

CCPS CAC Meeting Minutes

October 23, 2019
297C DeVos Center

In attendance: Paul Stansbie, CCPS Dean's Office, Patty Janes, HTM, Kristine Mullendore, CJ, Aaron Van Oosterhout, JCP, Shantonya Scott, Advising Center, Tonisha Jones, CJ, Sally Pelon, Huafang Li,

Absent:

Meeting commenced 3:00pm

I. Review of Past Minutes

- a. Minutes from 9/20 had no changes.

II. Administrative Matters

- a. The 11/20 meeting was cancelled due to the research symposium. We will meet December 11 at 10am for two hours. We will also keep the meeting on 11/6 at noon.
- b. Kris asked everyone to bring their class schedule for winter 2020 to the next meeting. Check your schedule for Wednesdays at noon first.

III. Old Business

- a. Jennifer Marson was approved to serve on the Affiliate Faculty Advisory Committee.
- b. Patty provided an update on the research symposium; Paul and Kris shared interest for a few of their students and encouraged a process for submitting for presentation opportunity.
- c. Tonisha shared the work done on the CCPS award program by her/Diane. However, there were several goals left to discuss with the committee. These goals include: 1) creating a uniform scoring rubric for analyzing applications and staying, 2) making all awards to include guidelines with a nomination form, and 3). (Kris added) standardizing amounts of the awards (as discussed in previous meetings). Paul suggested a set amount for the awards be included in the Dean's Office budget sufficient to cover all the awards, if they are all conferred during that academic year. Tonisha also shared the desire for clarity in evaluation of nominees as well as standardization in the procedures. The committee suggested

using a rubric as a guide to formulate the discussion of the nominees. Committee members would use the rubric to evaluate each candidate. They will bring these rubrics to the committee meeting and discuss each application. They will not be used in isolation of the discussion. Several suggested that will reduce any potential bias and create a very transparent process.

- d. Kris reviewed a past discussion on creating another award. Paul shared there are currently eight awards. The award we discussed was related to affiliates, however, there are only five in the college and there are other places for them to be recognized at the university level. Aaron addressed differences between adjuncts and affiliates and considering the award for the adjunct/visitor part time faculty. Kris clarified the category “adjunct” has in the past included visitors, instructors, and affiliates. Paul shared how the CCPS Dean’s Offices uses the language and how it may be different. There was discussion on the need for a Dean’s Award (various types of activities) or a Part Time Affiliate Teaching Award (to recognize the efforts of this growing group of faculty).

Aaron’s question is does every faculty group have an award they are able to be recognized for at the college and/or university level. Patty suggested an analysis of the awards by faculty group and then consider other possible awards. She will do this for the next meeting.

At this time, the committee did not find any new award necessary.

IV. New Business

- a. Dean’s Salary Adjustment Process was a topic discussed at the college retreat and Paul addressed this with the CAC. Kris mentioned concern of several faculty about LIFT scores being the only source used when the process was presented. And, following the winter term evaluation process, noted that one faculty member came to her concerned as being told that this was the only data used for his/her/their evaluation. Paul reviewed the Dean’s Salary Adjustment review process and suggested it was a “check and balance” to potential bias at the unit level evaluation (most departments evaluation of faculty for salary adjustment are done by unit head only). It was designed as an attempt to remove bias. They look at 25 faculty evaluations (those at the high and low end) from the over 109 that are completed. The rubric is the Dean’s office way to “double check” that the process was done with no bias. One faculty member’s evaluation (in the college) was changed by the Dean’s office. Further, he noted this was a first-year process and they will review it for next year and will include CAC input in that review.

Kris noted that the salary adjustment process is separate from the tenure review and reappointment process and suggested that there should be greater connection between these processes. She further asked for clarification regarding if the LIFT is the sole evaluation criteria used by the Dean’s office in this review and if the

Unit Head is also solely using this criterion. In the personnel review process three measures – student evaluation of teaching, self-reflection, and peer evaluation are required. Paul noted that the Dean's office process does look at course difficulty, too, and it view it as more of a flagging process. If a faculty member is significantly below the standard deviation, they then go back to the unit head and ask for additional insight/information about the faculty member's performance.

A bigger discussion emerged as the process for teaching evaluation is flawed. Both LIFT, peer evaluation, and other methods have innate issues with accurately evaluating a teacher's performance.

A discussion was shared about how the unit head shares this feedback (are they trained in how to deliver it). In one unit, LIFT of every faculty member was ranked and faculty were informed where they fell. The question was raised about whether there training or guidelines for succession planning for unit heads occurs in all CCPS units and if they are provided with support in administering this type of evaluation process.

It was also asked what type of developmental process is in place to help move those evaluated at the lower end to move upward. Paul shared that there was and FTLC helps with peer evaluation/teaching. Kris also asked about compression issues that may occur as a result. Paul will ask the university more about the process for faculty Professor increases this past summer (what criteria was used). Paul then excused himself from the remainder of the meeting due to a conflict.

Succession planning is important for all committees/organization. Kris shared we too should do the same and train/prepare the next leaders.

- b. Terms ending for committee member were shared in order to determine whether these current members are intending to run for re-election CAC members were asked to connect with their unit faculty and find out if they are interested in returning or if there are any new candidates for these positions:

1. Michelle Wooddell – University Academic Senate
2. Jennifer Marson and John Lipford, Affiliate Faculty Advisory Committee
3. Davia Downey, Campus Life
4. Allison Adams, Faculty Grievance Panel
5. Neil Buckwalter, FSBC
6. Lorie Tuma, Outstanding Service Award Committee
7. Brian Johnson, Undergraduate Research Council
8. Chris Yalda, University Assessment Committee
9. Carri Buist, College Curriculum Committee
10. Melissa Villarreal, College Curriculum Committee
11. Precilla Kimboko, College Personnel Committee (must be tenured)
12. Steve Smith, College Personnel Committee (must be tenured)

- c. Agenda item for future meetings when the Dean's office is in attendance include:
 - 1. Finish discussion re: salary adjustment and salary adjustment/compression issues
 - 2. The CAC members were asked to review the other topics from the kick-off meeting (included on the agenda for the September meeting and in its minutes)) list and add any to the agenda for future discussion that they think should be included.

Adjourned 1:40pm. Minutes taken by Patty Janes, HTM.