MINUTES

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

October 22, 2008

Via Three-Way Video conference in the Following Locations:

Room 136, Bullock Building, Brenham Campus

Room 205A, “E” Building, Bryan Campus

Room 110, Schulenburg Campus

Members present: Dr. Debra LaCour, Chair, Dr. Barbara Pearson, Dr. John Beaver, Linda Bow, Dr. Robert Brick, Ms. Becky Garlick, Mary Barnes-Tilley, Dr. Don Stewart, Cathy Boeker, Dr. Van Miller, Karen Anglin, and Jeri Thornton-Dulaney.

 **1. Approve Minutes from February 27, 2008 and April 23, 2008 meetings.** On a motion made by Dr. John Beaver and seconded by Linda Bow, the minutes of both meetings were approved with changes.

**Old Business**

**2. Follow-up on earlier request to adjust the value of laboratory time in calculating science faculty workload.** Faculty Council had submitted a request to Administrative Council during Fall 2007 to have laboratory time recalculated. Academic Affairs listed every lab class and set it to Business Affairs to cost out. Dr. Miller had not seen the proposal. Linda Bow will draft a document and send it to Dr. LaCour, who will send it to Dr. Miller.

Dr. Brick stated that he had been asked to present the information to Administrative Council; the proposal was to elevate lab hours from 33% of lecture hours to 45% of lecture hours. Dr. Brick thought there was no justification for making a lab hour a discounted form of a lecture hour. Linda Bow stated that Tarrant County College offers a one to one ratio for lab and lecture hours. Dr. LaCour stated that once the proposal has been developed, Linda Bow would share it with Council of Division Chairs before submitting it to Administrative Council.

**3. Tracking status of Faculty Title Change request from last year.** Dr. Beaver recalled that the discussion on this issue was that Council of Division Chairs wanted certain things accomplished before titles were given, and Faculty Council wanted the title change to be more automatic. Linda Bow commented that there was a new proposal on this topic being discussed. Dr. LaCour stated that once both councils have reviewed the proposal, they can submit it to Dr. LaCour who will submit it to Executive Council for review.

**New Business**

**4. Requests from Council of Division Chairs (Dr. Bob Brick)**

**(a) Division workload calculations for Spring, 2009.** Dr. Brick had created a chart (attached); he explained that the black numbers are numbers of faculty and the red numbers are for ranking. The sum is overall ranking by each division. The rankings are used for work load calculations. The last column is the proposed reduction of teaching loads (classes not credits) to allow for administrative work. Dr. Brick also explained that if the proposal is accepted, then the proposed reductions would take place Spring 2009. The Division Chairs request that the number of part-time faculty was given double credit because of the time-consuming nature of supervising part-time faculty. The designation of “NA” in some of the columns represents areas where there already exists program directors. There was a comment made that technical education faculty need to be separated from the academic faculty in those calculations.

Dr. LaCour questioned the reductions in the Business , Information Technology, and Public Service Division because it had been restructured in Fall 2007. She asked Dr. Brick to check on that division to make sure the numbers were correct.

Kinesiology and Fine Arts in Brenham asked to be left in the NA column. Allied Health is also in the NA column because they now have a full-time director.

Dr. LaCour asked Dr. Brick if the Teach Program was included in the count. Dr. Brick will research that.

Dr. LaCour asked if all divisions schedule their reductions. Dr. Brick stated that they did not all schedule reductions.

Dr. LaCour asked what the time line for updating the schedule had been. Dr. Brick said that it was supposed to be updated every two years, but that it had not been updated last year. The current schedule updates the document during the fall semester for implementation in the spring semester.

Dr. LaCour asked that Dr. Brick investigate the questions asked in the discussion and provide her with an updated form to take to Executive Council.

Dr. Brick stated that is has been difficult in the science division to schedule class and labs, so they have designated scheduling coordinators; these scheduling coordinators are faculty who do not get any course reduction for their administrative work. He asked that the committee consider giving them course reductions because in the technical education divisions, they have program coordinators.

Dr. LaCour asked if the divisions could designate these Coordinators as Assistant Division Chairs and give them a course reduction. Dr. Brick replied that faculty could only be designated Assistant Division Chairs if they had applied for the position according to Human Resources. Dr. LaCour suggested that the positions be posted so that they could apply. Dr. Brick stated that they probably preferred the title of Coordinator, rather than Assistant Division Chairs, because they do not function at the division level.

Dr. LaCour asked if the Council of Division Chairs could discuss the issue and create a proposal to forward back to Administrative Council.

**Dr. Brick said he would like to delete 4b from the agenda and instead discuss faculty evaluations.** Dr. Brick suggested that faculty evaluations be postponed because so many things are due at the beginning of the semester. Division Chairs need more time so that the evaluations can be more effective.

Dr. LaCour said that she appreciated the request, but that faculty evaluations were the first stage in the process for budget planning, to plan for professional development, etc. She reminded everyone that only full-time faculty evaluations are due February 22nd; part-time faculty evaluations are not due until April 1st. She also suggested that Division Chairs share the workload with all who participate in division leadership.

**5. Requests from Faculty Council (Ms. Linda Bow)**

**(a) Tracking changes to the Faculty Handbook –**Linda Bow wanted to know if faculty could be notified before changes were put into the Faculty Handbook. Dr. LaCour commented that the Faculty Handbook only captures changes that have already been approved; it does not create new policies or procedures; it only records those that have already been made. Dr. LaCour will ask all entities that make changes to share those policies and procedures changes. Karen Anglin commented that she felt redundancy was fine, so notifying faculty a second time when a change was included in the Faculty Handbook would be fine.

**(b) Two changes to the Faculty Council Constitution. –** Linda Bow reported that Faculty Council requests permission to change the name of Faculty Council to Faculty Senate. They believe that the title change will be a small step of affirmation of the faculty organization as its work pertains to all those on campus. They propose to change Article I of the Constitution to read:

“The organization described herein shall be called the Faculty Senate of Blinn College and shall be referred to as the Senate in the remainder of the document.”

Linda Bow also suggested that a Parliamentarian be added to the list of officers in the Faculty Council and proposed that Article IV, Section 01 be modified to read: “The officers shall consist of a President, President-Elect, a Secretary, and a Parliamentarian.”

Karen Anglin made the motion to make the proposed changes to Faculty Council. Mary Barnes-Tilley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Linda Bow also asked for clarification on the book allowance for faculty. Dr. Miller will research the issue. Cathy Boeker commented that Human Resources should have the policy. Dr. LaCour said that she would check on the issue and distribute information to all members.

Linda Bow asked that during the short semesters (summer, minimester) that offices such as the library, copy center, learning center, and deli be open for students. Dr. Lacour stated that since this request is not a formal agenda item, the Council could only take it under advisement. She suggested that it be considered especially as spring budget approaches.

Dr. LaCour asked everyone on the committee if they felt the structure of In-Service week was better with the initial workday preceding the meeting days, or if the former arrangement was better with initial meetings and then a workday. Discussion followed.

Dr. Pearson asked if In-Service for spring will be on the Bryan campus. Dr. LaCour stated that it would.

 Linda Bow stated that Faculty Senate was concerned about the evaluation of faculty by division chairs. Faculty Senate suggested that to make the process as positive as possible that all weaknesses should be discussed prior to the evaluation and that no documentation of those weaknesses be made on the evaluations. Dr. LaCour agreed that evaluations should contain no surprises, but stated that there was a mechanism in place for faculty to respond to anything on the evaluation.

Karen Anglin stated that she believed that the Faculty Senate recommendation was that the comparisons of GPA and W rate to a course average be omitted from the supervisor’s evaluation of faculty. Dr. LaCour stated that since this issue was not on the agenda, that the Council could take no formal action. Dr. LaCour agreed that there should be a balance on the evaluation strengths and weaknesses. Again, the process provides an opportunity for faculty to respond to their student evaluations and supervisor’s evaluations.

Dr. Van Miller moved that the meeting be adjourned; Dr. Don Stewart seconded the motion.

Respectfully submitted by : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Jeri Thornton-Dulaney