

---

# MEETING MINUTES OCT. 19, 2018

---

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

**In Attendance:** Dave Boden, Eddie Burke, Dan Hooper, Linda McGillicuddy, Terry Mendez, Melanie Purdy (Chair), Brandy Scarnati, Trenton Schoppe, Paul Seybold, Dolores Wonder

**Absent:** Sameer Bhattarai (Proxy Dave Boden), Keziah Dutt (student rep), Wes Evans (Proxy Melanie Purdy), Wade Hampton, Warren Hejny, Andy Hughes (Proxy Lee Raubolt), Cheryl Olson, Kelley Wong

**Guests:** Melissa Hogue, Jean Lampson, Barb Painter, Lee Raubolt, Gary Skibinski, plus three students who also work at Textbook Brokers (who did not sign in).

**Subtractions to Committee:** Kelley Wong

---

## Approval of the September 21, 2018

---

Approval of September 21, 2018: Eddie Burke and Linda McGillicuddy motioned and seconded respectively. The motion passed unanimously.

---

## Academic Calendar

---

Barbara Painter and Lee Raubolt brought calendar changes—graduation date in 2020 changed to 5/20/20—Wednesday from a Friday; altered summer school back to original way of not having a break between sessions so that grades can be posted prior to the fall semester start; and the next calendar. The committee unanimously approved these changes\*\*

\*\* Chair Purdy was mistaken in taking on this change as the calendar changes charge was shifted to Academic Standards. Chair Purdy found this out in the Executive Committee Meeting (after our meeting). Barb and Lee were notified, and Mark Maynard is now processing this through his committee. So the vote from Professional Standards is null.

---

## Annual Plan Review Process

---

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.

---

## Faculty Evaluation “Planned Activity” Double/Triple Dipping Policy

---

Chair Purdy gave a synopsis of what Ron Marston identified as the Salary and Benefits Committee direction... namely that each member of the committee is going to the excel sheet, set up by Ron -

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nozYOIb32n-U2mhhWKpoDjyTTQNmhg9myryUH58Y9vk/edit> and will identify how many times (between 1-5) they think an activity should be allowable. Paul Seybold, who sits on both committees, clarified how the strategy came about in Salary and Benefits. Professional Standards Committee members were invited to participate in this, however, resoundingly, the committee still believes the following, and did not think it would add value to put scores in to the chart because of the beliefs below:

- a) ***With minor tweaks to the part of the evaluation shown below, we can mitigate any potential misuse of activities (being used too many times). Example qualifiers are shown in green.***

To receive Commendable or Excellent you must fulfill all Satisfactory requirements and:

- **Commendable 1**
  - 5 points from C/E1–C/E3; a minimum of 2 points must come from C/E1; the remainder comes from C/E2 and/or C/E3.
  - **Commendable 2**
  - 8 points from C/E1–C/E3; a minimum of 3 points must come from C/E1; the remainder comes from C/E2 and/or C/E3.
  - **Excellent 1**
  - 12 points from C/E1–C/E3; a minimum of 6 points must come from C/E1; the remainder come from and includes activities from both C/E2 and C/E3.
  - **Excellent 2**
  - 18 points from C/E1–C/E3; a minimum of 8 points must come from C/E1; the remainder must include at least six points from both C/E2 and C/E3.
  - *Faculty member will determine the "Performance Achieved" value for the Self-Evaluation, and will determine the number of times an activity will be performed.*
- b) ***The committee believes that faculty should determine the number of times an activity is chosen. If there are concerns of the Chair or Dean about the number of times an individual is proposing to use an item, the Chair or Dean would address this when the individual submits the annual plan. To help clarify to the Chair or Dean, it may be useful to indicate in the instructions (see above in purple) that Faculty choose.***
- c) ***Any limits placed on an activity would potentially be an artificial limit as in every section of the evaluation there is a section: "Other activities as agreed upon with chair/dean/director. (1.0–3.0)" wherein one can add the "overage" on a repeated item.***
- d) ***The committee believes that rather than "solving a problem that does not exist," we (collectively) should let the new evaluation forms and method run for a couple of years, evaluate IF there is a problem, and then see what that might be based on data, and solve it based on clear identification of the problem.***

## Text Book Discussion

---

Gary Skibinski and Melissa Hogue (from the Bookstore, representing Follett) were kind enough to attend the meeting to discuss faculty concerns with the Follett Contract, specifically section 6.5 which reads:

Follett shall have the exclusive right, free from any alternate source endorsed, licensed or otherwise approved or supported by School (whether on campus, by catalog or through electronic commerce, including hyperlinks to alternate sources) to buy, sell and distribute (including the right to select vendors) merchandise and services traditionally offered in college and university bookstores, including but not limited to: textbooks, class and alumni rings and jewelry, clothing (whether or not emblematic), school supplies, desk and dorm accessories, gifts, souvenirs, graduation regalia (sale and rental) and announcements, course-adopted software and paper and electronic custom anthologies, and textbook buybacks. Follett shall also have right of first refusal to fulfill any distance learning instructional and ancillary materials required by School during the term of this Agreement. This Section 6.5 does not prohibit occasional sales by student groups Gary and Melissa identified that minors cannot enter into "binding" contracts for renting hard copy books, and that is likely why the under aged student was rejected from doing this in our bookstore.

Gary mentioned that we have a long history with Follett; that there is an automatic contract renewal in 2019 (June 30), and that the plan is to have a full RFP search in 2020. He identified that the contract with Follett benefits students, as a percent of the commissions are given back to fund various initiatives and to students.

Melissa gave a PowerPoint presentation on some of the new methods Follett is planning to implement that will make ordering and picking up texts easier for students; and ordering by the departments will be simplified too. It was also noted that open source materials are NOT in conflict with the above provision, and that often, open source materials are linked within the course through Canvas.

After the discussion, Committee Member Eddie Burke made a motion to forward a resolution to the Faculty Senate (see resolution below). It was discussed that it would be valuable to have faculty as part of the selection process and that it is important to really look at what we need in terms of a "bookstore" to best serve students.

**Resolution: motion Eddie Burke, seconded by Paul Seybold, unanimously approved.**

Whereas TMCC Faculty are intimately involved with choice and usage of textbooks, as well as with helping students successfully access course material; and because the contract with Follett is coming up for renewal (2019 - auto renewal and 2020 an open search for a new contract/contractor); and since the nature of accessing course material, and the volume of options has increased with technology, and yet faculty are restricted in helping students understand all of their choices (by section 6.5 of the vendor contract);

Faculty support reviewing the full contract of Follett, and putting the contract to bid in 2019, instead of "auto renewal," and waiting until 2020. Further, Faculty support revisiting the "bookstore" model as it is currently presented, with the vision of creating a technology centered, student friendly method of textbook/merchandise distribution.

## NFA Contract Input Discussion

---

We briefly looked at the additions of committee members to the review. Dan Hooper explained his insights into calculating workload for Department Chairs; Brandy Scarnati had extensive input on really updating the "remote" teaching section to be more with the times; we discussed the discrepancies in lab hours; and Chair Purdy asked that everyone please continue to provide input and after the November meeting, we will forward the comments part of the document to Scott Huber. Scott is very open and excited for the input, and will additionally address our committee in January.

Again, the main goal is to provide a number of data points to help clarify the potential direction for the contract negotiations; and to identify where the contract can be strengthened to clarify how it applies to Administrative Faculty too.

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