

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Thursday, March 29, 2018 @ 3:00 pm | G-102

- I. **Call to Order:** 3:05
- II. **Approval of Minutes:** Approved
- III. **Reports**
 - A. President
 1. Update on FT Online Faculty
 - a. The recommendation was made (by majority—not unanimous—vote) by FS Presidents to approve the 80% model for fully online faculty position(s).
 - b. Montgomery and North Harris rejected the 80% model.
 - i. Montgomery rejected all fully online, FT faculty models proposed.
 - ii. North Harris rejected the 80% and the 90/10% models. Voted in favor of the 100% model.
 - c. In the 80% model, 70% of load is teaching (fully online) and 10% is professional development. No institutional service is required, and faculty will be paid at 80% of a FT faculty salary. Current LSC faculty who move to one of these position would have their salary adjusted to 80%. No more than 10% of a campus's faculty can be fully online. The FSPs' recommendations included control of this position (whether to have this position or not) maintained at the campus level.
 2. RFP in for College Bookstore
 - a. Individuals/groups who submitted applications were interviewed today (3/29/18). Food service was discussed as an ancillary aspect of several of the proposals. The RFP for Food Service will not be considered at this time, as the contract does not expire for 18 months.
 - b. The committee discussed the possibility of continuing the search/call for RFP.
 - B. Vice President—Michele is officially missed.
 - C. Secretary—No updates
 - D. Task Force Reports
 1. Instructional continuity after a crisis or disaster
 - a. No updates
 - b. Presentation from committee will occur at President's Forum (April).
 2. Best practices and preparing for legislative academic changes
 - a. English Subcommittee
 - i. Supplemental instruction/tutoring taskforce begins meeting next week.
 - ii. DE/Credit courses will not be linked, but 1301 sections will be marked to help with tracking/data.
 - b. Math Subcommittee
 - c. Taskforce is developing strategies for supplemental instructions
 - d. Presentation from committee will occur at President's Forum (April).
 4. Developmental education
 - a. Questions were raised about enrollment requirements. EX: Can ENGL 0119/1301 students enroll in HIST, GOVT, etc.? The previous answer was "yes." The current answer is "no."
 - b. What are the rules, and who made these rules?

IV. Current Business

A. Academic Calendar & Class Scheduling

1. The state considers an hour 50 minutes, so, for example: a 96-contact hour course*50(min)=4800-110(min for final)=4690/42(number of days met)=155 minutes each class meeting.
2. NOTE: Janeu will share spreadsheet with breakdown of course meeting schedule breakdown upon request. (Four-track system)
3. Questions/Concerns raised:
 - a. How was the track a student was on determined?
 - b. When was this scheduled implemented? (The cycle was voluntary FALL 2017; placed into mandatory status for FALL 2018.)
 - c. What about scheduling issues that may arise from varied class lengths? (See iStar comment below.)
 - d. How does the change with the Wednesday before Thanksgiving affect the tracks and start times?
 - e. Classes in one area are overlapping with classes in other areas (one start time is before the other ends)
 - f. Teachers who have two 96-hour classes, have to teach until late and incorporate a long break between sections.
 - g. Teachers with varied teaching days/times now have more restrictions.
 - h. System supposed to prevent overlapping course schedules upon registrations.
 - i. DOSes set up track schedule; it was recommended that chairs and directors now work with a new group to set this up.
 - j. It was recommended that iStar prevent the "tight" scheduling of classes (with less than ten minutes between end and start times).
 - k. The system-wide calendar committee does not seem to have much faculty representation. [Two FSPs, Janeu and Rebecca Royer (CF) were placed in a meeting to discuss the System calendar for 2019 – 2020.] Calendar was already, ostensibly set.
 - l. It was expressed that overlapping of courses cannot be avoided because of the multiple variations of course days/times/lengths.
 - m. It was recommended all courses begin on the hour or the half-hour. Then the number of minutes of each class has to be determined. It was noted that this may work for 48-hour courses, but it may not work for 80, 64, etc.
 - n. It was recommended more pressure be put on advisors not to over-ride.
 - o. It was noted that the message(s) sent by students leaving one class for another are rude, and our inability to schedule courses adequately is demonstrating a poor message.

4. FEEDBACK REQUESTED: Please send Janeu descriptions of issues you and/or your students have faced as a result of overlapping courses.

B. Workload Committee beginning discussions (at System level) – feedback on learning communities

1. System workload committee has visited or requested information from various college systems that are similar to LSC about workload requirements, etc., with the goal of organizing/identifying best practices.
2. **FEEDBACK REQUESTED: Please send Janeu useful information about workload requirements, issues, etc. Specifically, send Janeu information about learning communities.**

- C. Dispute Resolution Center (at System level) -- communication and feedback
1. This information/proposal is only in "draft" stage.
 2. DRC would minimize the occurrence of formal complaints/legal involvement, replacing this with college representatives/ombudsmen to help mediate/resolve the issue.
 3. An issue was raised that this seems to do the job of supervisors; however, the DRC seems more geared toward issues that a supervisor may not be able to deal with or may be involved with. What happens when an employee (In this case, the DRC begins with faculty-faculty and faculty-administration disputes. Staff would follow at a later time.)
 4. Concerns/Questions raised:
 - a. Is it required to go through this center?
 - i. The initial draft recommends mandatory resolution through the DRC. Subsequent discussions among FSPs and the OGC (not currently included in writing) give the employee the option to resolve disputes through the DRC.
 - ii. If a faculty member did not utilize the DRC, yet wanted to file a complaint, the other option would be to file a formal complaint, which is the current policy.
 - b. Would the DRC "live" at the System Office"
 - i. Not exactly. In the original drafting, it was recommended by SO that FS Presidents identify representatives for each campus. This group of representatives would comprise the DRC and travel from campus to campus.
 - ii. Course releases and stipends could be negotiated for those who serve on the DRC.
 - c. Is the DRC for faculty only?
 - i. The first phase would be faculty-faculty or faculty-administration issues. (Currently, contained within the draft.)
 - ii. The long-term would cover all employees.
 - d. What about counselors and librarians?
 - i. Counselors and librarians are faculty. They would be eligible for DRC.
 - ii. The process would still involve the vice president to whom they report, where applicable.
 - e. Does the DRC simply create another layer of dispute resolution, which complicates issues instead of requiring supervisors to deal with issues effectively?
 - i. Possibly. Is it possible that faculty would refer a dispute to the DRC instead of attempting to deal with an issue prior to involving the DRC?
 - ii. Ultimately, there may be some prerequisites required.
 - f. What is the incentive to go through the DRC?
 - i. Avoids cost of legal involvement for both the System and the employee
 - ii. Allows for neutral feedback
 - g. Why not hire trained mediators?
 - i. It was expressed that this will prevent issues that may come from dispute resolutions that go through the hierarchy of the college/system. The DRC allows individuals who are familiar with the college culture to do the mediating instead of "outsiders."
 - ii. The other comment was that a single instance of an "outside" and trained mediator resulted in a lawsuit against that mediator when the ruling/decision was not in favor of the employee. (i.e., employee sued the outside party.)
 - iii. The DRC is to be designed to be separate from administration.

- h. A concern was raised that information (in writing) may be interpreted differently by future representatives. In other words, this center's scope should be very clear in case Mario leaves.

V. **New Business**

System Core Curriculum Committee—Update (Monica Gonzalez)

1. New SLO process is being implemented. Two new courses every two years (per January 2018 meeting)
2. Value rubric will be used for assessment. There are separate rubrics for each of the six component areas to be assessed.
3. SLOs have been mapped to core outcomes by the curriculum teams.
4. A question was raised about whether this assessment means there will be a move toward standardized testing. No, faculty are able to select which assignments are used to assess an outcome.

VI. **Announcements**

A. Incentive Drawing

B. Healthier U

C. Share Division Successes

D. Other announcements

1. Courtney has created a survey to enable the sharing of information across campus—textbooks, successes, etc.
2. Dual credit books are counted in numbers, but they are not shown to be “purchased” because these are obtained as class sets at the high schools.

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>