



Truckee Meadows Community College

Faculty Senate Salary, Benefits and Budgetary Concerns Committee

---

## MEETING MINUTES FOR DEC. 2, 2016

---

**In attendance:** Steve Bale, John Coles, Gail Ferrell, Hugh Fraser, Dan Hooper, Ellen House, Ted Lamber, Matthew Leathen, Ron Marston, Jeff Olsen, Robert Kirchman, Dan Williams

**Absent:** John Bailey, Kristen DeMay, Ana Douglas, Lars Jensen, Ted Lamber, Kreg Mebust, Rebecca Porter, Steve Streeper, Brian Wells

**Guests:** Mike Holmes, Jim New, Pamela Thomas

**Meeting called to order:** 12:04 p.m.

Chair welcomed Chair Elect Mike Holmes, Interim VP Jim New, Pamela Thomas minute taker, and everyone else for being there. Chair also welcomed back Ron Marston, who was out on sabbatical last year.

We lost 2 people due to retirement: Rich Olsen, Rosemary Rinaldi. We also lost Tammy Johnson, who is now working for NSHE.

---

### Approve minutes from November 18, 2016 meeting

---

**Vote:** unanimous, (2) abstentions

---

### Approve minutes from December 2, 2016 meeting

---

**Vote:** unanimous, (3) abstentions

---

### Budget Committee Report

---

When the Faculty Senate By-laws was changed, or updated last year, there were two things that were shifted to this committee.

1. Travel claims, and a travel sub-committee
2. Sabbaticals, and the sabbatical sub-committee

Mike Holmes Chair-Elect and the current Chair of the Sabbatical Sub-Committee, talked to us about sabbaticals. He gave a "heads-up" to making the transition, because it was Professional Standards thru last year who was in charge of the sabbatical committee responsibilities. There were a number of things that came out of this years' process, where sabbatical awards of academic year 17-18 in the committee's review that I think we need to tighten up because they presented some problems with regard to coordination, and scoring. I think what this committee need to do, is get in front of the traditional time frame that we had in the past. In the past it was always one of the last business items of the semester for the Professional Standards Committee to elect a sabbatical sub-committee chair in April or late May. In conversation with the President this past go-around we agreed we should be more pro-active about getting more people to apply for it, to consider it, with a longer views as to just coming back in the fall semester and having to rush through make a decision without thinking it through, and then making the application. One of the things discussed was to have a professional development seminar forum discussion, explanation of the sabbatical process, ideas, which will be helpful in generating enough interest. We need to start an earlier notice. We had applications that would have been a better more cohesive proposal had they had more of a discussion with their respective deans about the strategic plan of the collage. A couple of things that came out of the committee in the discussion was we need to tight-up, and put some more individual scoring against some things that are vague in general, and then get together a timetable calendar so everyone knows what's going

on, and then it's a smooth transition to whatever is going to happen, and needs to be followed up and rectified with regard changes to policy for this next year or next cycle. Chair-Elect Mike Holmes continues to be involved. This is something we need to handoff to the Salary, Benefits and Budgetary Concerns Committee from the Professional Standards.

Thoughts to bring two things to the committee next month:

1. To get in front of this, and get a sub-committee chair.
2. Tighten up the policies to help the committee.
3. Put out somethings to help the applicants.

## Perkins Grants

---

Perkins and are formula based. Dept. of education is getting much tougher on their expectations. Perkins show growth in career education.

Grants manual have a lot of information for proposal and budgets.

- 3 major issues:
  - Will the grant pay for all cost?
  - A lot of agencies are wanting to come up with match.
  - Sustainability is 2nd. If it can't be sustained
- We have 28 grants: 6 undergraduate research, 7 instructional base, 10 that are student based (Grant for workforce in Nevada. Serve 30 students doing CNA)

## Annual Plans

---

Steve has asked Dean Lance to come talk about observations he has regarding proposal of annual plans so we can better delineate. Dean Lance said: The issue then is the annual plan comes back to me in April and it's really a check box and conversation of compensation of work and merit pay. Example: Credit is the same of non-involved and very involved in community receiving the same pay. There are a lot of one-liners. This example is not negotiable, you either do or don't. When evaluating these, basics of what teacher should be doing job/ maintaining? Interpretation could cause filing a grievance. The design was never for evaluation it was as designed on whether you did this. It was redone to make as a merit evaluation tool. Faculty Senate passed the policy to use the annual plan. The discussion from Lance is to show from his perspective using the annual plan is not a very good tool. If we just want to document everybody is awesome send out certificates. If we want to use annual plan as a tool for approving teaching, can we say whether this is effective. About 10 years ago had info that had to provide as annual plan. If we can't approve documents to measure then it doesn't work. Administration wants to measure, how well we measure. What is issue of quantitative measurement? Robert Kirchman: We have to figure out what we want to measure. It is a measure of Merit service. Can or have they go above and beyond. Currently there is not a whole lot how good of quantitative measure of job you do. It's a service measure not performance measure.

Lance: I have 71 faculty it takes weeks to go through these. But to give any useful measurement of instructors on how well they are teaching.

Brain Wells: Where is the solution? Where's the middle ground?

Lance: Membership on SBBC as example. Are those that aren't here today giving the same amount of effort as those who are always here and can that be measured.

Steve suggests an attachment of a 1–5 ranking that the Dean gives you. Lance would love to see a narrative.

BoR policy specific components that we do. We have expanded and added Prof Dev to this. Can Dean sit down and give clear information on what they want narrative and interpretation. Lance Bowen: Would rather have a narrative summary at the end. Document only allows a small area for narrative and then stops. We need to rethink how we do the evaluations. What about sitting down throughout the year? Steve Bale: Suggestion of doing the evaluation every other year for tenured faculty. Currently the evaluations have to be done by June 1 so they can receive merit. What do we do going forward? Steve has done with annual plan. Can make gradable by faculty member, dean, chair etc. Does that really change anything? Suggestions of going the evaluation every 3 years.

Steve Bale: Should we go back and reword to deepen these questions? Making these questions more meaningful?

Steve Bale showed a simplify documents that are all checkbox S1-S7. Will show red if not all boxes are not checked.

Suggestion of a doing a do 300 word report of what the faculty member has done over that time period of the evaluation. Steve will go online and find 5 different plans that he will distribute to the committee so they can discuss the next meeting in Feb.

## Other issues for committee

---

None.

**Adjourn:** 2 p.m.

**Next meeting:** February 10, 2017, Noon in Sierra 111