TMCC
Truckee Meadows Community College

Faculty Senate Professional Standards Committee

MEETING MINUTES JAN. 18, 2019

Meeting Called to Order: 10:03 a.m.

In Attendance: Sameer Bhattarai, Dave Boden, Warren Hejny, Andy Hughes, Linda McGillicuddy, Cheryl Olson, Melanie Purdy (chair), Trent Schoppe, Dolores Wonder

Absent: Eddie Burke, Keziah Dutt, Wade Hampton, Dan Hooper, Terry Mendez, Brandy Scarnati (Natalie Fisher proxy), Paul Seybold

Guests: Melissa Deadmond, Natalie Fisher (proxy for Brandy Scarnati), Scott Huber, Ron Marston, Kelley Wong

Additions to Committee: Scott Huber, Robert Kirchman, Cheryl Woehr, Kelley Wong

Approve November 16, 2018 Minutes

Approval of November 16, 2018: Cheryl Olson and Linda McGillicuddy motioned and seconded respectively. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item Discussion

Scott Huber NFA Negotiation Update
Scott thanked the committee members for all the input and comments on the specific parts of the contract. He said the information was quite useful. Contract negotiations begin the second week of February, and must be finished by the June Regents meeting. Facts include:

- TMCC faculty negotiators are Cheryl Cardoza (she knows where the language of the current contract falls short), Scott Huber, and Steve Bale.

- Scott and the negotiation team will pull in individuals who are working on specific things to assist. For example, Ron Marston is working with department chair duties research, and will provide that information. Lars Jensen will provide statistical support, Julie Muhle will provide information on programs, etc.

- John Nolan from UNR will be an observer.

- John Albrecht will be legal.

Chair Purdy asked about the voice(s) of administrative faculty. Scott assured the committee that the new chair of the Administrative Faculty committee will be involved, and that it is a bit tricky as the administrative faculty are covered by the contract, but currently have very little protections or options for upward mobility.

Faculty Workload while Assessing GE Courses
Chair Purdy attended a division meeting for social sciences in December, and there was great discussion about the process of eLumin and faculty commitment in loading data associated with GE assessment. Members of the discussion thought it would be worthwhile to try and find out if this process and the workload are going to continue, or if this is due to the system processes in the beginning stages, as the time put into loading the data, etc. is excessive. There was no objection to assessing GE, it is this current process and time associated with completing it that is the issue.

Dr. Deadmond was kind enough to discuss some of the conditions of eLumin, and the GE assessment. She identified that the system is designed for collecting data on ALL students, though areas are submitting samples. They are working on

bridging the data communication gap between Canvas and eLumin. Once this is modified, the process should require less hand entering of data into eLumin.

To help facilitate the multiple systems, multiple rubrics and assessment conditions, and clarify the process, there will be eLumin trainings at the various campuses. These trainings will be hands on, and individuals should be able to bring their concerns, problems, and projects.

The consensus at this point is to give the system, the learning, and the process a bit more time before identifying if it is a greater commitment than is written into the planning documents.

Annual Plan Revisit

The resolution from the last meeting (see below) was tabled at the Faculty Senate meeting because clearer direction needs to be in place regarding the "measurable criteria" associated with the annual plan and achieving commendable or excellent.

Three groups of attending committee members were established to review, discuss, use, and make recommendations on the wording and/or organization of the directions and points. We will discuss these potential options at the next meeting and decide on a revised resolution to bring forward.

> Resolution (tabled from Faculty Senate Meeting)
>
> *To receive Commendable or Excellent, the Faculty member will determine the number of times an activity will be used/performed, per the NFA contract Article 12, and will determine the "Performance Achieved" value for the Self-Evaluation. The following point distribution is recommended.*
>
> 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.
> - Commendable 2
> - 8 points from C/E1–C/E3; a minimum of 3 points ~~must~~ come from C/E1..
> - Excellent 1
> - 12 points from C/E1–C/E3; a minimum of 6 points ~~must~~ come from C/E1; and include 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; and include activities from both C/E2 and C/E3.

Criteria for Tenure Track Faculty

Professional Standards will need to establish a rubric to assist tenure track faculty committee chairs and committee members in the evaluation of the faculty member's performance as associated with the "Probationary Development/Department Review Report," "Recommendation for Tenure," and "Observation of Teaching" documents. We will begin exploring this at the February meeting.