

# FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2017

Faculty Senate Chair: <b>Cheryl Cardoza</b>	Faculty Senate Chair-Elect: <b>Mike Holmes</b>	Executive Committee member, Academic Standards and Assessment Chair <b>Brian Ruf</b>
Executive Committee member, Curriculum Review Chair <b>Haley Orthel-Clark</b>	Executive Committee member, Professional Standards Chair <b>Scott Huber</b>	Executive Committee member, Salary, Benefits and Budgetary Concerns Chair <b>Steve Bale</b>
Library Committee Chair <b>Corina Weidinger</b>	Part-Time Faculty Issues Committee Chair <b>Marynia Giren-Navarro</b>	Recognition & Activities Committee Chair <b>Olga Katkova</b>
Senators At-Large: <b>Yevonne Allen</b> <b>Kate Kirkpatrick</b> <b>Brandy Scarnati</b> <b>Erin Frock</b>	Senators for Allied Health: <b>Julie Muhle</b> <b>Patti Sanford</b>	Senators for Applied Industrial Technology: <b>Clifford Bartl</b> <b>Mike Schulz</b>
Senators for Biology: <b>Meeghan Gray</b> <b>Dan Williams</b>	Senator for Business Division: <b>Ben Scheible</b>	Senators for Computer Technology: <b>Steve Bale</b> <b>Judy Fredrickson</b> <b>Ed Corbett</b>
Senators for English: <b>Elizabeth Humphrey</b> <b>Robert Lively</b>	Senator for History, Political Science & Law: <b>Fred Lokken</b>	Senators for Humanities: <b>Tom Cardoza</b> <b>Wade Hampton</b>
Senators for Math: <b>Anne Flesher</b> <b>Blisin Hestiyas</b>	Senator for Physical Sciences: <b>Dave Boden</b> <b>Patrick Guiberson</b>	Senators for Social Sciences: <b>Haley Orthel-Clark</b> <b>Micaela Rubalcava</b>
Senator for Visual and Performing Arts: <b>Candace Garlock</b> <b>Corina Weidinger</b>		

**Absent:** Olga Katkova (proxy) Michelle Montoya

**Guests:** President Karin Hilgersom, David Turner II (SGA), Julia Hammett (President NFA), Kyle Dalpe, Michelle Montoya, Elena Bubnova, Roni Fox, Ron Marston, Jim New, Yuli Chavez, Karen Wikander, Barbara Painter, Kim Studebaker

**The meeting was called to order at 12:33 p.m.**

## Approval of Meeting Minutes April 14, 2017

**Motion:** Approval of the minutes for April 14, 2017 as submitted.

**Movant:** Senator Clifford Bartl

**Second:** Senator Candace Garlock

**Vote:** Passed unanimously

## Consent Agenda

Before the approval of the Consent Agenda the Chair of Salary, Benefits and Budgetary Concerns, Steve Bale, explained why the consent agenda included a new redistribution of travel awards. Originally, there were ten applicants for Spring travel and two applicants for Summer travel. Upon review, it became clear that only eight of the applicants were traveling

in Spring. That meant that three were traveling in Summer, so we had to recalculate the allocations. The eight Spring applicants who were getting \$200.00 will now get \$250.00, and the three Summer applicants will get \$333.00 each. After this explanation, the vote to approve proceeded.

**Motion:** To approval of the Consent Agenda

**Movant:** Senator Anne Flesher

**Second:** Senator Wade Hampton

**Vote:** Passed unanimously

## Chair's Report—Cheryl Cardoza

---

- **Board of Regents Update**

- **Chancellor Search:** Chair Cardoza reported that the Chancellor search had failed completely. The Faculty Senate Chairs asked Chair Trachok to meet to discuss the process. The Chairs felt that the process was not inclusive and should have followed the code. The Chairs pointed out that the NRS states that the Chair of the Board appoints the Chancellor after consultation with faculty and that's all it says. We argued that letting us sit in meetings is not consultation. The Chairs were then invited to attend a meeting on Tuesday. There was talk of appointing John White the acting Chancellor on Tuesday, but then the meeting was canceled. Shortly after the cancellation, the Faculty Senate Chairs received a letter from Acting Chancellor White stating that he was resigning as of June 30, 2017.
- **The Vice Chancellor of the Community College Search:** The Vice Chancellor search ended 5/11/17. Chancellor White is now considering the feedback from all the different constituents. These candidates had a grueling two days with meetings between the Chancellor's meetings and meetings with each President of the Community College, so we should know soon.

- **General Education Assessment:** The assessment is in process and going well.

- Chair Cardoza reminded senators that the closing of the loop meetings would be held on the 17th. They added an overall meeting at 1:30 p.m., after the departments meet and have lunch, to talk about it in a big forum setting. Cheryl asked senators to make sure that constituents are aware of this other meeting.
- Participating part-time faculty who come to those meetings are eligible for a \$50.00 stipend. They have to be included on the minutes from the department showing that they went to the meeting and participated in those discussions. Cheryl stated that we want our part-time faculty to be involved in those discussions because their input is important.

- **Academic Faculty Survey on the Sports Facility:** Chair Cardoza reminded everyone that she had promised to survey the administrative faculty and that she wholeheartedly meant to do that. However, she was called out for breaking the policy. At that point, she didn't feel like she could survey her administrative faculty without getting into more trouble. Chair Cardoza referred to the policy for college surveys which states that IR is "a designated administrative unit. All college-wide surveys to be administered internally and externally must be reviewed by IRAE to ensure appropriate survey design, data integrity, confidentiality and administration.

Chair Cardoza pointed out that there is ambiguity in the policy: that as chair she should represent her constituents, but to do so, she has to ask them their opinions. She understood from Planning Council that she would be able to poll constituents without submitting anything for review. She also felt that a survey designed to get someone's constituent feedback does not constitute a "college-wide" survey. She asked for clarification of this at Planning Council and was told there that she did not have to follow the policy when asking constituents for information. Recent meetings have denied this, but faculty who were present all heard the same thing. The Planning Council is set to review the policy. She plans to make sure that the policy is more reflective of her understanding. Additionally, Cheryl along with Julia Hammett are concerned about the lack of Faculty on Planning Council. They

have called for more members to serve on that body. Cheryl wanted to be clear that as she is presenting this data from the academic faculty that she wish that she also had the data from the administrative faculty.

Senator Brandy Scarnati read a letter from Kate Kirkpatrick into the record voicing Kate's concerns about the administrative faculty not being surveyed. Kate stated that TMCC's employees include Administrative faculty and classified representatives which represent over 300. She wondered why are those groups were never surveyed. Without the administrative faculty represented, it appears that only half of the employees were surveyed, which only represents the attitudes and opinions of a portion of the college. Kate ended her letter stating that she does not support any resolutions from Faculty Senate on this issue until there is a true campus-wide survey.

Chair Cardoza wanted to make sure Kate's voice was heard. She pointed out that she does not represent classified, so their lack of a survey is not the responsibility of Faculty Senate. Nonetheless, Cheryl pointed out that Kate represents a valid concern, and one she shares. She pointed out again that she felt restrained from moving forward with the survey because of statements made to her in meeting on the subject. Because there were questions about whether Cheryl was breaking a college policy, she halted herself so that there were no questions about her integrity.

President Hilgersom stated that her perception of the meeting was different than Cheryl's. She thinks it is appropriate and necessary for the Faculty Senate Chair to discuss matters with her constituents in her role as Chair. She pointed out that the Planning Council Policy before the senate is one that has been in the works for some time. She pointed out two issues: that we don't proliferate surveys to groups on campus, and that we are careful conducting surveys with software that can be manipulated. If people cheat on the surveys, then the data is not complete. She stated that Survey Monkey is especially problematic in its trial version. The President went on to say that Cheryl was not called in, that she just wanted to have a meeting to point out some issues: (1) that following the survey policy would provide Chair Cardoza with more accurate results so she can do her job and that (2) she wanted to clarify what kind of workload the Administrative surveys would represent so that her staff could prepare. Dr. Hilgersom admitted that there are some communication issues to work out, but she agreed that the Faculty Senate Chair occasionally needs to find ways to poll the senate.

Chair Cardoza clarified that her response to the situation was not based on a single meeting but on two meetings and emails telling her that she was violating the survey policy. Cheryl said she was still committed to hearing from administrative faculty. Elena Bubnova mentioned that she was going to survey administrative faculty and the classified at the last Planning Council meeting, so Cheryl was happy to hear that and offered some assistance.

Yevonne Allen clarified that the Administrative Faculty includes 146 faculty members. Julia Hammett suggested that given what Kate has said it seems like the same the exact question should go out to the administrative faculty. Chair-Elect Mike Holmes mentioned that he plans to propose that we work with Elena to create a new plan, and then conduct a survey during the first part of August/September. Steve Bale stated that he was bothered by the fact that anybody needs to oversee surveys especially if we use Survey Monkey. Whoever has administrative rights can go down and track names to responses. He voiced great concern because if Survey Monkey is used, and a survey goes through the president, he will personally choose not to participate because he does not think that is appropriate to have people track you down. Elena pointed out her concerns over the fact there is a ton of data floating around in trial versions of Survey Monkey accounts that no one has access to. No one can secure the access of that data. She also has concerns that the last surveys that we did that represent this institution without any appropriate branding, or style guide. She believes these surveys reflected badly on this institution. Finally, Elena took exception to insinuations that there is lack of trust or creditability in the office that conduct surveys on behalf of this institution. She pointed out her history conducting surveys at the institution and her commitment to maintaining confidentiality. Senator Tom Cardoza added that his attorney who deals with things like this regularly assures him that using data from surveys happens in Nevada all the time. He pointed out that he does not have a problem with Elena or his colleagues, but it does happen. A lot of litigation involves just the breach of confidentiality Steve discussed. Ultimately, Tom pointed out that we are if surveys are not branded or proper, we should remember that this particular survey was internal. Nobody is going to release the actual survey to the media outlet or anyone else. Senator Cardoza went on to say that NSHE has a section in the handbook that talks about freedom of speech and open exchange of ideas. In his opinion, the new survey policy is about shutting down

viewpoints and getting people to go along with the Sports Facility proposal. He advocated all working together and treating each other with respect, compassion and understanding.

Chair Cardoza reported that she and Roni Fox met just before she was told to stop surveying, and they have an Administrative Faculty list. She argued that she was poised to send out the additional survey and asked Administrative Faculty to please go back to your constituents and express her intent. Steve Bale added that he had a lot of respect for Elena and if he sounded disrespectful he did not mean to do that. He pointed out that policy should be used to make everything fair no matter who is using the policy. It should not be focused on personalities.

Cheryl went on to present the survey results from the Academic Faculty. She turned to the figures on the Consent agenda. She also pointed out that she included all the comments from the survey so faculty could see what was said in those responses. There were 21 respondents at 19.8% that agreed with project and thought it should go ahead, we had 18 respondents at 17% said they were neutral on the project and they had concerns about the way it was being presented, and then 67 respondents at 63.2% said that they were not in favor of it, she also provided 60 of the comments. Cheryl stated that not all the comments were against the complex. Many objected to the way the project had evolved, not with the idea of having a sports complex. Those who were against the proposal said things like we don't need a sports here, we are a commuter campus, etc. She referred senators to the consent agenda for more information.

- **Constituent Feedback Surveys:** Chair Cardoza said that everyone should have received a constituent feedback survey if you are serving under the Vice President of Academic Affairs or Vice President for Student Services. Cheryl did not do a survey the Vice President of Financial Affairs because Jim New hasn't been in the job for very long, and she doesn't feel that it is fair to subject him to that. Cheryl also left out the Directors until we could come up with a fair tool for gathering feedback. But, because there are many Directors who serve in a Dean's capacity, we will do feedback surveys for them next year. Cheryl did send out surveys to assess the Academic Deans. She received several notices that people were not receiving their surveys. Some of this has happened if people had opted out of surveys through Survey Monkey in the past. She asked that if anyone did not receive a survey that they please let Cheryl know. Cal is working individually with people to make sure they get their surveys. She reported also that a number of surveys were going to spam, so please check there. She emphasized the need to give feedback on the Vice Presidents. Remember that these surveys are only asking for your opinion. That data is being aggregated before it's given to anyone, and then it is being discussed with each Vice President. Cheryl clarified that she does not have a role in anybody's evaluation. The purpose of the survey is to get constituent feedback, so that evaluations can be informed by their employees' comments.
- **Equity Study:** Chair Cardoza said that everyone should have received a letter stating whether you got equity or you didn't. If you haven't received that letter, contact Roni Fox.
- **Next Year's Graduation: May 11, 2018:** Chair Cardoza stated that next year's graduation will be May 11, 2018, again on the last day of school.
- **The Committee Schedule:** Chair Cardoza said she is working on the committee schedule. Once all committees have submitted their dates, Cheryl will send it out to everybody. The last faculty senate meeting for next year is schedule for May 5, 2018. Cheryl negotiated with her Executive Committee for meetings on Monday because of those three holidays that's coming up from October 27th to the end of November, so we decided to put in a couple of Mondays to make that work. You will get that schedule next week while you're still on contract.

## Chair-Elect's Report—Mike Holmes

---

- **Senator Elections:** Chair-Elect Mike Holmes reported on his progress running senatorial elections. He has contacted the Deans and has gotten responses back from only half of them. Because of reorganization, some of these units will not be able to vote for senators until July. Mike proposed postponing elections until August when faculty return. Over the summer he plans to work on researching representation of the senators, their terms of office, and some other things they need to know as far as timetables and annual schedules for elections. He asked

senators to inform constituents to look for this information at department meetings the first part of the Fall Semester.

## Action Items

---

- **The Academic Calendar – Scott Huber**

Chair Scott Huber explained that at their last meeting the changes to the academic calendar had been vetted extensively by Barb Painter, so he asked her to elaborate, and she stated that they were taking off the 2015 year that was on the calendar previously, and adding on 2020 and 2021. She reported that she received notification from Dr. Hammett who recommended that they specifically identify the contract start date and the contract end date for faculty. She pointed out where these appear highlighted on the calendar. The other piece that they added starting in 2018 reflects that the semester ends on Saturday as we offer Saturday classes. They did run that by Dr. Deadmond for accreditation purposes, and she recommended moving forward. Based on the survey results from commencement, she planned to make a change in Spring 2018. Chair Cardoza asked Barb that when she made those changes, if she could also make changes to reflect the correct date for graduation for this year since it's still on the calendar as it helps us to remember when we had those graduations, She also asked if we know if these graduation dates for 2018/2019, 2020/2021 are accurate, and Barb said the graduation dates were accurate. However, because they are still looking at venues, these dates could be revised. She pointed out that we do need faculty on the graduation committee if anyone is interested. The motion was called.

**Motion:** To approval of the Academic Calendar with corrections

**Movant:** Senator Wade Hampton

**Second:** Senator Mike Schulz

**Vote:** Passes

- **Honors Designation – Brian Ruf**

Chair Brian Ruf reported that the ASA committee was requested to review make recommendations to change our graduation Honors distinctions. He researched other institutions in the State of Nevada and listed their policies for review here. The ASA committee recommends the motion in your packet which allows TMCC graduates to have honors distinctions based on GPA, which is different from what we currently have for both the Bachelor's degrees and Certificate of Achievements. Chair Cheryl Cardoza asked for a motion. Senator Tom Cardoza said he had read the proposal and agrees with it, but pointed out that UNR has a different system based on a student's percentile in the graduating class. He argued that fixed GPAs for honors designation can lead to either very few or very many graduates getting the designation. Steve Bale clarified that UNR does not do a 5 percent. A student has to be a participant in the honors program in order to get those rewards. Senator Tom Cardoza responded that that is UNR's policy. He pointed out that most institutions don't have that policy and wondered if we didn't go to percentages for that reason or because it wasn't considered. He was curious what the rationale was for going with fixed GPAs. Chair Brian Ruf responded by saying, he compared UNR with Iowa state, which have the same policy and the numbers at their honors college. But, looking back at all the other institutions in the State of Nevada, UNR stands out as different. The committee tried to match variations from the other community colleges and not with the universities or state college. The proposed motion shows that there are slight variations between the other institutions. Chair Cardoza ask for a motion. Senator Wade Hampton stated that legally with wills and other things you always do a percentage. President Hilgersom said she is 100 percent in favor of an Honors program. Steve Bale stated that any motion coming from a standing committee does not have to include a first or a second. Chair Cardoza then called for a vote, which failed. She said that she would send it to the Professional Standards committee for review.

## NFA Report—Julia Hammett

---

Julia Hammett began by thanking the President for holding forums about the building proposals. There were two on the sports facility and one on the EATS building. She pointed out that the timing hasn't been great, but that there will be more opportunities in the Fall for people to know what's going on and get involved. Julia stated that she believes strongly in

shared governance and appreciated the opportunity for people to provide input on these projects. Julia also underscored an issue with the equity study. Because not everyone is clear on the changes to so many administrative position here at TMCC, she requested there be a process where every permanent employees' TMCC job description be available for people to review. Julia argued that this policy would cause less confusion when we're trying to do surveys. Her understanding from discussions with Vice President New and Director Fox was that they are going to explore that and see if it is possible to do it. Julia stated her perspective on the meetings with Chair Cardoza about surveys on campus. She felt that the survey policy, because it contains ambiguities, will probably need to be reviewed at Planning Council. She expressed concern over there not being minutes from Planning Council for the year. She pointed out that we have changed in Planning Council from a consensus decision making model to a one person, one vote model, but that means faculty only have four votes in the room. Since this is the room where we make policies and bylaws, Julia felt the Planning Council needs to consider faculty representation. President Hilgersom pointed out that she had already been approached by her Deans to help make sure that voice is heard. She said she wants all constituents and also classified staff to have representation. Julia thanked President Hilgersom for taking a look at the Bonus Proposal that NFA brought before her. But, John Albrecht had looked at it and said that we could not pull money and put it into an investment account that is tied to the stock market because of NSHE Code. Julia argued that there are other avenues we might follow, but our goal was to get that discussion going so we can start thinking about possibilities. She reported also that Jeff Downs who is the NFA President and the Faculty Senate Chair at WNC, is putting together a proposal for his Faculty Senate regarding a return to longevity pay. Julia sent his proposal to her NFA members and said Cheryl will send out to all of her members once it goes through the Executive Board. Julia reported that if senators are interested in looking at the proposal from WNC she would be happy email it to them. Finally Julia reported moving forward on a grievance, which has now gone to the Chancellor. She stated that NFA's goal remains to make this a healthy and happy environment for all our coworkers here at TMCC.

President Hilgersom responded to calls for the Planning Council minutes. She explained that she was very glad when Cheryl pointed this omission out. She stated that Valerie Kelly is new in the office, and that she's been posting them on a shared drive without knowing all committee members couldn't access them. She also realized that last year they were posted on the website, so she asked that the minutes be posted as soon as they are done. She promised to work with Valerie on clarifying the wording and making sure that everything is accurate in the minutes. Once that is done, they will be posted on the Planning Council website so people can find them. She promised to have this done probably in the next three weeks, though the workload in the office is high right now. In future, she offered to make sure that there is a better process moving forward. The president claimed that the process in Planning Council is informal and concluded that there is no problem. She then stated that shared governance is also important to her. She said that she has followed the AAUP guidelines for the last 20 years, and that she does not perceive anything that is amiss other than the fact that she would like to see about 6 more faculty members. Chair Cardoza responded that more faculty representation did pass as a motion of the Planning Council last year, but has not yet been implemented. She argued that that was the main issue Dr. Hammett was talking about in her report.

## CCSSE—Elena Bubnova

---

Elena Bubnova reported that during Spring 2017 semester the entire college came together to participate in a massive survey project conducting an extensive amount of surveys, which included the student module and the faculty module. This was the first time we did surveys specifically with online classes. Elena thanked Dr. Hilgersom for sponsoring the project, and the faculty who participated in this. She recognized that this was an effort for faculty. They went into 72 classrooms where faculty sacrificed one class session to make this project possible. Elena expressed appreciation for these sacrifices and thanked faculty who also spent their personal time out of the classroom to answer the faculty survey. Elena stated that she realizes that classroom time is precious and that we were challenged this semester due to bad weather. She emphasized how important faculty cooperation is. She also pointed out how important the data from the surveys is, and how getting the data is in the best interest of the students. During the 2017/2018 school year, we will be looking at the results and analyzing the data, Elena encouraged everyone to join their Task Force in the Fall to help with that analysis.

President Hilgersom reported that Summer Pell had passed. She thanked faculty who wrote letters to the Federal legislature. Dr. Hilgersom went on to say that the NSHE Presidents want to make state funded summer school monies the number one priority for the next millennium, so they have started talking about that. She stated that she and President are fully vested in that idea and working together to achieve it. She pointed out how difficult it is to plan summer without state funding. The President thanked Faculty Senate for their hard work and their willingness to share in the governance at TMCC. The President then requested that for the next academic year, Faculty Senate adhere to the Senate Bylaws in posting the agenda and the minutes three days in advance. Because all recommendations that you make advise the President, she worries that some Senators may not have time to make well informed recommendations if materials are received late. The President stated that she thinks we can do better with a shared governance model if we have time to digest the information. Chair Cardoza pointed out that without proper staff support she has had to compile all materials by herself, and that materials getting out late has nothing to do with Faculty Senate's integrity. The President responded that she was not insinuating that they are, but merely providing a discussion point. The President turned to the good news in the governor's office for the budget. She mentioned looking into a question about the proposed \$1,000,000 capacity building allotment that is scheduled for the year 2019. She reported that Vic Redding is working with the governor's budget office to seek the answers, but worries that it will be difficult to secure this money for TMCC. Other than that, the President was optimistic about the new budget. Again the President thanked everyone and encouraged everybody to continue to write letters regarding Merit Pay.

As for the Sports Complex, the executive management team is in the process of preparing a document that details the project in its current state, promised to share that document with senators as soon possible. The president stated not to seek any authorization to proceed until this college is ready to do so. She voiced hope that we can come to some kind of consensus around the scope and the cost of that project. The President said that she did take the time early this morning to read the survey results, because it is important to hear what you all have to say. She felt there were a lot of excellent comments made, but there were also comments that could have been worded in a more collegial manner and worded to depict a more well-educated faculty. The President argued that she does believe in free speech, but that she hopes in the future, that we remember that we are all highly educated people who can express views about policy without being denigrating.

Jim New (VPFA) reported on the EATS project to make sure there is no misinterpretation of what's happening. Jim distributed a document that outlined the timeline. He explained the purpose of the project and that the college is looking at public/private partnership for the facility which is something we've never done before. This would entail several extra steps. He talked about it as a window of opportunity. In order for us to enter into a public/private partnership we would have to take the first two steps which are not binding. This June or July, we plan to issue a request for qualifications that would go out to the public and that would allow us to gather input from developers in the region that may be qualified for the project. We would then select one of those developers. Jim thought we could probably submit an Memo of Understanding to the Board of Regents at the December meeting for approval. An MOU does not obligate us to proceed with the project as it is a non-binding document. It does allow us to talk in-depth about the project and work out the details. A public/private partnership lets developers build the facility and lease it back to the college for a period of time. Then, we would work out details about financing, state regulations, how we would meet proposed payments, and apply the rules and expectations for the college. Realistically, this approval would happen in December 2017, assuming everybody comes together and the college makes the decision to do this project. Jim also stated that as early as March or June 2018, if everything falls into place and everyone is in agreement, we would then ask the Board of Regents for approval of an implementing agreement. It's only at that point in time that we are obligated to the project. We would then finalize the details and give the developers the go ahead to draw up the final drawings and line up contractors. If you should hear about these things we don't want you to feel that as an Administration we are moving on anything in an obligatory way without giving you the opportunity to engage in critical discussions to define the process.

Chair Cardoza thanked Jim and Karin for their reports and asked if there were any questions. Senator Clifford Bartl asked if there was a summary as to the partnership. Jim responded by saying that this is what they were trying to determine. He knows that a private developer doesn't have the same restrictions as we as an institution have, so they can build more quickly, and the bottom line is how much we will pay in lease payments and for how long vs how much would we be paying

debt services. Dave Boden asked what kind of dollar amount we are talking about, and how does the public/private partnership idea save money. Is it simply a logistic matter to move the project through faster? Jim responded that they hope it saves them money, and that the MOU will define how much. Right now the college is looking at a 45,000 square foot facility at around \$33,000,000. President Hilgersom and Executive Director Gretchen Sawyer are seeking donations from private benefactors, new markets, tax credits which can be utilized for financing at about \$3.7 million. In the end, it could cost about \$16.3 million dollars. Chair-elect Mike Holmes asked since this public/private partnership is relatively new to the college, has anyone else at the State done it yet? Jim New answered yes, that the Universities do it all the time. Chair-elect Mike Holmes pointed out that there is going to be a standard qualification statement and a review to determine your selections. Jim New responded by saying it is still not clear how it's going to work, but that NSHE Vice Chancellor Redding is very familiar with the process. Chair-elect Mike Holmes then asked if selections will be a combination of both qualitative and quantitative. Jim New answered that they would be following the Vice Chancellor's direction on that.

## Committee Reports

---

- **Student Government Association – David Turner II**

David stated that they currently have a position going into next year for Clubs Organization, so there will be open applications until May 31. They are excited for next year's SGA. This will be David's last Faculty Senate meeting with us, and even though he feels sadness, David is excited about his next path. Kimberly Tran will be joining us at the Faculty Senate next year. She is both nervous and excited about developing as a new leader. Kimberly is in the TMCC high school program at TMCC. Chair Cardoza thanked David for his service this year and all of his help. Everyone applauded.

- **Classified Council – Saloma Helget**

No report.

- **Part-Time Faculty Issues – Marynia Giren-Navarro**

No report.

- **Professional Standards – Scott Huber**

Scott explained that they had a two hour meeting discussing student evaluations. He asserted that we need to figure out a way to get students involved in evaluating their classes, maybe next fall. Scott announced that Amy Cavanaugh has been elected Chair of the Professional Standards Committee. Chair Cardoza took a minute to thank Scott for stepping in after last year's Professional Standards chair resigned. There was an applause. David Turner II suggested that faculty should look into keeping the course evaluations open before grades are posted and offering an opt-out button, so if students do not want to fill out an evaluation, they can opt-out. Brandy Scarnati stated that there is an opt-out button and right now students return evaluations at about 67.79% at present. Tom Cardoza reiterated that the opt-out button is important because no one should be held to do this, but he has always been an advocate of sending out evaluations as late as possible because it's a course evaluation. Students should be able to look back on their entire experience through the final exam. Chair Cardoza said that Professional Standards will be taking up this issue. We also have a new web college advisory committee who can talk about this. Steve Bale committed that he taught online for a national university that requires evaluations from all students before they can access their grades. Steve Bale doesn't see the reason why students have to opt-out, he thinks it's worthwhile to say that everybody should be able to evaluate the course.

- **Salary, Benefits & Budgetary Concerns – Steve Bale**

Steve said that they have been working on a number of issues and many of those are going to continue with Ron Marston, who will serve as the new Chair of Salary, Benefits & Budgetary Concerns starting in the fall. They did update the sabbatical forms and they will be posting those online and sending those out. Last Friday, they did a professional workshop on sabbaticals. They will be doing another one in the fall, and will go over the new forms. People will find that the new forms will be a little clearer and provide a smoother transition. We added a Presidential decision form which will clarify things across the board. Chair Cardoza added that Steve had served on this Faculty Senate body for over a decade and that he is now not going to be a Chair or a Senator, but he will only serve as the Sabbatical Sub-committee Chair. Chair Cardoza thinks we owe him a great round of applause for all the work he has done.

- Academic Standards & Assessments Committee (ASA) – Brian Ruf**  
 Because of all the PUR meetings, Brian jokingly commented that he couldn't remember the number of meetings they had had since the last Faculty Senate Meeting. He then gave a brief summary: they had reviewed and approved the Entrepreneurship PUR, Sociology PUR, the Core Humanities, Humanities and Philosophy PUR, the Dental Hygiene PUR, the Veterinary Technician PUR, and Culinary Arts PUR. All of those have had meetings with Deans, Authors, and with Dr. Deadman's office, except Culinary Arts. That meeting is either Monday or Tuesday of next week. Brian thanked everyone for reviewing the motion on the Honors Designations. Next year, the committee will review eight PURs. More members are needed on the committee.
- Recognition & Activities – Michelle Montoya**  
 Incoming Chair Michelle Montoya stated there was nothing to report.
- Library Committee – Corina Weidinger**  
 Chair Corina Weidinger stated there was nothing to report.
- Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) – Haley Orthel-Clark**  
 Chair Haley Orthel-Clark reported that the implementation of Leap Frog will begin in the Fall of 2017, and it will be used for submitting course, degree, emphases, and certificate proposal, deletions and changes. Onsite training for Leap Frog is scheduled for August 24 and August 25. The first CRC submission period for Fall 2017 will accrue in September after the August training. Procedural changes are coming with the new system. The CRC web pages will reflect these changes as soon as possible. One change to be aware of is that the CRC email account will no longer be used once we migrate to Leap Frog.
- Web College Advisory Committee – Candace Garlock**  
 The new Chair Candace Garlock stated they had nothing to report.

## Old Business

---

Julia Hammett made a clarification of the memo that President Hilgersom sent around.

## New Business

---

Tom Cardoza stated that he understands Kate concerns about the need for administrative faculty feedback, and that he shares them. At the same time, he stated that given the survey results that we have, there is significant information we should not ignore. With that said, he presented a motion proposing to slow down the process of the sports complex project. Senator Tom Cardoza proceeded to read the motion which stated: The TMCC Faculty Senate expresses deep concerns regarding the lack of due process for the current building proposals. Designs have been rushed and planning has been conducted in a vacuum without proper review by all campus constituent groups, and with no regard for the responsible and sustainable use of college resources. Numerous questions persist regarding accurate lifetime costs of the facilities including financing, maintenance, and staffing, as well as the potential impact of students fee increases on enrollment. We strongly recommend that any significant capital improvement projects be properly vetted by the Faculty Senate in the spirit of collaborative decision making before they are presented to off campus groups, including the NSHE regents or the state legislature.

We look forward to working cooperatively and transparently with President Hilgersom on shaping the future of the campus facilities in the best interests of all of TMCC's constituencies. The motion was seconded by Senator Wade Hampton.

## Discussion

---

Senator Erin Frock stated that she had concerns because this motion acts on information that does not include the Administrative Faculty represented by the At-Large senators. She did not think we could move forward as a body without properly representing all constituents. Senator Yevonne Allen agreed and said it would send a message to the administrative faculty that our members are not included in the motion. Steve Bale said that a motion like this is somewhat divisive in that it uses tactics that he encourages his students not to use and that is all or nothing. Steve

disagreed that planning had been conducted in a vacuum. To say that this has all been done without notice or due process is not true representation. He suggested that if Senate proceeded with the motion that we change some the language. Senator Tom Cardoza said that he was totally open to modifications to the language, and he understands some of the concerns. He went on to say that it is a complex issue that we need to discuss.

President Hilgersom referred to Elena and they both agreed that they do not feel that any attempt on the part of administration was made to block the administrative survey. Chair Cheryl Cardoza said that she was told that she was breaking a policy and she should desist and that was before she was able to send anything out to the administrative faculty, so she did feel like she was blocked. Elena added that a good amount of time had elapsed without an attempt to survey administrative faculty. Chair Cheryl Cardoza stated her attempt to get the names of Administrative faculty had just been resolved by her and Roni Fox. Right after that, she was told that she could not conduct the survey because she was violating policy. Roni Fox then expressed that at that meeting Elena had offered to do that survey for you, so it was offered that they would do that for Cheryl. Chair Cheryl Cardoza then stated that the issue is whether she has the right to survey her constituents without going through review at IR, and her executive committee advised Cheryl not to go through IR because that would be saying that she does not have the right to survey her constituents. Until that issue is resolved, Cheryl did not feel like she could make surveys that she feels are a part of her job.

Julia Hammett stated that she was at that meeting with Cheryl, Michael, Scott, Elena, and Karin, regarding the survey, and at that meeting we offered to go forward with the administration, but President Hilgersom said, there has been a chilling affect and she didn't feel that we should do the survey. It was too late. Then Julia was surprised that Monday morning the President suggested that Elena should do it although it is not in the policy that Elena's office does constituent surveys. Julia commented that this process seems very disturbing and frustrating. This is not the tone or conversation anyone wants to have at this college, but there is clearly a lot of misunderstanding even in meetings. Julia voiced hopes that we can get back to a place where we're respectful, and treating each other as professionals and all of us can do our jobs.

Chair Cheryl Cardoza stated that in the meeting President Hilgersom and Elena, the President did say there are issues with the language in the policy and that Cheryl was grateful to her for that because the problem with the whole thing is that the policy is ambiguous and creating misunderstandings. Regardless of that we're going to go review the policy at Planning Counsel to clarify it. Even so, Chair Cardoza stated that as your representative, she should have the right to ask your opinions so she can represent you fairly. Chair Cardoza felt strongly that she should not have to go through IR to do that because surveys meant to gather constituent feedback are not campus wide surveys.

Elena responded that she considers Cheryl and everyone in the room colleagues and would have helped to make their surveys better. Elena suggested that she could have sent the same survey to both academic and administrative faculty. Elena then described the function of IR and their responsibility for the integrity of all data and all surveys at the institution. She pointed out that her office does not work within the capacity of being able to influence the process or approve it or disapprove it, but simply to render an expertise. For this particular case, she argued, with all due respect, proper communication and trust could have avoided all of the strife. Chair Cardoza thanked Elena for what she had said and expressed her utmost respect for her and IR, but the problem is that in that cabinet meeting where she was told that she was breaking the policy it was Elena who told her that, so Cheryl did not feel that going to IR was a good move. Chair Cardoza went on to clarify that the communication rifts happened on a lot of different levels. She reiterated that she considers Elena a friend as well as a colleague.

David Turner stated that SGA had issues, and that he understands that policies can be cumbersome to deal with. At the same time, the policy made sure SGA took everything into account because there we can overlook important things when surveying our constituents. He argued that there are reasons why policies are in place, and if faculty bypass them, it would set a precedent that the students can then follow. David did not feel this is something students should be allowed to follow.

Chair Cardoza thank David for his opinion but did not agree with him on the policy's place in polling constituents. She also pointed out that if she sent a survey out that had a leading question in it, the faculty would call her out on it. They are her constituents. They trust her, and she trusts them.

Yevonne Allen pointed out that there was a motion on the floor. Chair Cardoza stated that the question has been called. Senator Dave Boden made the comment that he was in favor of the spirit of the motion but not the language of the

motion. Senator Tom Cardoza said that if President Hilgersom makes a deal right now and says she's not going to move this project forward in any way that hasn't already been discussed then he'll pull the motion.

President Hilgersom responded by saying that she has worked on a number of big projects with Student Governments in the past. She pointed out that for TMCC this a relatively new thing, and that in her experience these attainments of big goals work to the betterment of college campuses. President Hilgersom then read one paragraph from a statement from the AAUP from 1966 that relates to shared governance. The statement discussed how joint efforts should be handled. It stated that different constituent groups have different roles in the efforts. It also suggested that different weights should be given to different constituents depending on the project and the responsibilities of the different constituents. President Hilgersom then applied the statement she read to the projects at TMCC. She said that in this case of the health club, track, and a soccer field, since it will be paid for by SGA fees should preference student voice over all others. She said she was especially interested to hear how the next SGA President feels about the project, and that she will continue to solicit opinions from the administrative faculty and part-time faculty. She said that in her mind, this is a student project as discussed in the AAUP Statement. She planned to listen to the students first, gradually bringing in faculty voices second including administrative faculty. She ended by saying that she intends to abide by the shared governance model and that she hopes we can began to come to what resembles a consensus.

Senator Tom Cardoza repeated his question: is the soccer field moving forward this summer? Yes or no. And then Jim New said no, we are not building a complex this summer. Dr. Hilgersom concurred. Senator Tom Cardoza made a brief statement that he applauds David for having big dreams, and he likes the idea of having a sports complex, but he doesn't like the way the process has been handled, and given the huge financial commitment, he thinks this is a transformative event this will changed the nature of this campus for the future. After the statement, Senator Tom Cardoza pulled the motion.

**Meeting adjourned: 2:20 p.m.**