*Minutes*

March 17, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. in I-122

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Present | Absent |
| Dr. Denis G. Wright | X |  |
| Dr. Emery Alford | X |  |
| Dr. Marie Collins | X |  |
| Dr. Eileen DeLuca | X |  |
| Jeff Gibbs | X |  |
| Dr. Erin Harrel |  | X |
| Dr. Theo Koupelis |  | X |
| Dr. John Meyer | X |  |
| Dr. Mary Myers | X |  |
| Dr. Laura Weir | X |  |
|  |  |  |
| Michelle Fanslau | X |  |

1. **Minutes from February 17, 2015**
   1. No corrections submitted
2. **Portfolio review discussion. Number of non-renewals recommended**
   1. Dr. Wright sent an email with an April 1 deadline for him to submit his information to HR
   2. Please send portfolios as they are completed
   3. The contract recommendation should be included with the portfolios
   4. Dr. Wright will return everything to the Deans including the contract recommendations
   5. Does Dr. Wright want to see those faculty documents that are not up for continuing contract? No
   6. Dr. Wright is making the assumption that there are no issues for any faculty who are up for comprehensive review because he has not heard otherwise
   7. Some of the current workflows do not follow the school structure for some activities
   8. Number of non-renewals:
      1. Four total
      2. One continuing contract who may have status changed
3. **Curriculum discussion**
   1. Dr. Collins wanted to mention that there is a difference between general education for AA and AS programs
   2. Dr. Wright stated that for baccalaureate programs, general education is the same as the AA program
   3. Dr. Myers approves endorsement of proposals
4. **Dean of Pure & Applied Sciences search update. Role of this group in the on-campus interview process**
   1. Committee has reviewed applications
      1. Six selected for telephone interview, 5 completed to date, and one interview tomorrow
      2. The committee will recommend candidates for on-campus, day long interviews
   2. There will be a meeting with the candidates and the Deans during the interview days
      1. Many are interviewing other places and we want them to feel welcome
      2. Many times in the past the Deans have met with the candidates during lunch
      3. A less formal atmosphere is preferred
      4. Dr. Wright wants two meetings, one with everyone during lunch and maybe another one less formal for breakfast or dinner
         1. Dinner the night before, or if they are arriving late breakfast in the morning
      5. There will likely be one candidate per day
      6. Faculty forums will need to be scheduled
      7. It may be as early as the end of March for the start of interviews
5. **Faculty Senate Executive Committee**

Executive Committee Member: Faculty Senate President, Faculty Senate Vice President, Faculty Representative from the Schools of Art, Humanities and Social Sciences: the School of Business; the School of Education, the School of Health Sciences; the School of Pure and Applied Sciences as well as representatives from Charlotte, Collier, Hendry-Glades, Lee (Edison) campuses. College Success and Learning Resources will have one representative.

* 1. According to the bylaws, the composition of faculty senate changes next year to follow the school structure
  2. Dr. Tawil is asking Deans for suggestions and Deans should correspond with Dr. Tawil directly
  3. Were the bylaws created before the Deans were hired?
     1. Dr. Collins would like the Faculty Senate to consider allowing Deans to participate as non-voting members of the Faculty Senate
        1. Why are the Deans excluded?
        2. What is inappropriate about Deans attending the Faculty Senate meetings
        3. Anytime a member of this group wants to attend a Faculty Senate meeting, they are invited to attend
     2. The Faculty Senate meeting is for the VPAA and faculty only and no other administrators
     3. With having both a Faculty Senate and the union the lines are blurred as to what is discussed by each group
     4. Dr. Collins thinks that all of her faculty would want her to attend and then let them know what is going on at the meetings

1. **Completing the schedule dates faculty input**
   1. Handouts were created by the faculty senate executive committee members
   2. Feedback from the Faculty Senate is that faculty are concerned that there is not a similar process in all schools and that they do not have equal input into the scheduling process
   3. We are now much more prescriptive in the scheduling process
   4. There is sensitivity about faculty creating their only schedule
   5. The Faculty Senate executive committee is asking to have more input in the finalization of the schedule
      1. The Deans make the decisions about the creation of the schedule
      2. Dr. Wright assumes that the Deans are having this discussion with their faculty
      3. The faculty want input into which faculty are assigned to the courses in the schedule
      4. What Dr. Alford does not understand is that the faculty think the S25 software is the issue when it reality the scheduled was “rolled” from the previous term; it was just manually input for the first draft.
   6. Dr. Collins feels we are promoting a culture where if the faculty do not get the answer they want from one person they go to another
   7. Dr. Meyer feels that he is working fine with the faculty for class schedules
      1. Why do the Deans have to provide justification for when they deny a schedule request?
   8. Dr. Alford has been using a faculty schedule preference form and it has been working
   9. We are doing what the faculty are asking, but can it be memorialized?
      1. For example, the schedule is available for all faculty to view
      2. Should we be establishing a culture where the faculty are building the schedule?
   10. The Deans feel they are being reasonable and the form would be problematic because it implies that requests are not being granted
   11. The processes are still conflicting with the school structure and the faculty who are at the other campuses
   12. Is this a courtesy issue? No, it is a transparency issue and maybe a fairness issue for those who feel they are not being scheduled fairly
   13. Dr. Wright feels that we could do a couple of things to memorialize the process
       1. Dates can be scheduled
   14. Should there be a document that explains the scheduling process? Examples:
       1. Twenty five percent rule
       2. Seniority
   15. When the schedule is not rolling, it is more difficult
   16. Once the schedule starts rolling again, it will be easier to work with the faculty for scheduling
2. **Department chairs and coordinators**
   1. Dr. Wright expressed that he is not pleased with the limits on the work responsibilities of the chairs
   2. There is only one chair who was elected three years ago
   3. Myra conducted an election in her area, and thinks she should is going into her third year
   4. Dr. Wilkins thought she was elected to a three-year term
      1. Dr. Wright visited the Math department meeting and asked if they wanted to conduct an election for a new chair or about using coordinators instead of department chairs
   5. It is Dr. Wright’s preference that there will be no chairs but associate deans that take on the responsibilities of the chairs
3. **Other Items**
   1. Introduction of Susan Bronstein, new Director of Human Resources
   2. The College’s COPs do not address the school structure for budget review
      1. Dr. Wright will have a separate discussion about budget and approvals
   3. The Coordinator of the Peer Tutoring Center are creating a newsletter
      1. Monica and Rachel have been to a lot of department meetings
      2. Anyone who wants peer tutoring information, please invite them to meetings
      3. They appreciate the support of faculty in suggesting tutors
      4. Can Smarthinking be available to all students?
   4. Seventy five faculty participated in the Online Institute last weekend
   5. Dr. Harrel will not be back after June 30
      1. The search for her replacement will not be opened until August

Next meeting is Tuesday, April 7, 2015 at 10 AM in I-122