

Minutes of Meeting

Faculty Credential Policy Review Committee

June 13, 2019 – 2:00 PM – Online Via Go-to-Meeting

Attendees

Dr. Martha Lavender, Dr. Vicky Ohlson, Peggy Linton, Rodney Land, Dr. Timmy James, Bradley Fricks, Dana Clements, Darlene Andrews, Kenneth Kirkland, Dr. Leslie Hartley, Tracey Driscoll, Art Rousseau, Amy Smith, Natalie English, Trish Jones, Jimmy Hodges , George Scott

Call to Order/Approval of the Minutes

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Dr. Martha Lavender, and it was noted that the minutes from the previous meeting (May 6, 2019) had been circulated and approved by email prior to the current meeting.

Announcements

No announcements were made.

Old Business

Dr. Lavender reminded everyone that the purpose of this meeting was to consider the comments that had been submitted to the feedback portal following the posting of the recommended revisions to Policies and Procedures 605.02 and 605.03 on the ACCS website. The comments had been downloaded after the period for public comment closed and distributed to the Committee members a few days before the meeting. Dr. Lavender called for an open discussion of the feedback that had been submitted. Dr. Ohlson stated she was pleased to see the number of positive comments that were complimentary of the Committee's work. Dr. Lavender agreed and pointed out that many of the less favorable comments appeared based on an incomplete reading of the two policies and procedures and reflected a natural fear of change. The Committee agreed that a thorough training plan would be necessary to ensure consistent interpretation and a successful implementation if the policies and procedures were approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

The following items from a review of the submitted comments were discussed further and resolved as indicated:

- Procedure for Policy 605.03, Item 8-b as compared to Item 10 – Clarification on role of deans in the portfolio review process and title that should be used to refer to the instructional dean that serves as the college's chief academic officer. Question - Is it possible for the dean referenced in Item 8-b to be the same dean as referenced in Item 10? Answer – The procedure does not prohibit that situation. Question - Should the title in Item 10 be changed to Chief Academic Officer? Answer – No, some colleges do not assign the title of Chief Academic Officer, and in fact have several deans on equal level with no dean above them. This was the reason the Committee chose the language "appropriate dean" for Item 10, acknowledging that colleges differ in organizational structure.

- Procedure for Policy 605.02, Item 6 – Submitted comments reflected concern over the recommended limit of 25% of fulltime faculty holding Rank IV in any program. Consensus – the procedure allows flexibility based on characteristics of individual programs and unique circumstances/needs: “Exceptions may be approved by the president.” This should be emphasized in employee training. It was noted that the current faculty credentialing process has resulted in a shifting of personnel funds to cover the cost of faculty rank changes by reducing the capacity to fill vacant positions.
- Common theme: Concern over level of subjectivity throughout the procedures. The Committee agreed that thorough training was necessary, would increase consistency of implementation, and would strengthen objectivity.
- Common theme – Concern over the ability of all faculty to participate in committee work (a performance expectation for various instructor ranks in the recommended procedures). Consensus – this concern will require faculty to be involved and visible at the college level; college involvement will likely lead to state level involvement in committee. This is a training issue as ways to become involved at college/state level committees.
- Proposed New Salary Schedule D1/D2 – Common misunderstanding of the treatment of division chair duties and division chair pay. The Committee noted that division/department chair is a separate appointment with supplemental pay, and not affected by these policies and procedures. Dr. Ohlson noted that although it was not included in the draft of the proposed new Salary Schedule D1/D2, that draft was intended only to serve as a preliminary model for the overlapping pay bands, and that in any officially adopted salary schedules, the current language referencing division/department chair pay will remain.
- New Job Descriptions – Common question of whether new job descriptions with the new minimum performance expectations would be issued to existing faculty. Answer – yes. This prompted discussion of the lack of guidance for librarian and counselor rank assignment and promotion in the current procedure drafts. After discussion, it was acknowledged that this was an issue to be addressed. Jimmy Hodges made a **motion to recommend to the Chancellor and BOT that a separate committee be formed to develop procedures for librarians and counselors** that would mirror those for faculty but reflect the differences in specific job duties. The **motion was seconded by Amy Smith and passed by voice vote with no opposition by the Committee.** Moreover, it was noted that the existing faculty credentialing process does not include librarians and counselors.
- Common theme – Confusion about the relationship between performance expectations in Procedure 605.02 and requirements for promotion in Procedure 605.03. Question – Would a faculty member have to perform the duties of a higher rank before being promoted to that rank? Answer – No. The procedures specify that promotion to a higher rank requires that the faculty member demonstrate excellence in the performance of the duties at the current rank, not the higher rank. Question – Can an instructor be promoted to a rank more than one rank higher than his/her existing rank? In other words, can you “skip” ranks in the promotion process? Answer – No. Instructors must spend the indicated minimum number of years at each rank to be considered for promotion to the next rank.
- Concern raised directly to a Committee Member – Will existing professional development plans be honored? Answer – Yes. Procedure 605.03, Item 3, states that all professional development plans approved and signed prior to the implementation of Policy 605.03 will be honored

provided the instructor has made satisfactory progress in completing the plan according to the established timeline.

- Question raised directly to a Committee Member – Can an instructor move up in levels of pay without being promoted in rank? This refers to the multiple levels of pay within each rank as given in the proposed new Salary Schedule D1/D2. Answer – No. Any increase in pay level must be accompanied by a promotion in rank, and any promotion in rank will move the instructor to the first pay level in that new rank that reflects an increase in pay. This will be clarified in training and in notes at the bottom of the salary schedule.

No more items were brought forward for discussion. Dr. Ohlson made a **motion to give final approval to Policies and Procedures 605.02 and 605.03 as currently revised** and to move them forward for consideration by the Chancellor and the Policy Review Committee of the Board of Trustees. **Jimmy Hodges seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken, and with no opposition and no abstentions, the motion passed.**

Dr. Ohlson mentioned that there were increasing concerns System-wide about Salary Schedule D-3, which applies to full-time Adult Education instructors. The low levels of pay on this schedule make it very difficult to attract new full-time instructors. Consequently, AE programs rely heavily on part-time instructors, many of whom are retired educators who already have benefits and who can actually make more per hour than most full-time instructors. This salary schedule does not represent a living wage for a new hire. It was acknowledged that a statewide compensation committee had been formed, but their work had been put on hold, and there is no guarantee that the issue of AE salary schedules would be looked at by this committee any time soon, especially if an outside firm is retained to assist in the classification and compensation review. It was agreed that the AE program needs an advocate external to the program. Tracey Driscoll made a **motion to recommend to the Chancellor that a committee be formed to study the Salary Schedule D3 issue. Amy Smith seconded the motion, and it was approved by voice vote unanimously.**

The question was raised about timing for implementation of these policies and procedures if approved. Everyone agreed that a rushed implementation would likely cause many errors and inconsistencies and that a plan for thorough statewide training would need to be developed quickly and delivered before the policies take effect. Dr. Ohlson made a **motion to recommend to the Chancellor that a committee be appointed to develop and implement training prior to implementation.** Dr. Hartley seconded the motion and the Committee voted unanimously to approve it. The committee recommended up to six months for training with implementation of Policy/Procedure 605.02 in Spring 2020 and Policy/Procedure 605.03 in Fall 2020.

Questions were also raised about faculty performance evaluations. Would these need to be standardized? An observation was made by one of the sub-committees that many colleges already use evaluations that are remarkably similar. Dr. Ohlson pointed out that while they are similar now, they will all need to be adjusted to incorporate items assessing the new performance expectations at each rank. Dr. Ohlson suggested that **a core set of assessment items should be developed for each rank and required for use in colleges' faculty performance evaluations, and that a separate committee should be formed to perform that work. Rodney Land made a motion to that effect, which was seconded by Trish Jones and followed by a vote of all in favor by the Committee.**

Dr. Lavender asked if there was any need to keep the next scheduled meeting. No one knew of anything else that needed to be discussed, so an agreement was made to cancel the next meeting. The minutes and a draft report to the Chancellor will be circulated electronically for review and approval. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

VLO/vlo