



Truckee Meadows Community College

Faculty Senate Salary, Benefits and Budgetary Concerns Committee

MEETING MINUTES FOR OCT. 7, 2016

Meeting called to order at: 12:05 p.m.

In attendance: Steve Bale (chair), John Bailey, John Coles, Ana Douglass, Hugh Fraser, Dan Hooper, Ellen House, Matthew Leathen, Jeff Olsen, Rebecca Porter, Rosemary Rinaldi, Dan Williams

Absent: Kristen DeMay, Gail Ferrell, Lars, Jensen, Tammy Johnson, Ted Lambert, Kreg Mebust, Steve Streeper, Brian Wells, Brian Wells asked to be removed from the committee.

Guests: Cheryl Cardoza, Robert Kirchman, Rich Olson, Pamela Thomas. Robert Kirchman asked to be included as a member of the committee.

Welcome

Steve Bale welcomed the committee and guests to the meeting. He announced that he will be sending out agendas and minutes at the beginning of the week prior to all future meetings.

Approval of the Minutes from September 9, 2016

Ellen House moved to approve the minutes. John Coles seconded. There was no discussion. The vote to approve was unanimous with one abstention.

Compensation Enhancement

Background

Last month Steve Bale committed to sending out three models to the committee. Bale talked to the president who pointed him to the process at Central Oregon College. Dr. Hilgersom wanted to discuss an approval process and recommended we do a task force. At the last Faculty Senate Meeting, Senate approved that idea. The Task force will be chaired by Steve Bale. Anyone that wants to join, send an email. A member asked what the difference between this committee and the task force is. On a Task Force, Steve pointed out that it would be a joint committee with administrators, and that those administrators will have a vote. A Task Force is also focused on a specific task as opposed to a committee which can cover new agenda items/projects each meeting. The President supports this policy thinks a task force will ensure that there is buy in for it. She is committed to finding money if we agree to a policy because it will improve the quality of faculty morale and performance.

Steve related his experience reviewing COC. Central Oregon College has a complex approach. Applications for merit look more like tenure reports. Faculty can apply every three years, but only 20% get raises every year. It is possible for your application to be denied. Application process includes indicators on the faculty member's service to the community, to the college, to the department or division. Bale was not sure our faculty would like this approach.

Discussion

Member comments: Task force is about designing a policy. Faculty want approval or the prospect of approval. The Task Force charge should include feasibility and implementation. Steve Bale suggested inviting VPAA Barbara Buchanan and VPFA Jim New to be on the task force. Another member asked about Oregon's program asking if faculty would have three years of work on the application. Steve Bale pointed out that faculty could include any period they want to cover. The member argued that this plan makes merit awards competitive, which could be an issue. If we followed the Oregon model,

one committee would review all the applications. Faculty would not have to have individual committees for merit like our tenure committees. Documentation would include only the activities that meet the criteria for merit. Examples brought up were: Talk to a club, thank yous for service. A member pointed out that this adds more bureaucratic layers to an already overworked faculty, and that it competes with teaching time and productivity. Bale suggested we should act on this as soon as possible. If we want the system to start next year, the Task Force should be done with its work by May 15th.

Travel Requests

Process

Bylaws last year were changed to move Travel Requests to this committee. We have \$5000 per year committed to travel: \$2000 each for Fall and Spring and \$1000 for Summer. Early deadlines are set. A travel applicant is on the committee. He will exit before the vote. Professional Standards used a travel subcommittee to make these decisions. We only have 5 applications. We should be able to do that as a whole committee. If there were 20-30, we might want to have a subcommittee. The committee felt they could handle these as a single body. A member suggested that there should be a policy that sets a number for the formation of a subcommittee. Policy suggestion: travel considered at a regular meeting of committee unless there are 10 or more applications, then a subcommittee will be formed. Steve Bale moved to accept the policy. Second: Rosemary Rinaldi. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion

Travel requests for Fall 2016 were considered. The committee member with an application left to avoid conflict of interest. Steve Bale passed out a spreadsheet of the applications. There were 5 applications for Fall travel and one for Spring travel. All were legitimate travel to Conferences, Seminars, etc. One applicant only needs \$384.04, so if Steve argued that if we award that and split the rest of the funds, the rest would get \$403.99 each. There was one application with a discrepancy. Steve called to ask if that candidate wanted to discuss it and was not engaged. Department Contributions came up as a possible issue. The committee voiced concerns about the Department process for awarding travel funds. Is it transparent? The committee wondered if they should check into this process. There seems to be inconsistency in how travel funds are allocated to department members in some departments. The committee could consider recommending policies to departments for travel. Offering models was also suggested. Rosemary Rinaldi moved to award one applicant \$384.04 and the rest \$403.99 each. Hugh Fraser seconded. The motion was approved unanimously with one abstention by the member with an application being considered. The awards were as follows: Katie Kolbet: \$384.04. Dave Boden, John Coles, Ben Scheible, and Crystal Swank: \$403.99. One member suggested gathering data from travel paid for Faculty vs. travel paid for Administrators. This information could help encourage or allocate more for travel for faculty. Steve promised to ask the Executive Board to pull that data with info from Elena and/or Craig Scott. The Travel Awards go from here to full senate for approval.

Other Issues for the Committee

Annual Plan Discussion

Steve reported that Professional Standards didn't want to discuss Hugh's Annual Plan revision proposal. A member suggested that the lack of merit funding creates a lack of enthusiasm for this discussion. Hugh pointed out that the current annual plan is too complicated a document, that it needs simplification. Hugh's proposal attempted to streamline, not change for merit. A snapshot in the end of the report would make it easier to read and assess. Steve argued that annual plans affect salary and budgetary concerns, so the committee could take a look at it here. He pointed out that Hugh had included values for items to make the plan a stronger measure of the quality of activities. Hugh pointed out that he was trying to keep the Annual plan objective and in faculty control. One member compared this to the awarding of sabbaticals only when they benefit the school. This takes away from the sabbatical's true purpose: to recharge our batteries. Some departments can naturally create sabbatical projects better than others which leave things uneven and unfair. A member added that the Annual Plan needs to be meaningful to faculty since there's no merit. We should be working on things that stimulate us to become better at our work. We should control what we do for that. John Coles moved that the committee take on Hugh's proposal to revise the Annual Plan. Rosemary Rinaldi seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Members asked Hugh to present his two plans to them: the vanilla revision and the value rated version. The chair suggested using

creativity in looking at this issue. Hugh pointed out that the value rated plan is done arbitrarily at this time. Those values can be changed. The committee should be open to discussing that. A member mentioned that the Annual plan could be put in Excel, and could include drop boxes, making completing it much easier. How we differentiate will be the key. Letting things cover more than one year when projects are larger should be included. Once the committee discusses, we could take it to Faculty Senate directly. We could also take it to Professional Standards if appropriate. Steve Bale thought going directly to Faculty Senate was the best route.

Grants

Members pointed out that support from the Grants office is not strong. That office won't talk to the committee though invited to do so. The Grants office should be supporting faculty who go for grants. They should coordinate and support faculty efforts. It would be nice to have workshops for writing/finding grants. Steve Bale promised he will try to get them to come talk to committee about how faculty could get support from their office.

Retirement Options

Members suggested that retirement options should be discussed more on this committee. There are some workshops coming up, but medical options for retirees were not covered at the last workshop. Members suggested more targeted workshops. One asked if we bring someone in to talk about medical options for retirement. One member thought this would be better for Professional Development Days. Another said that many faculty don't go to Professional Development Days though. Another commented that it might benefit some faculty though not all on the committee. A committee suggested another question about TIAA CREF ads to faculty about deferred annuities. It was also asked why there is another company presenting at Edison. Members wondered if our information was being sent out to others and who and whether that was for a profit.

Budget Committee on the Planning Council

Members asked for clarification on the Budget Committee on the Planning Council. They wondered if that committee would present to us and talk about their plans for the legislative session. Members asked if Jim New could come and do that. Steve promised to have Jim present on this. There is a Special Session now just looking at the Raider's Stadium in Las Vegas and tax. There has been no new mentions of this as the year of Education.

Meeting adjourned: 1:06 p.m.