



---

# MEETING MINUTES SEPT. 21, 2018

---

**Meeting Called to Order:** 10:00 a.m.

**In Attendance:** Sameer Bhattarai, Dave Boden, Eddie Burke, Wes Evans, Wade Hampton, Warren Hejny, Dan Hooper, Linda McGillicuddy, Terry Mendez, Cheryl Olson, Melanie Purdy (Chair), Trenton Schoppe, Paul Seybold, Dolores Wonder

**Absent:** Keziah Dutt (student rep), Andy Hughes (Proxy Sharon Wurm), Brandy Scarnati, Kelley Wong

**Guests:** Scott Huber, Ron Marston

**Additions to Committee:** Wes Evans

---

## Approval of the August 17, 2018

---

Approval of August 17, 2018 minutes: Wade Hampton and Terry Mendez motioned and seconded respectively. The motion passed with one abstention (Dan Hooper).

---

## Faculty Evaluation "Planned Activity" double/triple dipping policy

---

In response to the email from Dr. Murgolo dated 8.28.18, identifying that, at this point, pending guidance and direction from faculty, for the new annual plan/evaluation form, we will do the following:

If two highly significant activities fall into one "planned activity" category, then the value of that activity may be doubled-counted. For example, C/E1 a. is "teach an established course for the first time," and is a value of 2. Completing one new course is a total of 2 points, and completing two new courses is a total of 4 points. Specifics must be provided in the description box so that each significant activity is clearly described. Faculty are responsible for making and error-checking final tallies. Double-counts will only be considered for highly significant activities, such as teaching a new course (C/E 1 a.), creating a new course (C/E 1 b.), serving as chair on more than one screening committee (C/E 2 j.) or as chair on more than one tenure track committee (C/E 2 k.).

Whether or not an activity is highly significant is left to the discretion of the Dean, who will base the decision on whether or not the activity meets all of the following criteria:

- a) involves significant time
- b) is an expression of the employee's professional training (disciplinary-related)
- c) involves a critical contribution to colleagues, the department, the division, or the college

Deans will use these criteria as a guide until the college community, through the Faculty Senate committee process, reaches consensus on a double-counting policy for the new Annual Plan/Eval form.

The committee, in conjunction with Ron Marston, chair of salary and benefits, had a robust discussion with the following outcomes:

Professional Standards, and Salary and Benefits will work closely on this to identify faculty preference on how to manage this, as well as to come up with ways to mitigate potential misuse of the "dipping."

Generally, the committee agreed that we do not want to limit the number of times individuals may use ANY additional activity in their plan and we want to eliminate the subjective judgement of only using activities labeled “highly significant” and allow for ANY activity. Note: This is not an official statement, this will come in future in conjunction with Salary and Benefits input.

Concern	Discussion/Solution
<p>Concern 1</p> <p>Unlimited use of activities in one or two categories may lead to someone using the same thing to meet all the requirements for commendable and excellent.</p>	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Though this situation of concern is possible, it is unlikely as the annual plans imply that one must get a certain number of activities in C/E1-C/E3 to progress, not just in one area. For example: Commendable 1: 5 points from C/E1-C/E3...and Excellent 2 where 18 points come from C/E1-C/E3; a minimum of 8 points must come from C/E1.</p> <p>This sounds like one would get 8 points from C/E1; and the others from the various sections, however, with the current wording, one can actually get all 18 points from one activity, hard as that might be.</p> <p>Further discussion explored if it would actually BE a problem if one were to use one category for all extra points... An example was if one were to use the “teach a new class” as all the points. This is possible with some of the modular classes coming through Edison, the preparation of a new class could potentially become a huge point earner. The counter points to that included: instructional faculty SHOULD be teaching; contributing new classes is a positive; and the new class prep, would only be new once.</p> <p>Another concern was that if one were to use only one or two items as their point base, they would not be displaying roundedness, nor be contributing to the community (depending on the items chosen). Conversely, the majority of the committee believed that roundedness should not be based on one year, but be a cumulative impact (similar to how GE is a cumulative effort for students, and not just “gotten” in one class). For tenure track faculty, the safety net in roundedness and contribution comes in the tenure process; for tenured faculty, it would be discussion between the faculty and the department chair to help the faculty discover other things to do if needed.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p><i>The committee agreed that leaving it to the discretion of the faculty member to define the activity, and to be able to use a category as many times as applicable is acceptable; and to consider updating the instruction in the annual plan to indicate that to get progressive rankings (C1, C2, E1, etc), one MUST choose from through the plan and diversify the activities.</i></p> <p>18</p>

<p>Concern 2</p> <p>Using only “highly significant” items assessed by the deans would be problematic.</p>	<p>Discussion</p> <p>There were a few major concerns with this.</p> <p>First, other than the three points listed in the VPAA’s email (which can be subjective in evaluation) there is no definition as to what “highly significant” is, no rubric or matrix of significance was presented, and even with a tool to assess the “highly significant” value of something, the decisions would be arbitrary, subjective and judgmental and could easily be perceived as unfair.</p> <p>Additionally, to label some items as more significant than others is devaluing the efforts and contributions of items left out. Further, leaving the decision as to what is “highly significant” to the deans, devalues the professionalism of the faculty.</p> <p>There was also discussion around the idea of starting with two times of use, and then dropping the point value if one were to use the item again, but that tied back to the question of devaluing the work and effort. For example, if one were presenting three different, new workshops to the campus community, why would the third one be worth less?</p> <p>Positively, the committee discussed how the robustness of the current evaluation is actually designed to capture the essence of significant value. For example, “arrange a peer review and implement recommendations” rates one point. If one were to take the time to arrange eight different peer reviews, that would amount to eight points; wherein something like “lead assessment efforts of all sections of a GenEd course, including submission of CAR and GEAR,” which is three points, would add up faster, but if one were to do this for three different GE courses, it would take a huge effort and have a significant impact.</p> <p>SOLUTION</p> <p>Allow for ALL activities to be used for multi-use in the planning and evaluation, with the assumption that the form provides the checks and balances. To check the assumption, after two years of use, qualitatively assess (with faculty and deans) if additional restrictions need to be added. This check can be co-lead by Professional Standards and Salary and Benefits.</p>
---	--

There was discussion of the timelines of annual plans (being submitted) and department chair responsibilities in “reviewing” and providing feedback on these in September/October when faculty can alter and change the plan up until March. What IS the chair’s responsibility?

Some department chairs do make recommendations on annual plans (and some of the committee members identified that this is valuable to them as faculty); others do not. Further discussion needs to occur to determine if clearer guidelines need to be identified to supplement what is already written in the NFA contract.

## NFA Contract Review

---

Scott Huber provided an overview of the Nevada Faculty Alliance as the union that represents all faculty; how it has been advocating for both paying and non-paying members for many years; and how the NFA contract supersedes the NSHE code when it comes to policies and practices associated with faculty work and work environment.

Chair Purdy is to send out the NFA contract to Professional Standards members (ideally in a word or google doc) and will ask members (assign "homework") to review certain sections critically to come up with strengths and weaknesses to discuss. Members are encouraged to read ALL sections. The goals of this are:

- identify areas of concern to Scott, who will be taking on the role of lead negotiator (the contract is reviewed on a three year cycle; with July 1, 2019 as the new contract ratification date) as NFA president
- provide input and guidance as to what faculty priorities are in the negotiation process
- identify where the contract might be strengthened to address concerns and rights of administrative faculty.

One area to be discussed in more detail includes the issue of lab hours and faculty compensation. Finally, Scott made clear the importance of the distinction between credit hours and contact hours in terms of compensation.

## Text Books Discussion

---

The text book discussion centered around:

Current Follett mandates (faculty not being able to promote other sources for text purchase; under 18 year olds not being able to rent texts from the book store) and having this committee work to identify options with regard to text purchases, the contract with Follett in the future, or even the need for a bookstore. Jim New will be invited to come to discuss the Follett contract with the committee.

We will review the 2015 Textbook Taskforce Report to make recommendations for updates; and to see how (or if) the recommendations of the report are being implemented.

Identifying was to enhance the Textbook recommendations to make sure students are benefiting from their textbook purchases (actually being asked to use the books they are required to purchase); and that open source material is easily available and implemented (using Neil Siegel's research to help inform any recommendations).

## Seeking members to sit on the Administrative Faculty Task Force

---

Chair Purdy asked if any academic faculty member of Professional Standards could please step up to sit on this committee to a) show support for administrative faculty and to b) provide additional input and feedback to help guide administrative faculty's voice in senate.

**Adjourn:** 11:30 a.m.