

JSCC Faculty Council Meeting
Minutes—February 3rd, 2016

The Faculty Council met Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. in room 103 of the Nelms Classroom Building.

Present: Mark Walls, Josh Britt, Scott Woods, Carla Simpson, Jennifer Walker, Tim Britt, Dr. Liz Mayo, Carmen Corder, Roger James, Dr. Mechel Camp, Vivian Grooms, Bryan Kesler (visitor), and Abby Lackey

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes

A motion to approve the 12-02-15 Council meeting minutes was made and seconded; the minutes were approved with one spelling correction.

2. Announcements

Chair Abby Lackey referred the Council to announcements stated on the meeting agenda: (a) logo design meetings are forthcoming; (b) Patrick Davis is the new Dean of Academic Assistance; (c) Veronica Jones is the new AAC Coordinator; (d) the division secretary for Arts and Humanities is finally being filled; (e) a QEP Coordinator search is forthcoming pending a finalized job description; (f) Emily Fortner is soliciting faculty feedback on bookstore operations via email.

3. Advisee Contact Documentation

The Council discussed the requirement that Social and Behavioral Sciences faculty provide detailed documentation of their contact with advisees.

Council representatives expressed several concerns. One issue involved access to advisee information. No single, convenient “one-stop” portal or tool exists either for recording data or accessing advisee information. Proper resources are needed both to track advisees and to document attention to them. It was noted that according to Dr. Bailey, by this summer EAB software that could assist this record keeping might be available at JSCC. Another concern involved equity of faculty assessments across the campus. Only the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division is asked to record so closely faculty contact with advisees as part of faculty evaluations. As a result, some suggested, this creates an imbalance of evaluative criteria among JSCC faculty generally. A concern also was that these documentation requirements are new expectations that were not part of original 2015-16 faculty evaluation plans established last fall. Finally—and significantly—the Council considered that these evaluative requirements had not been vetted by faculty or their representatives. The Faculty Council,

historically and appropriately, reviews and joins in developing and implementing all general faculty assessment approaches and protocols. It was stated that before these criteria are applied, the Faculty Council must consider carefully their nature and their use within JSCC's faculty evaluation system.

4. JSCC Faculty Council Constitution

The Council discussed the history, since 2010, of changes to the Faculty Council's original constitution. Several Council representatives acknowledged the present constitution created significant problems for consistency of faculty leadership both at JSCC and at the TBR Faculty Sub-council. Sub-council representation for most institutions, both university and community college, is steady and experienced because members are not limited to one year's service. JSCC's representation at Sub-council is restricted to the Faculty Council chair who serves a one-year term within a two-year term on Council with a four-year roll-off period. The Council discussed how this limits informed and experienced faculty voice. The Council agreed that it made sense to review the constitution's terms of faculty service.

The Council agreed to form a work group to review the present Council constitution and suggest changes. It was noted that per Article VII of the JSCC Faculty Council By-Laws and Constitution, revisions to the constitution approved by the Council would be forwarded to the VPAA's office for presentation to the faculty for voting. A 2/3 faculty vote for change would then proceed to the VPAA's office for approval.

5. Assessment of Administrators Instrument

Dr. Liz Mayo explained that the Assessment of Administrators Committee had met. She shared that the Committee seemed comfortable with the Faculty Council's specific recommendations and the need for improved questions on the evaluation instrument. She noted the next meeting of that committee would be Wednesday, February 10th.

In discussion, the Council emphasized that non-value "0" response choices should be deleted. This would eliminate the chance respondents might intend "0" as the lowest performance score rather than its current "Not Applicable" or "Don't Know" meaning. Dr. Mayo stated that a written comments block seemed fine with the committee. Another representative suggested evaluation questions might be tied to the JSCC Strategic Plan and that questions could reflect the language of that plan's goals. It was observed that the SPEC Committee seemed just to announce the terms and goals of the plan rather than to engage the campus broadly in developing them. Others noted that the Strategic Plan might for that reason and others not reflect all the criteria important for evaluating administrators. It was noted that an IDEA survey instrument exists for assessing administrators. The Council wished to follow-up with Sarah Vonderheide on her research into external tools for evaluating administrators.

Abby Lackey agreed to seek input on administrator assessment from TBR Faculty Sub-council representatives and to check with Sarah Vonderheide about her findings.

6. Employee Restrooms

The Council heard discussion again about the need for dedicated employee restrooms. Abby Lackey clarified that Horace Chase would agree to research the matter if the Faculty Council voted to request it. Horace's position was that the request needs to reflect the will of the broad faculty through the Council, that there has been no history of restricted signage on campus, and that consistency for all employees must be considered. Arguments both for and against pursuing the request with Horace were expressed. A motion was made and seconded to request that Horace investigate the feasibility of dedicated employee restrooms. The motion passed.

7. LDAs and Attendance Reporting

The Council discussed an issue from the December meeting about the Attendance Reporting system, particularly the use of LDAs. While the terms of financial assistance packages vary, all require verification of the last date of attendance for failing students. Faculty feel that the "Y," "S," and "N" designations for "attending," "stopped," and "never attended" do not accurately distinguish acceptable, good-faith student progress from unacceptable, bad-faith attempts at a class. Abby Lackey reported that Dr. Larry Bailey agreed this matter should be studied. One council member summarized frustration when a student who rarely attended class last semester showed up just before Thanksgiving break and was thereby entitled to the "Y" ("attending") designation and the deletion of an LDA from nearly two months earlier. While the student would fail the course, documentation of his course progress for Tennessee Promise would certainly not reflect the facts of his bad-faith attendance. It was noted that LDAs were critical for Student Aids and Awards Committee decisions. It was suggested that the LDA designations had questionable value for that committee's work. The LDA was a critical piece of information for this group, yet LDAs may signify very little if they can be changed to "Ys" ("attending") on the basis of a single class day attendance. It was felt by the Council that some other data, like a percentage of attendance or actual absences would be more useful in tracking students who do not genuinely "attempt" their course obligations.

Mark Walls agreed to chair a working group on this matter, and Josh Britt and Roger James agreed to assist in studying alternatives with the Financial Aid Office.

9. Book and Supply "Bundling"

Abby Lackey reviewed information from the TBR Faculty Sub-council about "bundling" or packaging books and supplies by course for individual students. The bundling approach would include rented books and e-books as well as hard-copy texts. The spirit of this effort is (1) to provide accurate front-end course costs to students who will then know the prices of all course materials and (2) to provide students with all course materials on the first day of class. Apparently, TBR plans to review each course's book bundle at each institution to confirm the

best prices for course materials. Students will have an “opt-out” of the bundling approach to accommodate cases where they already have access to a book. Tennessee State University has tried this new bundling approach and reports that it works very well. Dr. Bailey reports that at least one more academic year will pass before this system is used at JSCC, and Horace Chase is examining how bundling payments occur (at student registration or later).

10. Late-Adds

Several faculty reported late-adds following two to three weeks of classes. Abby Lackey reported from Dr. Bailey that certain clerical/administrative errors occurred with Co-Requisite students; some late reshuffling occurred because students who failed fall math or English classes were not dropped from the next class level and needed to be reassigned. Dr. Camp clarified that about twelve students were affected. If they did not pass a prerequisite course, staff had to manually remove them from the roll of subsequent courses for which they had previously registered. The Council discussed other key issues affecting enrollment confusions, like course purges; students sometimes do not realize they must confirm their course enrollments. The issue of room limits was raised: many classes have seat or computer limits, yet faculty sometimes find that course enrollments exceed these physical limitations.

11. Co-Requisite Faculty Meetings

Abby Lackey reported from the TBR Faculty Sub-council meeting that Vice-Chancellor Denley was calling meetings of faculty across the state who had taught students in the new “co-req” model for math and English. From JSCC, Dr. Camp and Dave Hart will attend the English meeting; Dr. Wesson and Patrick Davis will attend the reading meeting, and Josh Britt, Tim Britt, and Dr. Coppings will attend the math meeting. Some Faculty Sub-council representatives reported their institutions would end the practice of connecting grades for co-requisite labs and classes, that this had proved “disastrous” and that grades for the class and the lab will now be separated.

12. Accessibility of Course Materials

Abby Lackey reported from the Faculty Sub-council meeting that by Fall, 2016, all course materials must be “accessible” according to new TBR requirements. She indicated that producing all materials in Microsoft WORD would generally fix the issue of accessibility. At the Sub-council meeting, she said, Dr. Denley, had encouraged faculty with accessibility training to work with their councils and/or faculty development committees to ensure that all faculty members (including adjuncts) know how to make their syllabi accessible.

13. New Three-Year “Rolling” Temporary Contract for Community Colleges

Abby Lackey reported from the Faculty Sub-Council meeting that a motion had passed to request re-introduction of the new “temporary” contract that is, in fact, ongoing and renewable indefinitely. This contract for community college faculty had been proposed in the President’s

Council meeting in June, 2015 and passed by TBR as a revision to **TBR 5:02:07:00** (Faculty Appointments to Community Colleges) without proper Faculty Sub-council discussion and voting. The request by Faculty Sub-council is for this contract to be re-introduced and then appropriately reviewed by all TBR Sub-councils according to established TBR practice.

Vice Chancellor Denley, it was reported, insisted that the contract absolutely was not intended to be a sort of “consolation prize” for denied tenure or a substitute for tenure. He explained that a tenured position cannot be converted to this “rolling” temporary contract. He explained that the idea was intended, at first, to keep excellent teachers at universities who were not pursuing research or other university tenure requirements.

The Council briefly discussed the issues at JSCC of converting term to tenure track and the future of tenure-track positions at the school. It was noted that nothing had changed to restrict converting term to tenure-track and that no “rolling” temporary contracts had been issued at the institution so far.

14. AAC Testing

The Council discussed faculty use of the Academic Assistance Center for proctoring tests and extra-time accommodations for students. Council representatives across the campus clarified that they either use the AAC’s resources for these purposes or, if desired, accommodate students appropriately in their offices or in other controlled work spaces.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Mark E. Walls, Secretary

Abby Lackey, Chair