
MEETING MINUTES FOR OCT. 20, 2017

Meeting called to order: 10:04 a.m.

In attendance: , Dave Boden, Arnold Brock, Amy Cavanaugh (chair), Andy Hughes, Linda McGillicuddy, Melanie Purdy, Trenton Schoppe, Kyle Simmons, Jim Winston, Warren Hejny, Cheryl Woehr

Absent: Sameer Bhattarai, Laura Briggs, Wade Hampton, Scott Huber

Guests: Amber Anaya, Kristin DeMay, Ron Marston

Approval of the September 15, 2017 Minutes

Chair Amy Cavanaugh called for a motion to approve the September 15, 2017 minutes. The motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously with one abstention.

FERPA Training

The following update is needed: TMCC Police Department is now University Police Services. Other suggested changes are clarifying the use of thumb drives for student data. Andy Hughes noted the media department has been reduced to one person and proposed two options: use a Department of Education video or get a subscription to the FERPA training offered by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). Andy further pointed out the difficulty in shooting a video that is both done well and maintains relevance over time. Other suggestions received were to check You Tube for videos, create a reference list (cheat sheet) of common violations for faculty and staff to be aware of, make training mandatory every two years, hold trainings during department meetings and possibly send reminders through email campaigns to complete training. Andy Hughes valiantly volunteered to bring demo videos and doughnuts to the next PS meeting for committee review.

Annual Evaluation Plan Revisions

Ron Marston, Chair of the Salary, Benefits and Budgetary Concerns committee presented the plan suggestions and summary his committee has created along with input from the deans. Below is a summary of his notes from today's discussion:

Item 1. Add weights

- Committee members voiced no concerns with adding weights. Some voiced support.

Item 2. Add performance value to activities

Ideas were voiced (paraphrased):

- Don't want to force a Gaussian distribution like the System wanted for merit pay.
- Faculties are all excellent; are excellent when hired. Should be okay if all get excellent rating.
- A rank advancement policy would be a better place for faculty to strive for a higher rating/more money.
- Having a performance rating can be valuable and be a benefit to faculty for feedback and growth.
- Allowing deans to evaluate performance will be a disaster.
- Could allow faculty to self-evaluate with performance value, but not allow the dean to dispute.

Item 3. Revise list of activities

- Discussion about reviewing all activities to determine which are appropriate to have a performance value attached, and which aren't.

Item 4. Revise rating scores

- No specific comments made.

Item 5. Improve usability of form

- If only the selected activities appear in the form, there could be an issue with faculty not being aware of the unused activities. Need a form where the faculty sees all the activities but the final shared version only shows chosen activities.

Item 6. Other suggestions/comments

- If we have performance values (item 2) we will need a dispute/grievance policy if faculty and dean don't agree, possibly similar to the merit pay grievance policy in the NFA contract.
- Need to think about how these changes will affect Merit pay and/or Rank Advancement.
- Need to revise the advisors/librarians version of the annual evaluation also.

Administrator Evaluations

Excerpted from Planning Council Draft:

TMCC Planning Council Bylaw Revision Proposed by President - September 2017

Black = original | Blue = updated

Existing Bylaw:

In addition to the annual evaluations of deans, vice presidents and other administrators who supervise academic faculty, a performance survey will be conducted by the Faculty Senate at least every two years, which shall be compiled by the employee's supervisor. The compiled results of the survey will ~~become~~ **inform** part of the annual evaluation of the administrator and will include input from ~~all~~ faculty and classified staff supervised by the administrator. ~~A confidential institution committee consisting of the Faculty Senate Chair or his//her designee,, the Faculty Senate Chair - Elect or his//her designee,, the Classified Council President or his//her designee,, a representative from Human Resources,, the respective supervisor and the employee being evaluated will meet to review the survey results. The supervisor of the administrator surveyed will compile the confidential results and incorporate the survey results and themes into the performance review. The supervisor will also notify the Faculty Senate Chair (in writing) that the inclusion of the survey results occurred and as one important element of the administrator's evaluation. The confidential institution committee is consistent with the NSHE Code, Title 2, Section 5.6.2a.~~

From Dean Channing:

In addition to the annual administrative faculty evaluations of deans, vice presidents and other administrators who supervise academic faculty, a performance survey, sent to all faculty and classified staff supervised by the administrator, will be conducted by the Faculty Senate every two years. The survey results shall be compiled by the employee's supervisor. The supervisor of the administrator surveyed will consult the compiled survey results in developing an appropriate performance evaluation. The supervisor will also notify the Faculty Senate Chair (in writing) that the survey results were consulted in the writing of the administrator's evaluation.

Discussion circled around the use of the word "inform". The committee felt it diminishes transparency of the survey. President Hilgersom's concern was confidentiality. The parties named in the bylaw: Faculty Senate Chair, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect and the Classified Council President do not have any professional need to view the survey results. Ron Marston suggested to approve the bylaw change with a revision of the word inform, suggest wording and vote on a motion to be sent to Faculty Senate. A call for a motion to approve the draft except the word "inform" was motioned, seconded and passed unanimously with one abstention.

Tenure Materials

The tenure binder requires student evaluations; however, it says do not use raw data as they should be compiled. The wording needs to be updated with better descriptors indicating how the data should be compiled. A call for a motion to strike or change the wording in the tenure instructions was motioned, seconded and passed unanimously with one abstention.

Other

The teaching evaluation form does not specify role of the observer. Determine on evaluations what makes excellent, satisfactory versus unsatisfactory.

Chair Evaluation/disciplinary issues tabled until January.

Adjourn: 11:34 a.m.