

- I. **Call to Order: 3:01**
- II. **Approval of Minutes—approved**
- III. **Reports**
 - A. President—none
 - B. Vice President—incentive for today is “Blah” button.
 - C. Secretary—none
 - D. Task Force Reports--
 1. Instructional continuity after a crisis or disaster—will present at all April division meetings
 2. Determining whether students are actively pursuing a course—on agenda for April President’s Open Forum
 3. Best practices and preparing for legislative academic changes—task force initially considered developing a video for faculty. This will be on the April President’s Open Forum agenda.
 - a. This will have implications for advising—all facets of advising.
 - b. Students either test into college level classes based on TSI scores or are placed into the co-req model with a DE or NCBO course.
 - c. It was stated by “someone” that students who test into 0119 or 0219 are unable to enroll in PHIL, HIST, GOVT courses.
 - d. ESOL implications—The state considered ESOL as developmental English, but the college considers them language courses. HB2223 adds ESOL students to our percentages toward compliance. The English compliance is set to meet the state requirements without a consideration of ESOL.
 - i. English Subcommittee
 - ii. Math Subcommittee
 4. Mission/vision/values for the instructional division—The scope of this taskforce is broad, so they will continue to meet.
 5. Developmental Education—See above.
- IV. **Current Business**
 - A. RFP in for College Bookstore
 1. Follett Food Service Concerns (contract renewal 2018)
 2. Update on Request to Recommend that we do not Enter 5-year Contracts for Food Service Providers, Instead of Considering Shorter Contracts—This was brought to the VPs, President, and Chancellor. (Fulfills Faculty Senate resolution passed:)
 - a. 3-4 RFPs were submitted—these will be evaluated by a committee and then interviewed by a second committee. NOTE: Janeu is representing LSC-M on the interview committee.
 - b. The question was raised about whether the RFPs are for just food service or for both food service and bookstore.
 - B. Open External/Educational Resources (Digital texts for students)—Some notes were mentioned, including OERs are different from digital texts. Three models are being considered by a System-wide committee to help students be able to afford textbooks AND to ensure they are purchasing and using them (This is in response to a desire by the Chancellor for the system to use one single model.):

1. **Inclusive Plan**—Lone Star will partner with specific publishers (limited to 2-4 publishers) through a brokering entity. Any other publisher would be considered outside of the plan. This comes with a negotiated price and an assumption that most instructors would use the online/digital version. Then, students would be charged a course fee upon registration that would include the text—with a set price. Students would pay an additional fee for print versions of a textbook.
 - a. PROS
 - i. Access occurs on day one of the class.
 - ii. Students are aware of all fees/costs.
 - b. CONS
 - i. All sections on a student's registration would be charged a fee. (Currently, the discussion includes a flat fee for all courses – no delineation between courses with more expensive texts versus those with less expensive texts.
 - ii. Lab-based courses require interaction with a text (writing in them, etc.)
 - c. Why are we having this conversation? This is based on money lost by LSC due to students not using textbooks or not purchasing books through the college bookstore.
 - d. There was a question raised about the use of the money that comes from the mark-up. Also, the issue was raised about forcing students to buy textbooks. What is the relationship to student success? What about used books? Academic freedom?
 2. **Publisher-determined Plan**—A publisher (or consortium of publishers) may charge a fee for a determined number of semesters. Students would have all access to this publisher's text(s) for that period. (A non-refundable subscription plan). Again, students would have access to e-books, but they can pay a fee for a print text. Book rental is an option.
 3. **No Text Plan**—Students would be charged a fee per section, and faculty would develop their own materials for the course using a "Quality Matters" rubric. Eight-week intensive program would be available for the development of these courses. A question was raised about the role of the librarians in the development of course materials. Faculty who teach these sections will receive a \$300 stipend per section with a cap of \$1200 per semester. Part time faculty would receive \$100 per section when using badged courses.
 - a. Additional comments: The motives behind this discussion were brought into question. For example, if this is related directly to the funds we get from the bookstore purchases, then the online purchases are not taken into consideration.
 - b. The quality of these courses and the upkeep of maintaining course content was also called into question.
 - c. Concerns over the eight-week program and the badging, training of courses.
 - d. **RECOMMENDATION: Bring your feedback and research (data, please) to the open forums that are coming up—President (3/8), Dr. Harvey-Smith (2/27)**
- C. EDUC 1300 and 60-hour credit restriction
1. No "hidden" pre-requisites
 2. Programs cut academic or program-specific courses for EDUC 1300 mandate
 3. Contextualized sections
 4. Current EDUC 1300 proposals fit with Pathways Proposals—These sections are integrated into Pathways. With the Pathway model, EDUC 1300 will be catered to the needs of the student/program. In other words, EDUC 1300 courses could be contextualized per Pathway.

EDUC 1300 is a state-mandated course, but it is not funded by the state nor in the core curriculum. *(After meeting Faculty Senate President's note: More specifically, the State mandates a First Time in College (FTIC) program for colleges. LSC uses EDUC 1300 as its FTIC requirement. The individual EDUC 1300 course is not, itself, State-mandated.)*

- D. Best Semester 2018 – 2019—Mike Green will serve as the chair of the committee, and no budget changes were made that will impact the program.
- E. Two-track scheduling—This model arose due to the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and its impact on contact hours.
 - 1. Student requests to leave courses early to attend next course
 - 2. Difficulty in scheduling (large gaps in schedule for professors)
 - 3. Issue was raised that this model seems to work only for faculty who teach only the same types/lengths of classes, not for those who teach a varied schedule (48, 64, 80, 96, etc.).
 - 4. Dr. McGee stated that he is willing to work with the faculty to develop a schedule that works best for this campus.
- F. FT Online Faculty—FT faculty have a set workload of 70% instruction, 20% institutional service, and 10% professional development. The system believes a significant decrease in f2f students is coming. The proposal includes a few options
 - 1. Fully online faculty, 90/10: Full teaching load with an additional course online and professional development
 - 2. Fully online faculty, 80%: Full teaching load (70% instruction) plus 10% professional development but no institutional service
 - i. May be 9- or 10.5-month contracts, with 1-year guarantee, but renewals only pending review—eligible for multi-year contracts after three years).
 - ii. The “look” of the online faculty will be determined on a campus-by-campus basis (perhaps even down to the division level).
 - iii. Recommendation by Faculty Senate Presidents to System Administration: No more than 10% of a campus’s full-time faculty may be online.
 - iv. Existing faculty would have to apply and prove proficiency as an online instructor to get one of the positions.
 - 3. A concern was raised that completion/success rates for online courses is significantly lower than F2F courses. Also, student needs seem to be less important than a handful of faculty.
 - 4. A question was raised that exceptions could be made for faculty who need to teach fully online due to health, family issues, etc. instead of hiring additional online-only faculty.
- G. Workload Committee beginning discussions (at System level)
- H. Share Division Successes

V. **New Business**

VI. **Announcements**

- A. Incentive Drawing
- B. Andrade, Simone: Developmental English survey (Survey Monkey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HZN9K6Y>; additional survey attached)
- C. Buckman, Karen: Jonathan Sandys (Winston Churchill’s grandson at LSC-M on 3/6/18 at 1pm)
- D. Gronlund, Kitty: BIT Faculty Workshop—How to handle difficult classroom situations (3/29/2018)
- E. Colmenares, Angela: Library Faculty Exchange (3/5/18 at 3pm in F114); 2018 International Education Conference CFP

F. Chancellor's Grants Due (CFTIG) (Submissions Due on 3/9/18)

G. Comment Period for Biology

VII. **Adjournment: 4:15pm**

Lone Star College – Montgomery Faculty Senate 2017 – 2018

Officers: President: Janeu Houston | Vice President: Michele Richey | Secretary: Simone Andrade

BASS Senators: Amy Curry | Phil McCue | Betsy Powers | Adjunct: Jason Sweeney

BELS Senators: Karen Buckman | Martina Kusi-Mensah | Mark Whitten | Adjunct: Gloria Kessler

NASH Senators: Kitty Gronlund | Mattie McCowen | Cynthia Lawry Berkins | Adjunct: Bernard Ambe

TEAM Senators: Emmy Frank | Carlos Landa | Chase Waites | Adjunct: Amy Nabors

Counselor Senator: Neil Phillips

Librarian Senator: Angela Colmenares

For information on the Lone Star College - Montgomery Faculty Senate, visit our website at:

<http://www.lonestar.edu/montgomery-faculty-senate.htm>