course, combine sections, or possibly eliminate them.) There have been a small number of Deans on the Ad Astra committee so far. It was determined that all the Deans need to receive training on Ad Astra and to begin interpreting the data it provides. Therefore, the Academic Council meeting on November 30th was entirely devoted to Ad Astra. All Deans, Provosts, the CAO, and the Faculty Senate Chair attended. The Ad Astra representative pulled up TCC data from Fall 2018 (which was entirely historical with no degree audit data) and for Spring 2019 (which includes both historical and degree audit data) for sample analysis. The representative stressed that the final decision for opening/collapsing/eliminating sections needs to be made by humans and that the data was only one factor. The [scheduling policy](#) will likely need to be revised to include the use of Ad Astra data.

*Degree audit data looks at how many students are enrolled in a particular degree program and at which classes those students still need to take to complete their degree. It helps the Ad Astra program determine how many seats of a particular course may need to be offered in any given semester.

D. President's Cabinet (PC) Meeting, November 27, 2018

-PC agreed to petition the VCCS to change policy language regarding administrative faculty teaching. It currently says that administrators who teach "must" be paid a percentage of their salary for teaching courses. Based on this, TCC currently does not allow administrators to teach as a cost saving measure. (It is cheaper to pay an adjunct than an administrator.) TCC would like more flexibility in the policy language, so that administrators could teach and receive the adjunct rate of pay.

-Discussion of Dean Evaluations. (See my notes in letter B of this report.)

- Human resources has determined that the college needs to hold mandatory discrimination training for all employees. The training will be developed and given to members of the President's Cabinet first and then to the rest of the college. Training will be provided in person and may be recorded for viewing by those who cannot attend in person. In person training may be made available on "in service" days. These are days when faculty are under contract, but are not part of the teaching semester. The training is under development and dates for holding the training have not yet been determined.

-Revision to [Policy 1106](#) Expressive Activity. Changes in state law require TCC to maintain a website with our Freedom of Speech policy and to provide a way for people to report incidents of disrupted speech (times when a person was exercising their right to speak and someone tried to stop them.) The Director of Public Safety will collect/maintain the reports of disrupted speech and the website will be developed.

-TCC's 50th anniversary. The PC discussed possibilities for how to celebrate TCC's 50th anniversary. There will likely be a collegewide event, possibly on the site of the original Portsmouth campus. Planning is in the early stages, so look for more information in future updates.

E. Academic Council

-Meetings of the council were held on November 16th and November 30th. I emailed all faculty with a summary of the November 16th meeting on November 20th. Please see that email for details. The November 30th meeting was devoted to Ad Astra training for the Deans. (Please see the Ad Astra update in letter C of this report for details.)

-Faculty representation to the Academic Council. The administration agreed to increase faculty representation to four faculty, with one faculty member from each campus. Initially they wanted the Faculty Senate to choose two representatives and for the administration to choose the remaining two representatives. The Faculty Senate requested that the faculty select all of the faculty campus representatives. The administration agreed. The administration may appoint additional faculty, who have expertise relevant to the council's work, to the academic council at their discretion. Language regarding the length of faculty member service and rotation off the council is being drafted.

-The next scheduled meeting of the academic council is December 14th at 2pm. !

-The Low Enrollment Pay subcommittee has its first meeting on December 6th at 2:30pm. !

Chesapeake Chair Report

The bulk of the meeting was spent discussing the latest academic reorganization update. As a result of that discussion, the Chesapeake faculty senate passed one motion:

The Chesapeake campus faculty senate moves to request executive administration hold a college-wide town hall meeting to provide the rationale for and to answer questions about the new administrative reorganization prior to the beginning of the Spring 2019 semester.

Other issues that were addressed:

- Potential policy changes regarding faculty pay for low enrollment classes
- Provost will be invited to our campus meeting either January or February

Faculty have also expressed concern about:

- Great Colleges to Work for Survey
- The closing of the child care centers

Updates:

- Evgenia Harrison is stepping down from faculty senate. We are now seeking a replacement.
- Horticulture sale (poinsettias) will take place December 10th-11th (9-4) and the 12th (9-1)
- Testing center renovation – end of Spring 19
- Recent "student day" (promotional event) on Chesapeake campus had record attendance.
- SGA has numerous initiatives including a food jamboree, the opening of the food bank and a 5k race

Upcoming meetings

- TCC's next board meeting will occur on Chesapeake Campus January 15th at 4:40 (Big Otter Room)
- Chesapeake campus senate meeting - January 29th, 2018 12:30 pm; Room TBD

Norfolk Chair Report

We mainly discussed the low enrollment/potential pro-ration issue/committee at the Norfolk faculty senate meeting. Here are the questions/concerns/thoughts that came up at the meeting:

- How many classes have been prorated over the last year?
- Faculty members should be able to say no to prorated classes.
- Proration could lead to chaos and bitterness.
- Proration discriminates against smaller campuses.
- Should faculty members get paid a bonus for teaching "large" classes?
 - If the argument is that classes at some % of SCHEV ratio take less time for faculty to teach (and therefore should be "worth" fewer credits) then shouldn't classes that are a certain % over the ratio be compensated at a higher ratio
- College-wide disciplines should weigh in on proration.
- Faculty loads involve much more than teaching.
- Should administrators share the burden with furloughs?
- Consensus at the meeting: the college senate should oppose proration.
- Alternative: change the threshold for making a class.
- When it makes sense, proration should require agreement between the faculty member, the dean and the campus discipline chair.
- VCCS policy allows proration in the summer. There is no VCCS policy for proration in the fall and spring.

Portsmouth Chair Report

Portsmouth Chair Report

Portsmouth Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, Nov 27, 2018 at 12:30pm. Curt Aasen and Kim Bovee delivered a presentation on Performance Based Metrics, followed by a question and answer session. Faculty expressed concerns regarding competition with fellow community colleges and potential loss of funding, despite improvements. Following this presentation, faculty expressed feedback on the new academic reorganization structure and low enrollment policy. Emphasis was placed on the need for faculty representation in the new academic counsel. In addition, faculty expressed the need to address whether high enrollment classes would result in increased pay if faculty are required to receive reduced pay for low enrollment classes. The definition of a low enrollment class was unclear and needs to be better defined. Last, information was requested regarding the status of the Portsmouth "campus pantry" and a response to this inquiry was emailed to faculty by Dr. Michelle Woodhouse on Dec 3rd regarding a soft launch. No motions were put forth as discussion time was limited due to the presentation. Our next campus senate meeting is scheduled for January 26, 2019 at 12:30pm.

Virginia Beach Chair Report

1. Canvas problems (with memory, exporting, and uploading Word and PPT docs).
2. Prorated classes (we're continuing the conversation via email, but the general sense is that faculty do not agree with prorating unless the faculty member agrees to it... and we're concerned that adjuncts will be pressured to do so against their better judgments).
3. Faculty/course evaluations (Where are they? I've emailed Marian Anderfuren and Corey McCray.)
4. Testing Center hours for online working students.
5. Reorganization...specifically the need for more Deans on the VB Campus, and specifics if we are to use Discipline Leads. How will they be selected? How will they be rotated within a division? What happens when there is conflict? Will they have 9 month contracts? If yes, will that provide enough support? (VCCS Policy regarding supervisors.)

6. The Website makes it difficult for students and their parents/guardians to find specific information on any one campus. For example, when trying to find a counselor or adviser, the website leads students to the Prospect Team (who have not always been following the set procedures... another problem really). This is frustrating for those seeking specific help.

Adjunct Committee Report – December CWFS – Submitted by Elizabeth Harris

One adjunct contacted the committee this month and has also contacted the local college provost with the following questions for which answers are requested. The adjunct would like to see the data specifically at TCC relative to the national situation.

1. ! How many of the TCC classes are taught by adjuncts relative to full-time faculty?
2. ! What is the TCC pay scale for adjuncts? How does this compare with full-time faculty?
3. ! What programs or benefits are available to adjuncts? [The adjunct suggests medical or retirement programs to which an adjunct could contribute.]
4. ! Is there a policy regarding when adjuncts should receive their contracts and pay for teaching? Is there any recourse for not being paid according to the printed schedule? With whom should adjuncts follow up if they are not paid? [Apparently on at least one campus some adjuncts were not paid in a timely manner, sometimes waiting up to 8 weeks after the start of a class to receive the first paycheck.]

Submitted to S. Deputy, 12-2-2018