

# FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

**February 20, 2015**

Faculty Senate Chair: <b>Ron Marston</b>	Faculty Senate Chair-Elect: <b>John Adlish</b>	Executive Committee member, Curriculum, Assessment & Programs Committee Chair: <b>Melanie Purdy</b>
Executive Committee member, Salary, Benefits and Budgetary Concerns Committee Chair: <b>Steve Bale</b>	Executive Committee member, Professional Standards Interim Committee Chair: <b>Eddie Burke</b>	Executive Committee member, Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee Chair: <b>Brian Ruf</b>
Library Committee Chair: <b>Tom Kearns</b>	Part-Time Faculty Issues Committee Chair: <b>Dawne Ernette</b>	Recognition & Activities Committee Chair: <b>Erin Frock</b>
Senators for Allied Health: <b>Julie Muhle</b> <b>Patti Sanford</b>	Senators for Technical Sciences: <b>Mike Schulz</b> <b>Brian Ruf</b>	Senators At-Large: <b>Tommie Guy</b> <b>Jay Jorgenson</b> <b>Tom Kearns</b> <b>Melanie Purdy</b>
Senators for Biology: <b>Jim Collier</b> <b>Dan Williams</b>	Senators for Business Division: <b>Robert Kirchman</b> <b>Nancy O'Neal</b>	Senators for Computer Technology: <b>Cathy House</b> <b>Judy Frederickson</b>
Senators for English: <b>Julie Armbrecht</b> <b>Robin Griffin</b>	Senators for Humanities: <b>Tom Cardoza</b> <b>Wade Hampton</b>	Senators for Math: <b>Shannon McCool</b> <b>Lars Jensen</b>
Senator for Physical Sciences: <b>Matt Leathan</b> <b>Dan Loranz</b>	Senator for History, Political Science & Law: <b>None</b>	Senators for Social Sciences: <b>John Coles</b>
Senator for Visual and Performing Arts: <b>Dan Bouweraerts</b> <b>Brian Wells</b>		

**Absent:** Cathy House (her proxy was Judy Fredrickson).

**Guests:** President Sheehan, Dr. Jane Nichols, Stephanie Prevost, Dr. Rachel Solemsaas, Rich Olsen, Fred Lokken, Travis Souza, Kyle Dalpe, Sharon Wurm, Michele Meador.

The meeting was called to order at 12:34 p.m.

**Chair Marston:** Please be sure to sign in on the sign in sheet (Exhibit A).

**Order of Business:** We have a very full agenda today. We have important items to discuss. Many of these items are action items that you will be voting on. I expect some of these items to potentially generate some robust discussion and differing opinions may be expressed. I would ask everyone to please be respectful of each other's viewpoints. It is my job to keep this meeting productive and civil. That is what I intend to do today.

In that light I would like to remind the Senate of a handful of Roberts Rules that I will be adhering today a little more strictly than I typically do. If any of you want to speak please raise your hand and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

- During the discussion of action items please limit your comments to 5 minutes. Roberts Rules allow 10 minutes per comment but suggest that 2 minutes is ideal. This is so everyone has the opportunity to speak.

- If anyone wants to speak a second time on an item you will need to wait until everybody else who wants to speak has had an opportunity to do so.
- As a reminder to our guests today, if you are not a Senator or not on the agenda you can only speak if called upon, or if you have made prior arrangements with the Chair.

The President and the Vice President will be giving their reports shortly. If you have questions for the President or the Vice President during their reports:

- Please limit your questions to 3 minutes a piece as well.
- If you have a comment or a statement to make rather than a question and if it's related to the resolutions that we have got further on in the agenda, I am going to ask you to please wait until we reach those items on the agenda to make your comments or suggestion. This is in the interest of not rehashing information twice.
- If it's related to an agenda item let wait and have the discussion when we get to that item on the agenda.

## Approval of Meeting Agenda (Exhibit B)

---

**Motion:** To approve the meeting agenda for February 20, 2015 as submitted.

Movant: Melanie Purdy

Second: Dan Bouweraerts

Vote: Passed unanimously

## Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 19, 2014 (Exhibit C)

---

**Motion:** To approve the Faculty Senate meeting minutes from December 19, 2014 with the following corrections- Senator Wells: 2<sup>nd</sup> page from the end-Motion to adjourn was seconded by Brian Wells. I will take credit for that one.

Chair Purdy: On page 25 the second paragraph that should be the English Curriculum for AA/AS, not the AAS. On page 25 in the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph should say Poly Sci.

Movant: Melanie Purdy

Second: Wade Hampton

Vote: Passed unanimously

## President's Report - President Maria Sheehan

---

Thank you for the opportunity to address you this afternoon. I want to start with an apology for the upset of recent decisions that I have made. I have been very focused on the concerns that you have expressed.

As soon as the first resolution came to my attention, your Chair called me and asked for an opportunity to speak to the issue. That meeting was scheduled in less than 24 hours of that request. I cleared my calendar because there wasn't anything more important than hearing the concerns that were being put on the table. At that meeting we had the author of the resolution, your Chair and the President of NFA. We talked about what bell had been rung and what bell could not be unring. A decision had been made. We talked about what we could do going forward. I think the resolution that you have is a good expression of what can be done going forward and I am certainly interested in supporting it.

So what exactly occurred? Going down the path and I don't want to rehash old things, but I did all of the checks I thought I should have asking if this was permissible.

I checked with finance, HR and I did the legal check with Systems asking if this was something permissible, before going to our governance body and expressing what I thought I was going to do.

I think it's merited that we've had somebody in a position and making that change seems merited. I don't know that there is any discussion about having equity between Vice Presidents as the issue. The issue is process. I completely get that now.

The most critical part of what we do here is all about students. What I am trying to do is address student needs. That's what the public, the Chancellor and the Regents want me to do. They want me to be about students. I am running fast on your behalf to address the needs of students. I thought that we are all losing our focus here.

This morning I spent the early morning hours with the Nursing Faculty at Redfield. They were talking about issues that are critical, but they didn't talk about issues in terms of losing focus about students.

Since 2008, at our very first Convocation, our conversations were about students. What we could do and how we could make it better for students. That was an engaging discussion.

Since that time, we've had made incredible strides because of the work that you have done.

I thought "The Faculty's not losing their focus, it's me that is losing my focus". You need me strong to address the issues that we are going to be dealing with within the legislature.

Our Chancellor is going to be fighting for our budget. We need every dollar that we can get.

I need your support to move us forward looking at how we are going to address student needs.

Look at the campus at Redfield, that's about students. They said you can't do it, that's not going to happen. It's happening!

- Look at Edison, it's for students that are our technical students. It's a terrible location and environment for faculty to have to work in. It won't be anymore. That's about students. Helping students, helping job remedial students.
- Now look at this campus. Why are we looking at an opportunity for another huge funding obligation to ourselves? It's about students. Isn't it sad that we are over 40 years old and we are taking students space every single day and saying you can't be here because we need your space, we are setting up for a meeting, there's a group coming in. They deserve to have their space.
- What about our Fine Arts campus, our Performing Arts Faculty? They're in an environment where the lease is going to be up in 18 months where are those students going to go?
- We've got focus on our one opportunity to have the last building that this Institution is going to have. That's not going to be easy. That's a hard, hard sell. Raising money in this environment over the last years has been extremely difficult. I would like to focus on what we can do to make a difference to solidify the financial base of the Institution for years to come. If we wait for the state to support us, we are going to be waiting a very long time, it's not going to happen, it's not happening now.
- Our Chancellor's going to go to bat for us and he is going to pour his heart out to try and make something happen for us. But it's a 50/50 that we'll get the kind of funding that we need.
- We need mitigation funding, will we get that? We hope so for our colleague's sake and for our sake. That's a huge issue.
- We need our \$5 weighted student credit hour. That's a huge effort for us. That will help us and help us help the students tremendously. It will put money into projects that are dedicated to students.

My obligation is to keep my focus on the students and not to be distracted by other issues. I want to put time into working with this body to go forward in a positive way.

When I look at what the board is going to ask me... What have you done for students? How did you spend your 8% money? That was fee money from the students; how did you spend that? That went to students with a promise that we're going to do a better job in a number of areas, including work force support, retention services, making sure students have ed. plans and restoring the positions that were taken away in the very early cuts.

The student support, the student life coordinator. I can remember the students going to the Chancellor and saying the President took our position away. Yes, I did. I took the position away and I took many other administrative positions away. I tried to keep those cuts as far away from the faculty as I possibly could.

Academic faculty has not lost jobs here. We cut other things prior. We are stable here. We are not going to cut academic positions.

So, how do we go forward? That's going to be up to you. But I've got to keep my focus on students. How do we do that? I think we have to build a sustainable future financially. The only way we are going to do that is to be more entrepreneurial that we have ever been before. It's not enough that we launched a \$25 million dollar campaign and got this close to it. That's not enough we need to have \$50 million. That needs to be the goal. We can't stop or there will not be any stability for the Institution in the future. This is building the future. How do we do that? I think we have to completely throw out some of the old things that we have been thinking of. There can be new ways that this Institution can approach.

I need your help on this. Right now there is one Institutional Advancement Officer on this campus and myself. The opportunities to support this campus are everywhere. For the first time we are actually getting major foundations asking us to give them a proposal. These same foundation were for years not giving us more than \$20,000 a year. Then it moved to a \$1 million, then \$2 million.

There is support out there for us if we can get to those who wish to support us. But 2 people can't do it. I am not talking about bringing on a fulltime individual. I am talking about working with the faculty senate to redesign, to bring about a new approach.

- Using the 20 years of a university college professional in fundraising.
- Use my 20 years of being a fundraiser in community colleges.

We have just gone through the most collaborative effort ever - To build a dream for a building here. How many participated in the faculty review of the building? Where would the parking lot be? Where would the building be?

- From this collaboration came great ideas. We will have the best possible building that we could ever hope for because of this collaboration.
- I step back and say this can't be my dream this has to be your dream. It's got to be what you want. It's going to be because of an effort that brought together the faculty, administrators, students and respected classified staff as well.
- We can resolve the parking problem, we can dream for that building if everyone is participating. But I need your help on that.

Getting back to our financial stability, we need every kind of entrepreneurial effort if you're going to build the base of the institution for the future. I want to talk about this. I want this to be an issue with this body. This is a powerful body that can do great things.

I need help in building the things that you want. For the sake of students and no one else, that's why we're all here.

The campus community at Redfield talked about the issue of safety. I want us to spend more time on the issue of safety. I want us to know that we're all safe, both our student and ourselves.

- We have more expertise here than I have had in past institutions where we had a crisis. I think we were better prepared in my past institutions than we are today. We've got to do something about these safety issues. But I

need everyone's help to take a look at the resources we've got and how to put them together. So that you feel safe, students are safe and we know what to do in a crisis. Not just at Dandini but at every campus that we have. That's critical and that's what was foremost on the minds of your colleagues at Redfield.

- I think we have to look at grant writing as a critical part of what we do. I know that your Vice Chair participated in the grant writing seminar just recently. There are dollars to support this Institution if we go in that direction in a very strategic manner. It's got to be the fundraising, it's got to be the grant writing. All of that has to come together to create the best financial base that we can have.
- What about shared services? How is that going to work? I need participation in that. We are trying to do everything that we possibly can. If you've seen your colleagues Cathy Brewster she's running in circles. She is everywhere at once. We're servicing Great Basin and Western.
- We're trying to do everything we can to get the best service here at TMCC.

So in conclusion, I'd like to say that I would like to get our focus back to where I can help the best.

- I can help you best at the Legislature and in the community.
- I want partners in the community because the support for this Institution can be far greater than it ever has been and so far we're doing pretty well.
- We've got to look to the future and know that the holes are going to be there. The University Presidents in California for years had to Fundraise 10% of their base budget. I don't know if it will be that unreasonable in the future that will be the expectation of presidents at this Institution.

I am in support of your resolution. Once again I definitely regret the time and attention away from what the public wants us to be responsible for, why we are all here. We are here for students.

Before there are any questions, can we reflect on how the question addresses students?

**Q. Senator Wells:** President Sheehan why can't we protect our cherished shared governance processes while still providing for the needs of our student and raising money for new buildings? Why can't we do all of these things?

**A. President Sheehan:** You are absolutely correct in that regard. In running so fast and trying to make progress quickly, did I make mistakes? Absolutely, and I regret that. In going forward you have to catch me while I'm running down the road and say wait a minute! You didn't consult. I am going to try and remember that's part of the culture of the Institution. That's what I wasn't paying attention too. That's my failing and I am sorry for that. I wasn't keying in on that issue. I should have been. I am usually very good at looking at what the cultural values of an Institution and each one is different. I missed that and I am sorry.

**Comment: Senator Jensen:** I don't believe that a decision has been made aware or a bell has been rung. I think Presidents of a places like this around the whole country have rung the bell many times and they've had to be unringed upon closer review. I don't think that there is any shame or anything wrong about that at all. You talked a lot about students and how collaboration brings better planning, and how you the President, you need help. We want to help with the hiring of the VPSS.

**Q. Senator Jensen:** I want to ask you in that respect why you wanted to violate the bylaws which are our governing document, to suspend the bylaws in order to install a Vice President of your choice?

**A. President Sheehan:** I think that has already been responded to by a legal opinion and also within your own resolution, granting the authority to make that decision. In the future I will certainly be far more collaborative in making that kind of decision. I have already expressed how we went down the road. What I shared and how I shared it. It wasn't a secret. I went to our governing body. I went through what happened in 2008. Here we are today and here's where we want to go. These are the reasons why. I presented that to the governance body thinking that's pretty good shared governance. Obviously that's not the thinking and I understand that now. I get it. The final decision is not with me. The paperwork is with the Chancellor. He will make the final decision.

**Senator Jensen:** I don't think your legal council is correct. I think that some of the legal counsel you have received I believe is factually incorrect. I will talk about that later today at the meeting. I do think that needs to be reconsidered.

**Q. Chair Purdy:** It's more of a comment just to identify where I recall us being aware of this information. Is it appropriate now just say that?

**A. Chair Marston:** Briefly.

**Comment: Chair Purdy:** I recall us as being aware of this information. I remember and looked and I was talking with Bridgett about this that on August 14th it was mentioned at Convocation that the 2 positions were being split. So we were notified at that point and then also in the PAC meeting. I think that Chair-Elect Adlish you were at that December meeting, it was identified. Does that meet the critical definition of consultation? No, but were we completely in the dark and did this take us by surprise? No.

**Comment: Chair-Elect Adlish:** I just need a point of clarification. You said that the positions were split. Which positions are you talking about?

**A. Chair Purdy:** It's clearly a side that says that Dr. Sheehan had planned to separate the Vice President of Student Services back out from the Vice President of Academic Affairs and it was verbalized at 9 minutes and 56 seconds in that. I have been trying to get all of the information on this so I just want to clarify that we weren't taken completely blindsided by this. So it had started to feel like that.

**Chair Marston:** Thank you President Sheehan. Are there any other questions for President Sheehan?

**Chair Marston:** Now, moving on to the Vice President of Academic Affairs Report.

## Vice President of Academic Affairs' Report - Vice President Jane Nichols

Thank you very much. It's a pleasure be with you this afternoon. I have a very brief report. There are two issues that I want to bring you up to date on and then I am happy to answer questions.

### **Textbook Taskforce**

- The Textbook Taskforce has been meeting.
- We will be bringing forward to Faculty Senate recommendations from the taskforce.
- At the March meeting, if I may: The recommendations are in line with the current Faculty Senate Policy on textbooks and do focus on our finding new ways to try to provide the course materials to students in the most affordable way and the best opportunity for students.
- We've had some really good meetings. I have learned a lot. I think we all have learned a lot about some of the new options out there.
- We are going to come to you with some recommendations in March.

### **Scheduling Software**

Many of you are aware of the Scheduling Software. Many of you may not be aware of it. Two years ago, we purchased X25 Scheduling Software. We have been using it. We have not used it to its full capacity.

Beginning with the fall semester, we will have the ability to run the optimizer part of that software. Please don't ask me detailed questions about how that works. We will get the information to you if you have specifics.

Basically what we're going to have for the fall semester, in scheduling is a tool. That is all. One tool to help look at the fall schedule and see if we are optimizing our room space and students demand based upon past history and the students that we have.

I want to give you a heads up that:

- I had a meeting with the department chairs.
- I will be working with the Deans.
- I will be coming to the Faculty to look at the fall schedule you have planned.
- In some cases, not all, I will be asking questions about what we could do regarding trying to setup our schedule in a way that will enable students to get the classes they need.
- You know a lot of the pieces of that discussion. You know we need our enrollment next year to be as high as it can possibly be since it's the basis for our budget for the next biennium. Not this one, but the next biennium. If our schedule in any way is getting in the way of students getting the classes they need, I will be sharing that information with you from that tool.
- You may tell me that well, it doesn't know this and doesn't know that. I am not going to come in and tell you that you have to do this.
- You will be getting that information and we will be having that conversation within the next 2-3 weeks, before we finalize the fall schedule.

**Q. Chair Ruf:** My question is on the software. Does that software also track student's that are concurrently taking classes at TMCC and UNR? Will it track students that transfer to UNR?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** Will it track students who transfer to UNR? No.

**Q. Chair Ruf:** Will we be able to count those as completers?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** The capacity to track our students to UNR only resides at the System Level. They track by student ID across the Institutions. We have made the request to the System Office to track those for us. We have not received that information. We do have the ability and in the funding formula we are recognized for successful transfers to any Institution. They do track that. But into the field and then how successful students are in graduating from UNR? We do not have that data. This software doesn't track individual students. So it will not be able to do that.

**Q. Chair Ruf:** That's only transfers in the state. Correct?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** No, it's actually across the country. They have the ability to use our national database to track students.

**Q. Chair Burke:** You alluded to it there in the last answer. In the Professional Standards Meeting and Division Meeting you talked about possibly increasing class sizes. Is that going to be a consideration with this new scheduling?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** I have opened the door and asked all of you, thank you very much, many of you are stepping up to consider adding class size where it doesn't interfere with pedagogy. Yes, that is a part of that conversation but it's not part of the software. It's just part of our conversation as a Faculty. It has also opened the door to some innovative new ways of thinking, where you might teach instead of 25 students you might teach 50 students and it would count as two sections and put it in a bigger room, because a lot of this has to do with the match between the room size and the cap that you place on the class.

So, if you have a Tier 2 room that will hold 50 students but you have a cap of 25, it's not a very efficient use of space. It may be fine because there may not be any other class that needs that space. But if there is, the software will say: This probably is not the best use of your space.

So we are looking at room size, room cap but the conversation about Faculty putting a higher cap on your class is a conversation going on in your departments I hope and in your division.

**Q. Chair Burke:** Who gets to decide the actual # number. Will it be the software or the Faculty Member?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** The Faculty are always in control.

**Chair Burke:** Well, I hope so. But that wasn't the case when I got my fall schedule for 2015. My numbers were already locked in. They were increase and I was not consulted before.

**A. Dr. Nichols** -I don't know. I can look into that. But the question of who sets the class cap which is really the CAP Committee when they approve a course, I have asked Departments and Deans to look at increasing that cap if it makes sense. Whether or not that has occurred, I can look into it.

**Chair Purdy** – On the curricular side, we do ask that when people submit if the class maximum isn't there, that individuals put that in and Admission and Records Jeffrey has been a key in finding that default number.

**Chair Burke:** I understand that but my classes are not in every semester in the same room. So my class size will now be dependent upon what room I am in according to the software. Which is disturbing.

**A. Dr. Nichols** The software is not going to change your class size. It does not have that capacity. It can flag your course as saying you know this could be bigger because you are asking for rooms that are bigger. But the software itself doesn't change anything. It just provides information.

**Chair Purdy:** So, check your MCO and see what it says.

**Chair Marston:** I think that Department Chairs in conjunction with the Deans might be making some of these decisions right now and we probably do need to keep an eye on this process. We don't want class sizes arbitrarily getting larger without the consultation at least of the Faculty member.

**Chair Burke:** That's my point.

**Chair Marston:** So that will have to be a part of this discussion.

**Dr. Nichols** Thank you.

**Comment. Senator Cardoza:** First I wanted to thank Dr. Nichols for Chairing the Textbook Committee. We've done some tremendous work in there and one the recommendations that we asked for or made. The Bookstore has already implemented that the new textbook orders coming out now have the retail price of the textbook to students for each textbook listed. I encourage everyone when you get them to look at them and then add up what the total cost is. I looked at some of we are offering and my eyes just about popped out of my head when I added everything up and said "Wow! That's a lot of money". So that was really neat.

**Q. Senator Cardoza:** Dr. Nichols, when you say that we haven't received the information from Systems does that mean we haven't received it yet or we're not going to receive it because they said no?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** The question of whether or not the System will provide us with the record of our students who transfer to 4 year institutions coming out of the community college and that is primarily the University of Nevada Reno. The answer to that has been no, they do not have the resources to provide that information to us. We have asked the University to provide that information. To my knowledge, this is not on anyone's radar screen right now. If Faculty Senate wants it to be on everyone's radar screen I can try to get it moved up. But it is not currently on anyone's radar screen.

**Chair Marston:** Are there any questions for Dr. Nichols?

## Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services - Dr. Rachel Solemsaas

---

Good afternoon. Thank you for having me. I am here to provide you three updates. The first I am going to defer to Chair Bale regarding the Summer School Compensation Taskforce.

### Summer School Compensation Taskforce

Chair Bale is one of your reps together with Molly Lingenfelter. We met 4-5 times and our work continues. Chair Bale can provide more details. We're really trying to make sure we base our recommendations that are grounded with data. In fact that's where we are at. We are trying to do a more thorough analysis of that so that there is no adverse impact to the students we serve for the summer school.

### **Parking and Transit Taskforce**

This taskforce is addressing both our parking and our transit needs.

#### **Parking:**

- DRI has already given us notice regarding the loss of the overflow parking which is about which is about 371 stalls.
- Depending on what we do with the Fine Arts Center and where it would be located could possibly displace 100 more stalls.
- We need to find where these are going to go. On certain days and during certain hours of the day we know we need that overflow and that extra capacity.
- On that committee you have Kreg Mebust and also Chair Bale joining us to help inform our recommendations. We also have several students for the student representation.
- We've actually hired a consultant who has given us 4 options ranging anywhere from \$4,500 to \$20,000 per stall
- The committee so far I believe has opted of course to the most economical model. So, we are looking into that.
- Our next step is to develop a financing strategy to support that cost. As you know it's a project that we are not going to get state funding for. It's not like we have money sitting around that we can put into our parking. We are working with the students, the faculty and staff so everyone knows that some of this cost will probably be some kind of a rate that we might have to secure support for.
- Probably another month, maybe at your next senate meeting or two we will probably have a proposal when it comes to parking.

#### **Transit:**

- As you do know we have quite a few students whose mobility access is by the bus system. We are working closely with RTC, but we do have a service gap. If you take the North/Northwest side, they have to go back to downtown in order to go to our Campus.
- With the help of UNR, we should be able to close this gap by having a transit/shuttle service available relatively cheaper than what RTC could offer us. That would continue to provide students discount bus passes and also address the service gap for those students who live on the North/Northwest side.
- We are trying to address this as one issue because you either drive or you take the bus.

#### **Capital Planning:**

As you know Robyn Powers has been here really as a follow up to see what are our next Capital Projects. We're in the process of putting this together. There's the transition plan for the RDMT 4<sup>th</sup> floor, when the Nursing Program goes to Redfield. The President has asked Robyn and I think several of you have participated, not just Faculty, we have Classified, Students and Administrators letting us know what our Top 5 Priorities should be when it comes to our Capital Planning.

Our next step is to take all of those top 5 from the different groups, then give you an update on what we are doing or planning to do. Whether it's additional classrooms, Faculty spaces, the Art Center, (I heard it's not Fine Arts now it's Art Center), or whatever that name would be. The Student Center, the President mentioned how we displace our students on the first floor.

We want to give an update so, we will be scheduling 2 sessions.

- The first is an update to what Robin has heard from the Campus Committee.
- The second update is on what we are doing now and how do we move forward.

**Q. Senator Jensen:** I would consider anything we have to pay for parking as a salary cut . Are we, Faculty going to get free parking? Is that part of the plan, free parking for Faculty?

**A. Dr. Solemsaas:** That is what the Parking Taskforce is considering. We are trying to see how we can keep open parking space, but we are also trying to figure out where the fund sources will come. It will most likely be some additional cost for the students and maybe some contributions from Faculty and Staff. I want to be upfront with you that this is what we are looking at. But, we haven't formulated our final recommendations. One of the things I did hear, it's not going to be something like UNR. I met with UNR Transportation Department. They have 18,000 stalls. Their parking budget they have to add about 40% to 50% just in operations and enforcement. We have 1,500 parking stalls and if we come to some kind of a parking fee, not only are paying for that service but we also have to consider an additional 40-50% just to enforce it. So there might be some way that a flat rate that both Students and the Faculty and Staff so that we don't have spend money just to hire enforcement officers. All of this we have to really incorporate. We have to come up with at least \$5 million to build that new parking lot and there aren't enough sidewalks during those tough hours cover 371 spots. I am looking at SGA President Provost, I know the students have been very active on this.

**Q. Chair Burke:** I was also asked at Professional Standards meeting to ask you about the Fine Arts Building, is there going to be a student fee for that? Is this going to be built on extra student fees?

**A. Dr. Solemsaas:** On that we don't know yet. It may be a combination because what we're seeing from the priority that the Campus Community wants us to pursue next is definitely the Art Center because you don't know our carrying capacity is there. The other is the Student Center Remodel. Those projects are combined. Then we will definitely have to ask the Students to see what kind of support they can provide for the Student Center Remodel.

**Q. Chair Burke:** I am talking about the mortgage, is it going to be paid off in Student Fees?

**A. Dr. Solemsaas:** Not all of it. I know that it may be a combination. The President is currently fund raising for the Art Center. Yes, definitely. That is why I have said that this Taskforce is not going to be just about parking. It is going to be parking and transit. Call it the Mobility Task Force.

**Q. Chair Burke:** We do have a situation at UNR where the fees are just out of control. We do have one student that is a member of our Committee. She's doing classes at UNR and the extra fees are \$480 a semester because of other add-ons.

**A. Dr. Solemsaas:** I am also taking a 1 credit class and realize that it's \$250 to take that one credit class. So that is why we have the Students involved in the process. If ever we do ask the Students for help, it requires their vote.

**Q. Chair Burke:** I understand but this a mortgage that is going to be here for 20-30 years so getting the Student vote today is not the same as the future Students.

**A. Dr. Solemsaas:** It's choices you're right, so how do we move forward and where do we get the investment? It may be a combination of minimal fees plus what we are able to raise from the Community. I know the President has already committed to raise \$15-20 million for the project. The last time I saw the Art Center modification, if we proceed with that, it's about \$21 million. The Student Center I don't know how you can raise funds for the Student Center without Student support.

**Chair Marston:** Are there any other questions of Dr. Solemsaas? The Chair recognizes Neil Siegel.

**Q. Neil Siegel:** How do we pass on the costs to the Students when we have an increase of 4% this year, another 4% next year, another 4% the next year, another 4% the next year and about 16% over the next four years and that's with the current status of the state. Now we are going to tie something else on for the students, in terms of parking I assume.

**A. Dr. Solemsaas:** We haven't imposed a fee yet. That's something that we would have to make an Institutional choice on and if the Students through their vote, it is not supported then we are not moving forward. All of these are choices and these are all Institutional choices and so we are providing as much information to make those choices. Then we can move forward after those choices.

**SGA: Stephanie Prevost:** We have three Student Representatives on the Parking and Transit Taskforce.. They have been very active in giving input. As Dr. Solemsaas has mentioned, we are going to have a question on the Student Government Elections ballot to propose the fee. We are not going to consider that information unless we get enough participation in that to have a substantial survey of the Student body.

**Senator Cardoza:** I think that Neil makes a good point. This is one reason why we as Faculty Members have a responsibility to bring the cost of the Textbooks to our students down. The fee increases, increases of all sorts are coming at them. We can't control or mitigate all of those, but we do have a responsibility to actually know what the cost of the Textbooks we assign is and to search for quality materials that are available at the lowest possible price. These students really don't have a lot of money. There are a lot of demands on their pocket books and we have an ability to make a really big difference just there at that point. I was just going to say to Dr. Solemsaas that I am glad that the Committee is considering the monstrous cost of enforcement, whenever you create pay parking because that where you lose half of your money that way. It really starts to make it look like a subsidy to the parking police than an actual fundraiser. I am wondering if we are looking at ways to encourage and facilitate alternate means of transportation. Whether it's bike paths up to the Campus or ways/incentives for student or Faculty to ride the bus, bicycle or otherwise get here not in a car.

**A. Dr. Solemsaas:** We haven't had that discussion. We will definitely consider that. That is why we are addressing transit. We want to make sure that we offer those alternative modes of transportation.

**SGA Stephanie Prevost:** Another thing that ties into this is with all of this, the bus route and the service gap to all of the North Valleys \and all of Northwest Reno, there's also a huge safety issue that I know a lot of you have expressed with students taking the bus and walking up the hill where there is not even a sidewalk on the hill. I wanted to let you know that I have been talking to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents about this issue because it's not an inconvenience issue, it's a safety issue. So I am also trying to get support from the Systems Office in that regard.

**Dr. Solemsaas:** Just one more bit of information. After the Students determine whether to support or not support the fee, it's also subject to the Board of Regents approval. So we also have that hurdle to go through.

## Report of Faculty Senate Chair Ron Marston

---

I have a couple of informational items that are not on the agenda. I want to announce that Sabbaticals were awarded. We awarded six Sabbaticals and actually a lot of those awardees are currently here.

**Sabbaticals Awarded for 2015-16:** Judy Fredrickson, Robin Griffin, Katie Kolbet, Patty Sanford, Neil Siegel, and Brian Wells. It's nice that were are still able to do that.

Another quick announcement: Student Services is looking for a faculty volunteer to serve on a new Suicide Prevention Advisory Board. I think this is a grant funded committee. If you are interested please shoot me a quick email and I will set you up with that.

### VPAA Search:

- Announcement for first consideration closes today.
- This committee is chaired by Dr. Solemsaas.
- Faculty are well represented on the committee: Chair-elect Adlish, Cheryl Cardoza, Anne Flesher, Michelle Montoya and I are all on the committee.
- We have a large pool of applicants.
- Meeting on Monday for the first time to go through the applicants
- ELS consultants –will not be involved in the decision making process. They were hired primarily to bring in a broad diverse pool. They will not be on campus, period.
- We are setting up a Webpage for this on our site that will have information and updates about what is going on with this search. This is all to help make the process as transparent as we can make it.

## **Budget Reduction Committee:**

Being Chaired by Dr. Nichols and I am Co-Chairing.

We met for the 1<sup>st</sup> time 2 weeks ago. We are meeting for our 2<sup>nd</sup> time later today. The Faculty are well represented on this Committee. We have 6 Faculty including myself, Chair-Elect Adlish, Chair Bales, Julie Muhle, Dr. Julia Hammett, Ana Douglas, Wes Evans, and SGA President Stephanie Prevost.

- Being run similarly to the way we ran it last time (Dec. 2013, 15 months ago).
- We are looking at the same deficit of \$2 million that we need to cut out of our budget.
- We have started to identify potential areas of savings and potential revenue streams.
- Stay tuned for more information on this as it becomes available.

## **IT Shared Services statement:**

This is a statement to be read into the record as information. It comes from administrative faculty in the IT department, who have asked me to pass this information along to Faculty.

***Under the topic of Shared Services, much is underway in our Information Technology area. Pete Zipkin, a consultant for Shared Services in IT at NSHE has been hired by NSHE (Woodbeck, Zink, Klaich) as an interim Chief Information Technology Officer.***

***He has developed a plan to bring together the IT departments from TMCC, WNC and GBC. This plan is in the process of being approved. Mr. Zipkin is engaging TMCC IT staff for input on how this new shared services organization will work. A chief goal in all of this is to maintain the same level of service to constituents at each of these institutions.***

## **My comment on IT Shared Services – also for the record.**

It is my hope that faculty at TMCC will have a voice in the planning and implementation of any changes to the IT Department, and that no reduction of services to students or faculty occurs as a result of any changes, and that IT services remain directly accountable to the institutions they serve.

**Q: Chair Purdy:** That is your statement. Should we have something from the Faculty Senate? A resolution or wording that is similar so that everybody is aware that we don't want to lose all of the greatness that we have?

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Are you making a motion to turn Chair Marston's statement into a resolution?

**Chair Purdy:** We could do that or we re-sample the words.

**Senator Cardoza:** I'll move that.

**Chair Marston:** It certainly would not be inappropriate for such a resolution. However, I would recommend that rather than turning my statement into a resolution on the fly that the Senate may be able to come up with some slightly better wording. It would be better if a resolution was drafted and distributed amongst Faculty and then approved at the next Senate meeting. That would be my advice if the Senate wants to pursue such a resolution.

**Q: Senator Cardoza:** How much time do we have?

**Chair Purdy:** I think he said the next meeting which would be a month from now.

**Chair Marston:** The next meeting is March 27, 2015. You would have to have it done by then.

**Q: Chair Purdy:** When is the shared services supposed to happen?

**Chair Marston:** It's is really up in the air right now.

**Q: Senator Cardoza:** How much time do we have until the IT shared services is going to occur anyway and it becomes mute what we think?

**Chair Marston:** I know that movement is going to happen before our next Senate Meeting. I don't know exactly what that movement is going to be. I still think that a resolution, even if it were at the March Senate Meeting would probably be a good idea.

**Senator Cardoza:** I like your resolution.

**Chair Purdy:** I wouldn't mind working with IT. I think Tommie is a representative e and you are actually in IT. So maybe we could work together, reviewing Chair Marston's' statement and make a thoughtful resolution. I would be willing to do that. If one of us could bring that forward if we want to.

**Chair Marston:** I want to make sure that I was clear. If you want to move such a resolution today, you are certainly allowed to do that. I was just giving some advice.

**Q: Senator Wells:** Would you please read your statement again?

**Chair Purdy:** I hate to make decision without consulting with our constituents though.

**Chair Marston:** If there was a resolution I would get rid of the first several words. It says:

"It is my hope that faculty at TMCC will have a voice in the planning and implementation of any changes to the IT Department, and that no reduction of services to students or faculty occurs as a result of any changes, and that IT services remain directly accountable to the institutions they serve."

**Senator Wells:** I'm not sure that we should make a resolution from your hopes.

**Chair Marston:** Like I said we would want to strike those words.

**Senator Wells:** We might want to take a close look at that first sentence.

**Chair Marston:** This could be given to the Professional Standards Committee. Time is somewhat of the essence here. I would suggest that if there is a resolution it needs to come by our next Faculty Senate Meeting.

**Chair Purdy:** So are you going send it to Professional Standards or should I work with Tommie.

**Chair Burke:** Am I being appointed that?

**Chair Marston:** Are you volunteering?

**Chair Burke:** Sure.

**Chair Marston:** Very good. Let's keep moving then.

## **President Evaluation Survey**

This has turned out to be somewhat timely I think. Let me take a little bit of time to explain this. I gave all of this information top you at our last Senate Meeting. It was in my report in December. The Faculty Senate Chairs of all the Institutions were drafting some revisions to Board Policy regarding the evaluation process of the Presidents. This was actually initiated by the Chancellor, so I expect this to be support by the Chancellor.

What I have given you is a draft of the changes to the Procedures and Guidelines Manual (P&G Manual). This is where it is in the NSHE Code, so to speak. This is where that information exists.

There 2 components to this set of changes:

1. The first of the changes basically allows the Faculty Senates to do an annual survey of the Faculty, the results of which will be used by the Chancellor in his/hers evaluations of the Presidents. There is currently a periodic evaluation every three years of all of the Presidents. That's the big one our President went through last year. In addition to that there's an annual evaluation that the Chancellor does that the Institutions don't participate in. This gives Faculty an opportunity to weigh in on their thought of the performance of their President and then the Chancellor will use this information to inform his/her evaluations.
2. The second components are really just revision to the existing policy that makes Faculty participation a little bit stronger and a little bit more inclusive. It makes recommendation that the Faculty Senate be more involved and that notification come out quicker. We had an issue with our Presidents evaluation last year where I was sitting in the evaluation committee meeting and listening to legal counsel with the System read this statement that says that the Faculty can do a survey to be used in conjunction with the period evaluation. I had never heard of this before. We scrambled while sitting in that meeting to get a survey put together that Faculty could participate in. Last Semester I received an email from CSN's Faculty Senate Chair saying we were doing our Presidents evaluation and on the last day that we can do a survey and we haven't done a survey yet. I responded that this is exactly what happened to us.

This change to the verbiage requires that the System notify the Institutions that these evaluations are coming. I know that now moving forward but, future Faculty Senate Chairs from now, may not know.

What I am asking is to support this draft of changes so that we can continue moving forward with this. We are going to submit it to the Vice-Chancellor of the Legal Affairs Brooke Neilson. She has already giving this her verbal stamp of approval. My hope is to have this policy change in place. Approved for the June 15 & 16<sup>th</sup> Board of Regent Meeting which

**Q: Senator Wells:** The language on the first one under annual evaluations of NSHE Presidents; Is it this language cast in stone here or can we make recommendations? It seems a little clunky for lack of a better term. For comparative purposes there should be general consistency of question for each Presidents Evaluation. That almost sounds to me like the consistency should be within each Presidents evaluation rather than between the evaluations of the member Institution Presidents.

**Chair Marston:** The intent there is that the survey be consistent across the Institutions so that the Chancellor has what he calls longitudinal data. You can make a suggestion if you want; I would say though that this language is not perfectly done yet. In fact the reason that area is in yellow is because it's already been revised for the same reason you are bringing up. It was even more confusing originally. The final verbiage is not set yet. My suggestion would be to focus more on the overall intent rather than picking apart the individual bits of language.

**Senator Cardoza:** I agree but I also see Senator Well's point. The language there tends to take the intent in a different direction. If we said consistency of questions across all Presidents Evaluations, it would clearly indicate that the intent of the rule without allowing that wiggle room for interpretation.

**Chair Marston:** If the Senate is willing, we can certainly approve this motion with that caveat or with that change. Is there any other discussion?

**Chair Marston:** Am I to interrupt that Senator Wells, you are making a motion to approve as amended and Senator Cardoza's is a 2nd to that?

**Senator Wells:** Yes.

**Senator Cardoza:** Yes, I think you could take it that way.

**Chair Marston:** Any further discussion?

## Approval of Presidential Evaluation Policy (Draft of Changes)(Action Item) (Exhibit D)

---

**Motion:** To approve with the amended changes.

Movant: Senator Wells

Second: Senator Cardoza

Vote: Passed unanimously

Abstentions: 1 Senator Bouweraerts

**Chair Marston:** That concludes my report.

## Report of Faculty Senate Chair-Elect - Dr. John Adlish

---

### Ad hoc Reorganizational Committee

Let me give you a little background on this document.

The Organizational Unit Elimination Form (Action Item).

- This document is in response to some of the changes that have been occurring regarding Dean. Lokken's position and to some extent the VPSS (Vice President of Student Services).
- I was appointed the Chair this Committee and I am Chairing it.
- Dr. Nichols (who is on this Committee as well) who filled in the language.
- This document has gone through some editing and the ? Committee. Right Dr. Nichols.?
- Then the Ad hoc Reorganizational Committee changes to create the final document in front of you now.
- Dr. Nichols has asked us to approve or not approve this document.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** So what we need to do is if you've read this and you go through it, is really to entertain a motion for a vote to approve or not approve this document.

**Senator Purdy:** To approve this document?

**Chair Marston:** This is an action item for you to approve or not. We will need a motion to approve first and a second. Is there anyone willing to make such a motion?

**Chair Purdy:** I will motion.

## Approval of Elimination of Web College (Action Item)(Exhibit E)

---

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Is there any discussion?

**Q. Senator Kirchman** It just wasn't completely clear to me for example where the current Web College Support Services are going to live. In particular, I can't do my job if someone if it's not Brandy or someone/somebodies got to be fulfilling that. So could you give us a little exposition on that?

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Dr. Nichols would you mind answering?

**Dr. Nichols:** Yes. I think I understood the question. I think the change will be invisible as far as this Campus is concerned. Brandy assumed a year ago a position of Program Manager in which she actually has responsibility for the online college and also for the Academic Support Center. Obviously she has been performing those duties and I think

going forward work very hard at that. It is certainly not my intention in supporting this in any way to decrease or change the services we need in classroom instruction and online education.

**Chair Purdy:** But Web College I mean Brandi's Department wouldn't be with the shared services IT going wherever right? That's always going to be separate?

**Dr. Nichols:** Of course IT is critical to everything. To supporting keeping online going, keeping Media Services going and the support for videography and so forth. Currently those services are divided between IT and the Web College. So, any change that we were to make in IT could certainly have an impact. I don't think that this particular change and that has got to be monitored carefully is looked at in terms of keeping the services we need. I don't think that this particular administrative position is critical to do that.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Just to go along with that Senator Purdy, it's also her position as Program Director so that entered into the discussion on this committee of reorganizing what would be her title and where she's placed and things like that. So, there is a description for Program Director.

One other thing that I want to bring up; I don't think I see anyone here today from History, Political Science or Law. Are you in that department? There was discussion over strengthening the language to keep that department intact because as they move back into Liberal Arts because prior to that there had been discussion about fusing 2 departments together. So that's why the language down there, we wanted it to actually be redundant:

The Department of History, Political Science and Law will be returned to the Division of Liberal Arts along with its classified support. This academic Department will remain intact within the Liberal Arts Division.

That's our way of getting the Administration to commit to that that will remain a department and will have its own Chair.

**Q. Senator Coles:** What is the political aimings for people in that department? Do they support the change or oppose it?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** The Chair of the department did meet with the Faculty. Are you speaking about there are different subsets of people. But within the Political Science, History & Law Faculty, I met with the Faculty and not unanimously but by a wide majority the Faculty supports this move back to Liberal Arts. The people within the Online Education support it. Within the Academic Support Center it really means no change to them so they're not concerned about it.

**Q. Senator Cole:** You concur?

**A. Chair-Elect Adlish:** Yes. I do.

**Q. Senator Cardoza:** I would like to call on Dr. Hall and ask her if she wants to add anything to this or make any kind of statement. But no pressure, but you're here so.

**A. Dr. Hall:** I came to observe but to answer your question Senator Cole. Most of us in the History, Political Science and Law department have been against loosing our Dean. We think Dean Lokken had done a phenomenal job and so we are very saddened by that. However, with the reorganization already being in place our primary option is to go under Liberal Arts. So supportive of us going back under Liberal Arts, yes, and the majority of us are now in support of the elimination. Period.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Any other questions, discussions or comments?

**Q: Senator Lingenfelter:** Dr. Nichols when you say people in Online Education support the change, who are those people? Is that Brandi and who works for Brandi?

**Dr. Nichols:** Who is in that division? That is it. It is Brandi and who works for Brandi.

**Senator Lingenfelter:** Okay, thank you.

**Dr. Nichols:** It is very much a support unit to all of us, all of you. A critical support unit for us going forward.

**Senator Bale:** Because John Reid's in my hallway and because I talk to John somewhat regularly, I took the opportunity to ask him his feelings on this to make sure no one was misunderstanding. He was very clear that he is very supportive of this.

**Q. Senator Wells:** The reporting line of the Web College entity, where does that Program Director report?

**A. Dr. Nichols:** It would be to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, just as the Library Director is to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. So it would add an additional direct responsibility of supervision to the VPAA.

**Chair Marston:** We've got a motion and a second. So, let's call the question here.

**Motion:** To approve the elimination of WebCollege.

Movant: Chair Purdy

Second: Senator Wells

Vote: Passed unanimously

Abstentions: 1 Senator Cardoza

#### **Ad-Hoc Chair-Elect Committee (Action Item):**

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** In March it will be that time to run elections for Senate Chair-Elect. The Committee is pretty small. I am it so far. We're looking at about the people. We don't have to do a lot. You just have to get the date out and ask for nominations. There is a time period when nominations are open and we close that, get the voting results (which are all done electronically through Cal. Which he tabulates and then returns to the Chair-Elect. Then I would talk to the new Chair-Elect on that issue. Senator Bale, where you serious about joining?

**Chair Bale:** Sure.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** (If you would like to be on that committee, you can put it on your annual plan. Just let me know. I'd appreciate it. Unlike my colleague to the left here...who has been marketing the Chair-Elect Position... You just have to look at this whole Senate Chair situation as dog years. You know, Chair Marston is 28 years now because of 2 years as Chair-Elect and 2 years as Senate Chair. So they go by quickly.). In case you're thinking that it can be a long commitment. We are encouraging nominations.

#### **Administrative Evaluation Policy:**

- We have finalized the language in our statement.
- We will present this to the Faculty to vote on that as well as the Presidents Advisory Council.
- We have the 1<sup>st</sup> rough draft of surveys that we can send out for Deans. We will start with Academic Deans. By sometime in March or the beginning of April, we have to send those out.
- The Deans Evaluations have to be done by the Vice President and the Vice President has agreed that the surveys will go into her accountability with the Deans. So, be looking for those to come out.
- Please participate in these. We are trying to make the survey for Deans shorter than things we've done before, (which was many years ago), but better quality of questions (how does your supervisor actually perform their job).
- We've worked on wordsmithing a lot of these question on the survey so they will hopefully have a little more meaning than just did they communicate 1-5.

## Consent Agenda (ACTION) (Exhibit F)

---

**Motion:** To approve the Consent Agenda

**Chair Marston:** Any deletion or changes to the Consent Agenda? Hearing none I move to approve the Consent Agenda. All those in favor?

Movant: Senator Cardoza

Second: Chair-Elect Adlish

Vote: Passed unanimously

Abstentions: None.

## Committee Reports

---

### Student Government Association - Stephanie Prevost, SGA President

- SGA Rally on Monday, March 2<sup>nd</sup> Education Day at Nevada State Legislature.
- In support of NSHE Initiatives:
  - To increase credits of Millennium Scholarship covers.
  - Community College Workforce funding.
  - Need based state funded financial aid program.
- SGA is chartering a bus 7a.m. and return at 2p.m. with commitment of 40 students.

**Chair Marston:** I encourage you to encourage your students to attend the SGA Rally. Its Monday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>. This is an all day event at the Legislative Building. The more warm bodies we have there in support of higher education the better.

**SGA President Prevost:** And, the Mascot will be there!

**Chair Marston:** The Mascot will be there! Yeah!

**Q. Senator Kirchman:** I was wondering if there has been any discussion at the SGA to the slight changes to the Millennium Scholarship. Has the SGA been discussing that?

**A. SGA Prevost:** Yes. They are talking about increasing the Millennium Scholarship to go with the 15 to Finish Campaign. So the Millennium Scholarship will now cover up to 15 credits. But they are also talking about moving the minimum from 6 to 12. That is an issue with a lot of our students who are non-traditional college students and aren't able to take 12 credits every semester.

The Nevada Student Alliance that I Chair has formed a resolution that we are not in support of increasing the minimum. We would support them in increase the credit to 9, but not to 12 credits.

### Classified Council - Dee Dee Segal

- Fundraisers
  - Fitness Challenge now until end of April
  - Books are Fun! Next Monday 10-5 p.m. & Tuesday 9-4 p.m. in RDMT Center.
- Annual TMCC Egg hunt. March 28<sup>th</sup> 10:30 in the Student Center. Information will follow via email.
  - Open to children of Classified, Faculty and Staff of TMCC Ages 2-10.
  - Limited to the 1<sup>st</sup> 100 who sign up.

- Donations RDMT 328 Saloma Helget. Prefilled plastic eggs, Easter grass, coloring books, crayons, markers, bubbles, jump ropes.
- Donation Deadline March 13<sup>th</sup>.

**Chair Marston:** Thank you Dee Dee for being here.

## **Professional Standards Committee – Dr. Eddie Burke, Chair**

Professional Standards met Friday, Feb. 13, 2015. I do have one action item. It should be the Appraisal of Instruction Survey Questions. This came out of Professional Standards Committee. Idea from Travis Souza in Web College.

### **Possible Evaluation Question Changes**

Background:

Starting in the Fall of 2014 all TMCC Appraisal of Instruction Surveys (Course Evaluations) were delivered online via a vendor provided solution, Evaluation Kit. There is only one statement that is different between the survey given for on-campus and online classes.

- **Question 4, Statement 10**, There are 2 Current Versions:
  - **On-campus:** The Instructor was punctual – class began on time
  - **On-line:** The Instructor was prepared and course materials were updated appropriately

Due to the inconsistency we were are forced to deliver the evaluations separately. In the Fall this led to multiple evaluation projects which greatly complicated support for both faculty and students. It also forces faculty and administrator to retrieve multiple reports to review the evaluations for one course or instructor.

- **Proposal: Have only one version of Question 4 statement 10, which can apply to any course delivery method.**
  - **The Instructor was punctual** – class began on time (campus classes).
  - **The instructor was prepared** and course materials were updated appropriately (on-line classes).

Chair Marston: This comes to you as an action item from one of your Standing Committees. It does not require a motion or a second. Is there an discussion about this motion?

## **Appraisal of Instruction Survey Questions Change (ACTION) (Exhibit G)**

---

**Motion:** Have only one version of Question 4 statement 10, which can apply to any course delivery method.

**Chair Marston:** This comes to you as an action item from one of your Standing Committees. It does not require a motion or a second. Is there any discussion about this motion?

Movant: NA

Second: NA

Vote: Passed unanimously

Abstentions: None.

## **New Travel Funds Application & Applicants for Faculty Senate Funding (Exhibit H)**

- We have a new Travel Application for Professional Standards Travel Funds.
- We had 6 Faculty Senate Travel Funds applications for this Spring.

- I will be bringing these applications (recommendations) forward for your approval of the Travel Funds at the next Faculty Senate Meeting in March.

### **Travel Requesting Form Changes:**

If you're apply for Travel Funds from Professional Standards, we will be using the standard Travel Request Form that you would have to use either way as part of your Travel Application. At the bottom of the form there is a box that states: If you're requesting Faculty Senate travel Funding: Then fill in the details under that box. The idea is to make it simple so that you no longer have to go to 2 different place with 2 different forms. This should hopefully make it easier for the Faculty applying for Faculty Senate Funding. This also means that Saloma Helget in Budget and Planning office, will now have a record of whether or not Faculty have applied for Faculty Senate Travel Funds. Rather than the record getting lost and delay payment we are trying to make sure she will have a record of the applicants and delay in reimbursement.

### **Student Enrollment Surveys**

We will be posting these Enrollment Surveys on the Faculty Senate Website for you to look at.

- Travis Souza created a satisfaction survey for enrolment for the Students. These are larger documents and are in PDF form.
- I have copies here if you would like to see them.
- Interesting information in there about:
  - Why the students are dropping classes.
  - How satisfied they are with our online classes.
- We will be posting these Enrollment Surveys on the Faculty Senate Website for you to look at.

Professional Standards next meeting is March 13, 2015. Thank you.

## **Salary, Benefits & Budgetary Concerns Committee - Steve Bale, Chair**

### **TMCC Summer School Policy**

We developed a policy that passed through the SBBC Committee last fall. Then we brought to the Faculty Senate and was passed resoundingly. After it left the Senate it went to the Administration who basically put a hold on it and said they weren't sure of the overall fiscal ramifications of that policy and so they tasked Dr. Solemsaas with forming a Summer School Compensation Taskforce to look at options. We have been meeting in that capacity to try and look at a policy. The policy has a number of goals. We want to do something what will of course benefit the Faculty but at the same point in time we want something the Administration feels they can live with and something that Board of Regents will pass. We've looked for an element of consistency with other policies that might better drive that because there appeared to be some things in the policy that we passed through the Faculty Senate in the fall that might have been roadblocks to the passage by the Board of Regents. We are still looking at proposals. I want to talk a little bit about the proposals that are on the table but I want to get a feeling for what you think the priorities ought to be.

As the current policy sits, a fulltime Faculty's Member who's on a B Contract is paid 1.875% of their present compensation per credit hour for Summer School Class. Summer School is self-sustaining so everything has to be paid for by summer school classes and the revenue that Summer School generates. Years ago when Pat Slavin was in charge of Summer School, there wasn't a whole lot of worry about where money came from and if we needed money from other sources it was brought in and Summer School did not create any surplus. Over the last 5 years that correction has been changed in part at the direction of the President and it has been creating a surplus that has been used for other things such as Summer Bridge Program.

We started talking about this in the Taskforce. One of the proposals is that for general compensation instead of this 1.875% that we tie more closely to the new salary scale that is currently in place for our normal salaries throughout the year. That there are 5 categories (1-5), and that we attach the Summer School compensation to the minimum and

basically take the number that is in the minimal scale, divide it by 30 (30 credit hours that we teach). That would be the Summer School per credit compensation rate. The effect of doing that has a couple of things. First of all, as adjustments would be made to that salary scale, the Summer School Compensation rate would automatically adjust. Secondly if we look at the 75 courses that were taught this last summer, by fulltime Faculty, I think 67 of those would have received a raise. So 8 of them would have received a pay cut. But 67 would have received a raise. So we're talking about a fairly substantial increase to some people's compensation for Summer School.

One of the things this does is instead of determining the cost of each class on a per Faculty basis, it allows us to have bands and it's a lot easier to estimate what the costs are going to be going forward instead of looking at each individual.

However, one of the things that we did in our policy last fall that came through the Senate, was we took those classes that are in sciences and the arts and graphics area where sometime there isn't sufficient seats to generate the sufficient revenue to pay the Faculty their full salary and we said "You've got to pay it, no matter what". That was one of the things I think the Administration did not like. The new policy being considered by the Taskforce goes back to saying that every class is looked at as far as how much revenue that class generates and if the Faculty Member that is teaching 2 or 3 classes, then you look at all of the classes that Faculty Member's teaching and do all of those classes generate the revenue that is sufficient for that Faculty Member. If it does not, then the salary is going to be negotiated.

I am interested in your thoughts about where we're going and what we talking about.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Chair Bale, just one comment. The way we currently do the Summer School pay is that it's the money. It's upto the total amount of money generated by the course. You said it would be per credit. Is that per contact hour? My course it 7 contact hours and 4 credits.

**Chair Bale:** Keep in mind we can say contact hours all we want. But if you're teaching a course that has 24 people, because that is the number of chairs in the lab and if it's capped, they are paying for 4 credits, you will never generate enough revenue to pay for 7.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** That's my issue. That we are working 7.

**Chair Bale:** I understand that. But contact hour/credit hour is a thing that we discussed for an hour yesterday? We are calling upon some other people in the Campus Community to come and participate in the discussion.

The other issue, with Dr. Solemsaas here that I would like you to know your feelings on is whether or not we should cap that class or we should pay full boat.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Well I will speak for Biology. We have cap enrollments on all of our courses because we have a lab size. It's not determined by us. It's determined by safety codes, OSHA, NIH and such. So my course can only take 24 students, but I am doing 7 hours of instruction. I think that if you looked at the Labor Relations Board, they would say that we can't pay someone who's working that much only 4/7 of what their supposed to be entitle to. That's been the argument from the beginning. No offense to the Administration, but I don't think the Administration has been hearing what we have been saying. I think they've been hearing what they want to hear. The fact is that goes for Graphics, Chair Marston is in the same boat. You've got 18-20 students in a class. If the class doesn't generate enough money, I think that's a dis-equity. I can teach Political Science with 50 students, Scantron every test, max myself out on the salary and then someone who's working 7-8 contact hours they don't get that.

**Chair Bale:** Just so you are aware, I have addressed that issue with the Taskforce. We're gathering more information to see what the impact of that is.

**Chair Marston:** I would like to jump in here and suggest in the interest of efficiency, because everyone in this room is probably hearing this information for the first time. It's not going to be able to make substantive comments on behalf of those who they represent. I have the draft proposal here which I think would be worthwhile to share with Faculty or at least with the Senators. Whatever the current draft proposal is, if you could distribute that to the Senators and put some talking point on there.

**Chair Bale:** If I provide those to Tara, can she send it out to all of the Senators? Our next meeting is a month. So that gives us enough time to get back all of the necessary input from everybody so we can address the issues.

**Chair Marston:** That would be great. Then the Senate can maybe weigh in on this at the March Meeting.

**Chair Bale:** We're happy to do that.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** Are meeting on March 6?

**Chair Bale:** The Salary Benefits Committee is meeting on March 6, 2015. The Taskforce is meeting in a month.

**Chair Marston:** The draft does say contact hours. That is subject to change.

**Q. Senator Kirchman:** Chair Bale, do you anticipate or do you have a goal of having an actionable policy for this coming summer?

**A. Chair Bale:** Because the budgets were required, probably not.

**Chair Marston:** This requires a change to the Regent Board Policy and so I don't think it's possible to get it done that fast.

**Q. Senator Coles:** As I recall as Chair there was a comment that the amount of money we were talking about was very negligible and now I am hearing there is opposition based on fiscal ground, plus there's a surplus of funds being directed outside the Summer School Program? Am I accurate in my memory?

**A. Chair Bale:** You're accurate as far as what would happen last summer. But with the adjustments in the salary scale, that we're proposing, all of the surpluses are actually consumed with the increase. So there would not be any surpluses for the next 2 years I think.

**Chair Marston:** Regarding the issue of not having the clause in there where a lower rate has to be negotiated as the courses or paying for itself, however we calculate that. That little clause is in every single Institution's Summer Pay Policy. We are predicting I think with a high degree of accuracy that the Board would never approve a change to our policy if it didn't have a similar clause.

**Senator Coles:** So that's the Boards position?

**Chair Bale:** Yes. We are gathering information on the impact of the small number of courses from those three areas Science, Art & Visual Graphics. That might impact that and looking at whether we want to accept that out as a separate element or whether we want to apply it across the board.

**Dr. Solemsaas:** I want to clarify for the Summer School Program, indeed some of the surplus Dr. Bale has reported have gone to what we would call an Invest in the Future Programs like Summer Bridge. In our new proposal, that will redirect. What we have also done is in the past, there has not been an indirect cost contribution from Summer School. We just sweep whatever's left after covering direct costs. In this proposal there's a minimum amount based on the Federally Indirect Rate that has to go to the Institution to provide for covering indirect cost recovery, which we charge to all sole support programs. Remember it goes to our Invest in the Future Fund and indirect cost recovery. When we talk about budget reductions, then we have to do a buyout, guess where the funds are going to come from. Also when we have to do Invest in the Future. We live within our means and we invest in the future and we have prudent levels of reserves. We want to keep in mind that Summer School also supports that, not just providing the service that our students need in term of the courses offered during the summer.

## **Curriculum, Assessment & Programs Committee - Melanie Purdy, Chair**

- We passed the first 2 Bachelor of Applied Science Proposals. That's very exciting! We won't know if they're going to go until June when they will go to the Board of Regents. If passed, we will start getting our first 300/400 classes coming through in the fall.

- Join the Committee in the fall to be a part that!
- Discussion in CAP and some in the field, people who teach Diversity Classes are thinking our writing assignment that was established based on best practices using some University samples is a little bit too specific and maybe rigorous for our needs. So we will have that discussion in our next CAP Meeting as well.
- For those who submit, I will working with Tara to reformat some of the Submission Forms for DEC's so that the Revision Forms will be much simpler than they have been. Look for those if you are going to submit degrees.

### **Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment (SLOA) - Brian Ruf, Chair**

- At our last meeting last Friday, Feb. 13, 2015.
- We are currently working on building GenEd requirements for AAS Degrees that are geared more towards the Occupational Degree.
- We had a presentation of a proposed GenEd Criteria for English for the AAS.
- Since that meeting it was briefly reviewed by a Dean for feedback. We did not receive any feedback at that meeting.
- Our next meeting is on March 13, 2015, We will be hearing from the other GenEd areas and hearing their proposals.
- Once the proposals are finalized in SLOA, they will move to CAP for approval.

### **Recognition and Activities Committee - Erin Frock, Chair**

#### Distinguishing Faculty Award

- We are accepting Nomination materials from our Nominees for the Distinguished Faculty Awards for both Teaching and Service.
- The Review Committee will start to review Nomination material in March.
- We are still recognizing our Professional of the Month every month.
  - January was Kathleen Kolbet, Physical Sciences.
  - February was Melanie Purdy, Counseling.
- If you have a deserving colleague please nominate them on the online nomination form.

### **Library Committee - Tom Kearns, Chair**

- Our last meeting was on Feb. 12, 2015. The focus was on future events.
- That being said, keep your eyes out for announcements and fliers for March.
  - Our Presentation will be from one of our TMCC Professors and Authors, Jennifer Huntley-Smith. Her book about the Creation of the National Park System and how it shaped the West.
  - That will be on March 25.
- In April & May we are currently working with a Public Agency and are going to start a children's book drive. Please watch for that.
- We have many more things for the future and are open to suggestions.
- Our next meeting will be March 12, 2015.

### **Part-Time Faculty Issues Committee - Dawnne Ernette, Chair**

We met this morning.

Dean New came to our meeting and presented us with a Student Support Model.

- The intention to this model is to protect student from class cancellations when the enrollment is too low.

- The Part-Time Instructor would receive a reduced per credit rate, depending on how many students were actually in the class.
- This is supposed to help students graduate as sometimes the students cannot graduate when they need to due to cancelled classes.
- This is a good way to keep them going and get what they need.
- We have a lot of questions on this.
- We need to collect the data.
- Do some investigations.

In March we will talk about and see if there is something that we want to bring forth to the Senate.

We had a little bit of a discussion on the Active Shooter Protocol because we no longer have keys to lock our doors.

We asked some question regarding losing our keys as well.

**Q. Chair Purdy:** This cut in pay for Part-Time Faculty for lower students vs cutting the class, does that need work with Professional Standards? Do those 2 tie together?

**Chair Marston:** I can address that briefly. This is a proposal coming from Dean New. But because this is a policy that only impacts Part-Time Faculty, Dean New brought it to the Part-Time Faculty Issues Committee first, which I think is appropriate. I think that their voice needs to be hear on this issue. Whatever comes from that Committee, needs to be vetted through SBBC then this Senate can make the decision at that time.

**Chair Purdy:** They have the freedom to consult if they feel bullied or don't understand everything right?

**Chair Marston:** Yes. I don't think there is any bullying going on there. I was at the meeting as a guest. As Chair Ernette said they are requesting a lot more information from Dr Solemsaas's Office and a few other offices to determine what the cutoff rate, at what level are we typically cancelling classes, 7, 8, 10, 12 students, to determine whether this is viable.

**Chair Ruf:** It does effect Part-Time Faculty. It also effects Fulltime Faculty. I have 2 overloads classes that are currently being taught at reduced rate.

**Chair Marston:** Good point.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** We used to have a policy that if the course was needed for students to graduate, we had to offer the course. I think that when we're talking about Student success and then they need a course to graduate. Then we cut the course. It's kind of odd.

**Chair Ruf:** I have a class with 7 students so I am teaching that at a reduced rate. Then I have other classes at reduced rate for 2, 3 & 4 students.

**Chair Marston:** That has to be an overload I assume.

**Chair Ruf:** Yes, that's only on overload.

**Chair Marston:** So it only effects Full Time Faculty if it's an overload. We will keep our eye on this. It is a pretty big and important issue. I think it's appropriate that it comes through the Part-Time first. Then this Senate can decide what they do with it. Chair Bale, did you have anything to add?

**Chair Bale:** If it effects Full time Faculty on overload. We will add this to our agenda at the next SBBC meeting and start the discussion of that at the next meeting.

**Chair Marston:** Okay, maybe the two Committees can work in collaboration.

**Chair Marston:** Is there any Old Business?

## Old Business

---

**Chair Marston:** Hearing none, before we move to New Business, I am going to preemptively ask for a Senator to consider making a motion to extend the time of the meeting by 15 minutes. Is anybody interested in that?

## Extend the Meeting

---

**Motion:** To extend the Meeting by 15 minutes.

Movant: Senator Hampton

Second: Senator Cardoza

Vote: Passed.

## New Business

---

### **NFA President Dr. Hammett**

**Dr. Hammett:** Thank you. I am just going to read my statement into the record and then I will hand it to you so you don't have to type frantically.

Read into the record. (Exhibit I)

### **Q&A:**

**Comment: Chair Bale:** I've heard that a lot of people talked about John Albrecht and his opinion. I have read his opinion although I probably agree with the conclusion because of the structure and the way the structure had changed in this Institution in that one regard. I think there are a lot of legal flaws in his discussion. So I have no confidence in him as an attorney being able to advise this Institution legally.

**Dr. Hammett:** I should add that we also had NFA Legal look at it and they concur that there is an alternative way to look at it which is much more consistent with what Senator Jensen has mentioned in the emails.

**Chair Bale:** I think President Sheehan had the legal right to do what she did. I think doing it was unwise and standing behind it and remaining immovable shows her imprudence.

**Chair Marston:** Thank you Chair Bale.

## Resolution Regarding Presidential Appointment of Deans & Vice Presidents (Action) (Exhibit J)

---

**Chair Marston:** This is the first of two Resolutions that I am sure you have all read. This is an action item. It is being introduced by Senator Armbrrecht.

**Senator Armbrrecht:** The Resolution that I am bringing forward on behalf of my Colleagues. It addresses the Intuitional integrity. It's about the appointment of the Deans and the Vice Presidents. While it's acknowledge that the president has the right to do this, it creates some lack of parity in the hiring process. Whereas faculty needs to go through a national search in the hiring process and these positons can just be appointed. It's kind of a good piggy back on that was just said. "While it might be legal it isn't the best practice". I make a motion now to approve the resolution?

**Chair Marston:** This resolution comes to you as a motion. There needs to be a Second. Is there a Second? Senator Griffin is the Second. Let's have some discussions.

**Chair Purdy:** Is this the one that Dr. Sheehan was saying when she was apologizing, that she was supporting the resolution?

**Chair Marston:** Yes, I think she first said the first Resolution.

**Senator Jensen:** Is the Resolution the first three lines up there or the rest of the document too?

**Chair Marston:** I think the entire document is the Resolution.

**Senator Jensen:** I don't think we should acknowledge the Presidents right to do this.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** What sentence are you talking about? What sentence are you referring to?

**Senator Jensen:** I don't have it with me here. I just heard it being stated. I do support the Resolution though. I am not trying to say we should vote against this Resolution. I was just hoping it was the first 3 lines were the wording of the Resolution. I just want to comment that I do not think we shouldn't acknowledge that what the President is doing is right because we have a set of Bylaws that she doesn't.

**Senator Guy:** Can we make a motion to amend the Resolution by striking out the first part of the first sentence. My constituents and I think it's a little political and doesn't serve the purpose of the Resolution.

**Chair Marston:** Senator Guy has submitted her amendment.

**Chair Marston:** We have a motion on the floor for the Resolution. We now have a motion to amend. There needs to be a second on the motion to amend. Sentor Loranz seconds.

## Resolution Regarding Presidential Appointment of Deans & Vice Presidents Amendment Motion (Action) (Exhibit K)

---

**Chair Marston:** Now we will have discussion on the amendment and a vote on the amendment. If the amendment fails, then we will go back to our vote on the original resolution.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** To clarify are you just saying start with "it is"?

**Chair Purdy:** No, start with "be it resolved" and then the rest.

**Chair Marston:** Further discussion on this amendment? Before I give your permission to speak Lars, I want to make sure no one else wants to speak. You have already spoken three times.

**Q: Senator Cardoza:** Can I just clarify what the amendment is? I thought the amendment was we are striking the first part of the line under Institutional Integrity while the President has the authority to appoint Deans & Vice Presidents. Can I ask what the point is to striking that line?

**Chair Marston:** It's on the screen.

**Senator Guy:** My constituents and I think it's a little political and doesn't serve the purpose of the Resolution. We agree with the Resolution but, feel that part is needed.

**Chair Marston:** So essentially this is removing the reference to the VPSS.

**Senator Jensen:** Is this the full resolution or is the rest also there?

**Chair Marston:** I believe the resolution is to remove that first half of the first sentence, and there will not be any other changes.

**Senator Guy:** Correct.

**Chair Marston:** Are there any other comments or discussions?

**Q: Senator Fredrickson:** If we are taking out the beginning of that sentence, why do we have to tell them the following grounds? Why can't we just make the resolution that says that first sentence? Why are we explaining ourselves? Then why don't we just make a statement? Do we have to justify it?

**Chair Marston:** Good question. A Senator could propose the elimination of all of the rationalization at the end. Roberts Rules does allow amendments to the amendments but only 2 level. You can only do an amendment to the amendment.

**Q: Senator Fredrickson:** Can I propose an amendment to the amendment? That we don't need to justify our reasoning. We could just make a statement and leave it at that.

**Senator Coles:** I would second that.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** You want to amend the amendment? If you want to amend the amendment, the amendment is to change the wording. So want to amend that by changing the wording. You have to specify what you want changed.

**Q: Senator Fredrickson:** So strike out everything made by the President period and then everything below that.

**Chair Marston:** That is going to require a second. Senator Coles did you second this?

**Senator Coles:** yes

## Resolution Regarding Presidential Appointment of Deans & Vice Presidents Amendment to the Amended Motion (Action) (Exhibit L)

---

**Motion:** To amend the amended Resolution by striking out everything after the word "president" in the first sentence.

Movant: Senator Fredrickson

Second: Senator Coles

Vote: Fails.

For: 6 Opposed: 16

Abstentions: 3.

**Senator Jensen:** What's being proposed?

**Chair Marston:** Let's be clear about what we have. Here's what we are looking at right now (on screen). Is there any further discussion to the amendment of the amendment?

**Senator Cardoza:** I think that we are getting so general here that it might be meaningless. What I tell my students is "You make a statement, you damn well better get me evidence". Give me specific examples to back it up. I see the reasoning behind this but I also think that the Resolution is shrinking to the point where it's not going to mean anything. It's going to be so disconnected from the situation it addresses that we don't have anything that really has teeth. It might be worthwhile asking some of the authors to comment on it as well.

**Chair Marston:** That's fine. I think Senator Coles and then Senator Fredrickson

**Chair Coles:** I yield to comments of the author.

**Bridgett Blaque** makes a statement in support of the full wording of the resolution.

**Senator Jensen:** I want to comment that the sentence about the power to make the appointment, that was made before anyone had read the bylaws.

**Chair Marston:** You have made that point. Now just repeating it over again.

**Senator Jensen:** My point was this Resolution did not mean have that sentencing. It is in there because you said we could not take the Resolution back once it had been submitted. So the actual errors in it are still in it.

**Senator Kirchman:** I'm just wondering if there should be a specific reference to the Bylaws in this resolution.

**Chair Marston:** There is specific mention of NSHE Handbook, Section 4 P. 2. Which is really what this is relevant to.

**Senator Kirchman:** Another thing that we could say, in anticipation of the response that we've seen, is that legality is a minimum standard. Not doing something illegal is not a very high standard of performance.

**Chair Marston:** That's kind of the first sentence there. It says while the President can do this, we don't think it's a good idea.

**Senator Kirchman:** I don't think that's the same thing as saying lawfulness is as high a standard.

**Senator Hampton:** I think we should just leave the long version.

**Chair Purdy:** I motion to vote on the short version.

**Chair Marston:** Please don't make those motions. Those require a vote and 2/3 majority. Let's let people have a chance to speak.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** What you can do is call....

**Chair Marston:** You're calling the question. Which requires a second and a 2/3 majority vote and then moving forward from there to the actual vote and it usually takes more time than to just let more people speak.

**Chair Purdy:** Going back to the long version that everybody's talking about. This is the version that's up for discussion. So, I guess I am a little confused.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** We need to vote on the amendment. She can call for a Point of Order.

**Chair Marston:** If you are calling for a Point of Order then we're going to vote on it.

**Chair Purdy:** We are voting on the short version. Everybody's talking about the long version, right? To amend the amendment? Is that what you're motioning Senator Hampton?

**Chair Marston:** Senator Hampton is suggesting that we not approve this second amendment, which is the shortening of this resolution.

**Bridgett Blaque:** The idea of putting NSHE code reference in here was an explicit acknowledgment of the legality of the situation, and that as Albrecht said, the Code trumps the bylaws. We were saying that we recognize your power to do this. Legally, nonetheless we are opposed to it.

**Senator Coles:** As to the question of reducing to this, I'm hearing words like crisis of confidence. I was told that when asked to I sign the petition that it was a prelude to a vote of no confidence against the President. In regards to Senator Cardoza's question, I'll turn it right back; what does the long version as for? Is it asking that the appointment to Vice

President be stopped and opened to a search? Or is it asking for the future to adhere to the Bylaws? I don't think that clear. So if we're just going to make a statement, I think that's the statement. If we're moving towards no confidence then let's own it and move towards no confidence.

**Senator Fredrickson:** Point of order, we have 2 minutes left.

**Chair Marston:** Someone may make another motion to extend the meeting. Are there any other comments to the amendment of the amendment? Hearing none let's take a vote. I want to make sure you are all clear that you are voting to amend the original amendment. To basically move forward with the statement as it is written on the projector.

**Chair Marston:** Voting in favor would mean that this is what the Senate has accepted. Nothing below that first sentence would be included.

**Chair Marston:** All those in favor to the amended amendment? For? 6, Opposed? 16, Abstentions? 3. That does not pass.

**Chair Marston:** We are now back to the original amendment. Which is the entire draft as you have had it with the elimination of the first half of the first sentence. We're back to "be it resolved..." with the rest of this intact. Is there any more discussion on this?

**Senator Wells:** I vote that we go along with Senator Guy's suggestion to remove that first line. My reasoning is because this may have been precipitated by this one event, but it's not in response only to this one event. This resolution is in response in my opinion to a series of events that have been occurring for several years. I support the amendment to remove the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence and the new resolution should start with "Be it resolved".

**Chair Marston:** Are there other comments?

**Senator Cardoza:** I'd like to recognize Professor Bein.

**Professor Bein:** I don't want to ruffle any feathers. I just want to clarify. I was listening to the President speak and to me she said "Moving forward I'll listen to you". So it sounded to me like this is decided. She has her VP in place and moving forward then maybe she will listen to us. I feel like that point needs to be on there. So we address this now and If we don't address this particular appointment, its going to be this smoke and mirror that we've been seeing continue with. We have to address this positon. It is the issue.

**Chair Marston:** I will go ahead and point out to the Senate we are out of time and we need a motion to extend.

**Senator Cardoza:** Motion to extend by 15 mins.

## Extend the Meeting

---

**Motion:** To extend the Meeting by 15 minutes.

Movant: Senator Cardoza

Second: Senator Hampton

Vote: Passed.

**Senator Williams:** Can I have Professor Blaque comment on the first line of this? I know you have already stated it, but?

**Bridgett Blaque:** We wanted to place it in a specific context. That is what initiated it.

**Chair Marston:** Any other comments? I am calling it right now. All those in favor of supporting this as amended raise your hands. We are voting to approve this with the first line struck as Senator Guy had proposed. For? 14 Opposed? 7. Abstentions: 1. Motion passes.

**Chair Marston:** What passed it what you see on the screen.

## Resolution Regarding Presidential Appointment of Deans & Vice Presidents- Amended Motion (Action) (Exhibit K)

---

**Motion:** To approve the Resolution Regarding Presidential Appointments of Deans & Vice Presidents, with the amendment of striking the language referring to the VPSS appointment in the first part of the first sentence.

Original Movant: Senator Armbrrecht

Second: Senator Griffin

Amendment Movant: Senator Guy

Second: Senator Loranz

Vote: Passed.

For: 14            Opposed: 7

Abstentions: 1

**Chair Marston:** Let's move on to the second resolution. As long as we have a quorum we can still look at. Senator Jensen, we are running out of time. I'm double checking to see if we have a quorum right now. We have a quorum.

**Senator Jensen:** I'd like to point out that the language of Title 2 Chapter 1, Section 1.4.9 on Changes in Administrative Units, differ on one important point with TMCC Bylaws, Article III.B.4.

NSHE HANDBOOK TITLE 2 CHAPTER 1, SECTION 1.4.9 READS:

Creation, abolition or substantial alteration in the organization of administrative units within a System institution shall be approved by the president only after prior consultation with the senate or the faculty of the administrative unit of the System institution involved.

TMCC BYLAWS ARTICLE III.B.4. READS:

Creation, abolition or substantial alteration in the organization of administrative units within TMCC shall be approved only after prior consultation with the Faculty Senate...There is no definition of "substantial alteration in the organization of administrative units." Reading the entire section one may infer that a substantial alteration is not the creation or restoration of a specific position or job. The words, "creation" and "abolition" refer to "administrative units," and not specific jobs within the administrative unit.....As a result, the TMCC President has the final authority to interpret and decide whether establishing a position of vice president over an administrative unit is a "substantial alteration," requiring a prior consultation with the TMCC Faculty Senate.

There are several problems with the TMCC General Counsel's reading:

(a) The President does not have the final authority to decide on "creation" and "substantial alteration." The final authority lies with the System (presumably the Chancellor).

(b) The sentence: "The words, "creation" and "abolition" refer to "administrative units," and not specific jobs within the administrative unit, "is factually wrong. The NSHE Title 2 Chapter 1, Section 1.4.9 quoted above clearly expresses that the words "creation" and "substantial alteration" refer to changes within an administrative unit (singular!). This clause is indeed talking about changes within a single administrative unit, and not just changes in the overall system of administrative units, or changes in the overall organization of administrative units.

With this in mind, and considering that no single greater change can occur within an administrative unit at TMCC than the creation of a VP position within the unit, it is clear that the creation of a VP position within Student Services is a "substantial alteration" of that unit, and hence it appears that the President has already violated.

Title 2 Chapter 1, Section 1.4.9 of the NSHE Handbook by not consulting the Faculty Senate prior to the changes in Student Services.

**Chair Marston:** Okay. Senator Jensen. Can we put the resolution up on the projector? This is the resolution you have before you. We currently do have a quorum. Currently we have 19 out of 25 Senators present. Is there discussion on this item?

**Senator Kirchman:** I have a question. Senator Jensen do you want based on your updated research do you want us to vote on this or do you want to make an addendum to it?

**Senator Jensen:** It would be nice to change my reference from the Bylaws to the reference to the other NSHE HANDBOOK TITLE 2 CHAPTER 1, SECTION 1.4.9. Then we have to change the wording that actually speaks of the administrative unit in there.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** If we vote on this as it's worded I would vote no because I have not further firsthand knowledge of the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence. The intention is to remove the Dean of Web College. I don't have any evidence of that intention for that. The way that it is now is that Dean Lokken stepped down voluntarily. So it's up to you.

**Senator Jensen:** I perfectly fine in taking that out completely and having the resolution as the first 4 lines.

**Chair Marston:** The resolution is correct. Unlike the last resolution, I think this resolution stops at the end. It is not referencing directly the type below. So that's just added information. Is that correct Senator Jensen? Is that the correct interpretation?

**Senator Jensen:** I didn't think that far about it. That's why I asked the question the first time around. I think it would be fine to submit it as is. I think it's our and your obligation to let the Chancellor know we think that she has violated.

**Senator Kirchman:** Proposed wording changes to the resolution.

**Senator Fredrickson:** We are word-smithing this thing and I can't say that I vote for or against it.

**Chair-Elect Adlish:** I am going to make a motion to lay this aside temporarily which requires a 2<sup>nd</sup>. Any discussion? To be resubmitted later at the next Faculty Senate Meeting.

## To Table the Resolution (Exhibit M)

**Motion:** To lay aside the resolution until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Movant: Chair-Elect Adlish

Second: Senator Hampton

Vote: Passed.

**Senator Hampton:** Thank you Senator Jensen for going to all the effort of doing this.

**Chair Marston:** Meeting adjourned.

**Adjournment at 2:59 p.m.**

*\*Adjournment time will run no later than 2:30 p.m. unless approved via motion by the Senate.*