**NWACC Faculty Senate, 2007-2008**
Linda Lovell, President
Angie Albright, Vice-President
Barbara Alexander, Secretary

**Minutes**
Friday, 21 September 2007
Burns Hall 1209

**Present**: Linda Lovell; Angie Albright; Teresa Briggs, RTC; Judy DeGarmo, At Large; Keith Foster, Division of Business and Computer Information; Curtis Harrell, At Large; Burnetta Hintertheur, At Large; Conrad Krauft, At Large; Stephanie Lewis, At Large; Cathy McAuliffe, At Large; Carol Olson, Science and Math; Jo Ann Schwader, Associate Faculty; Abby Selby, Division of Health Professions; Janel Stryker, Adult Education; Gene Vinzant, Social & Behavioral Sciences; Barbara Alexander (recording).

**Guests**: Brian Aguiar, representing the Business Department; Don Koelling; Karen Tinker; Dr. John Tuthill, Associate Vice President for Learning.

**Linda Lovell called the meeting to order at 3:00**.

**I. Curriculum Committee Proposals**

Curtis Harrell presented the proposals; Brian Aguiar discussed the new courses being offered through the Business Department. Following discussion, Teresa Briggs moved to accept the proposals. The motion was seconded and passed. A proposal to rename and number a "special topics" class in Art provoked questions of clarity. Harrell and Carol Olson explained the class does not generally make, so the proposal is to restore it to its original number. They are actually eradicating all other numbers used for "special topics," an action which is now possible in Banner. Angie Albright moved to accept the proposal and Briggs seconded the motion, which passed with one abstention.

Curriculum was moved to the top of the agenda in order to accommodate guests who were representing the proposals.

**(Added to Agenda) Confidentiality**

Lovell added a discussion of confidentiality to the agenda, stating that if a Senator brings an issue brought to the table, the name of the individual who contacted the Senator should not be named, unless it is with that person's permission.

Albright mentioned a comment made by Diana Nagel, former Faculty Senate President, who said newspaper reporters could attend a Faculty Senate meeting. However, their presence would change the nature of the meeting. The Senate should be confidential but this is still an open meeting. People should feel trustful.

Cathy McAuliffe asked if two people talking together [about Senate matters] is a meeting. Lovell said it is not, but McAuliffe thinks it might be a legal matter, and she will research it.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

**II. Faculty Issues Raised**

*a. Independent Study Pay or No Pay?*
Albright reviewed last year's Senate discussion of payment for independent study. Previously, instructors were not paid for it, but they did not have to agree to do it. Last year's Senate approved a request for additional payment for independent studies, and Dr. Paneitz approved it. However, there was no pay scale. Greg Kiser, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, 2006-7, proposed 90 percent of the tuition would go to the faculty. The tuition depends on the nature of the class, whether it is in-district or out-of-district, and tuition could vary by the number of hours or type of class.

According to Albright, Dr. Ates was concerned faculty would abuse this; but since it has to go through a dean or supervisor, there is a monitoring process. At least one Senator has heard of abuse of independent study pay at another college.

Albright said the proposal is done, but it needs numbers. Discussion followed regarding what the amount might be, if independent study should be restricted, that 90 percent of in-district seemed an appropriate amount. McAuliffe moved to add the payment figure to the proposal; Jo Ann Schwader seconded it. There was a question as to whether this was the same as overload. The amount will result be approximately $150 a semester for one class. There was a question about what would happen if the class did not make. The motion to add the funding amount passed with one abstention and one opposed. Pay would be 90 percent of in-district tuition per credit hour.

During his session, Dr. Tuthill noted he had never seen faculty paid for independent study courses, at any institution, and he thinks it will be a hard sell.

b. *Why a limit to 2 online classes for full time faculty?*
Lovell will ask Dr. Tuthill.)

c. *Class cancellations*
Dr. Tuthill remarked on this following his question and answer session. He is against cancellation, for instance, he was extremely sorry to cancel the German class (only six students enrolled), because it is hard to build a program with cancelled classes. In the past, 14 students were required for a class to make. This was based on adjunct pay plus overhead. Some have seen ten students as the cutoff for class cancellations. The deans seem confused, nothing seems to be written. Part of the issue is room utilization, according to Dr. Tuthill.

d. Written Policy on Office Hours?
One of the issues needing to be addressed is written, consistent policies in all the divisions. Faculty are being given different information in different departments. Having written policies available online would resolve that. Lovell said she uses the following guideline: "If they don't tell me, it's not a policy." Hinterthuer moved Senate work to establish this procedure, McAuliffe seconded it, and the motion passed. The need is for a written policy on office hours for online instructors.

e. Salary Clarification
Albright reported on full time salary steps. There will be two steps in the next year. The three phases have been followed, and the plan would be a year behind if not for the two



PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

step increase. The goal is to bring everyone up to scale and to address the unevenness in salaries. Lovell asked Albright to explain this at the Faculty Business meeting on September 28.

**III. Emeritus Policy**

The sabbatical policy has been approved, and the committee addressing sabbaticals and emeritus status has moved on the policy for the latter. They are working on a policy which would allow instructors to acquire emeritus status, retire, then return to teach part time for two years. These emeritus instructors would be paid half their salary and would have an office.

Emeritus status would be considered an honor, and would be an option to those who have been at NWACC for 15 years. It would not be necessary to retire first; rather these individuals could ascertain whether or not they would receive emeritus status and then make the decision to retire. The individuals would not have to be nominated; they would inquire on their own. Briggs made the motion to put this into effect; Olson seconded, one opposed, two abstentions, the motion passed.

**IV. Faculty Web Standards**

Pat Kelly was unable to attend.

**V. AVP for Learning Introduction—John Tuthill**

Lovell introduced Dr. Tuthill, the Chief Academic Officer, who meets on a regular basis with the President and Vice President of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Paneitz and Dr. Ates. After giving Dr. Tuthill's background, Lovell opened the meeting to questions and answers. Judy DeGarmo asked about his first impression of NWACC and his priorities.

Dr. Tuthill remarked that he has an alarming tendency to tell the truth. When he came for his interview, he found NWACC to be a remarkable place, beautiful, with an energetic and hard working faculty and staff. Once he was actually here, he sees it as an anthill—everyone running around confused. He is flabbergasted and amazed at the absence of priorities. Dr. Tuthill considers himself to be a specialist in small dysfunctional schools. NWACC is not small. It does not have a policy on salaries or academic probation. Some of this is due to the dynamic growth of NWACC, with no time to do policies. Dr. Tuthill said he is glad to be here.

As for priorities in the next academic year, Dr. Tuthill said they are "what's in my face this instance." In random order, the biggest needs are as follows.
1) Outcomes development and assessment; "we say NWACC is 'great,' but cannot prove it."
2) "Diversity is an issue, with NWACC having an astonishingly white campus, faculty and administration. Forty seven percent of our student enrollment increase from Spring Semester 2005 to Spring Semester 2007 came from minority students. NWACC needs to do a better job of having both faculty and administration reflect the composition of the student body."
3) Dr. Tuthill is working on restoring the lines of communication. When he came for his interview, he observed the faculty was suspicious of administration, administration was afraid of faculty.

4) Policies and procedures need to be established so everyone knows what the rules are. One thing that came out of Conversation Day was the "fear issue": folks aren't talking, or their vocabulary is different. Part of Dr. Tuthill's role is to be a translator.



PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

There was a comment about NWACC architecture not working, that is, people can't figure who is "the we" and who is "the they." Dr. Tuthill responded, "we are a 'we.' We have to get past the we and they. This is not a learning college. We have to get past to 'us,' then we can be a real learning college."

Another comment noted faculty is behind students in regard to technology; faculty do not know as much. Dr. Tuthill replied 1) faculty is never going to excel in technology more than students; 2) technology is overrated. Faculty are instructional content specialists who have skills students do not have. Technology is a tool, not a be-all and end-all. Faculty has to get training, to figure out a way to make technology useful. This varies from discipline to discipline. He's not sure how to do it. Dr. Tuthill would like to learn how to teach his history class online.

Faculty recognizes steps being taken, such as hiring Kate Burkes and having faculty involved in the professional development of distance education. Dr. Tuthill agreed, noting the success of distance education at NWACC.

In response to a question about the schedule changes enacted last year. Dr. Tuthill said there is a 14 percent increase overall, with a 13 percent increase on Monday/Wednesday; a 23-28 percent increase on Monday Wednesday evenings; Friday enrollment down. There was a comment about distance learning, asking for more screening and orientation, along with orientation on pedagogy, not just WebCT. Dr. Tuthill said there is value to training and screening, but some students can only take online classes, which means faculty still has to do some handholding.

In closing the question and answer session, Dr. Tuthill said he would like to be involved as much as possible with the Senate. He'll be ex officio for the Senate through the committee reports. He wants to be helpful; he'll be throwing as much policy as possible on the Senate, since it represents half the campus. He will need support, as he is going to encounter some real resistance to barriers. He's the outsider, so it's easier to talk to him. Dr. Tuthill invited faculty to drop by his office, BH1303.

**VI. Conflict of Interest Resolution and Policy on Faculty Royalties**

This issue is a result of State Senator Sue Madison's proposals. The state has defined it a conflict of interest if a faculty member requires a student to purchase a text authored by that faculty member. As a result of Madison's legislation, the faculty member cannot collect royalties on that text. NWACC needs to write their own policies concerning royalties.

The following questions arose from this discussion.
1) Can I have a college use my book and then I use their book?
2) Can I earn royalties from other sections using my book?
3) Can the text be used if it is listed as an optional text?
4) What happens when NWACC wants to use a faculty's book?
5) What happens to the royalties?
6) How to figure the royalties?

The Senate needs a written policy for distribution to the faculty. Briggs, Curtis Harrell, and Conrad Krauft will work on the policy and bring it back to the Senate in October. Lovell provided copies of the act and of the University of Arkansas' policy. She will also contact the U of A's Faculty Senate for more information.



PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

**VII. Communication Methods for the Senate**

Lovell says the Senate has communication challenges. Senate members responded they are fine with her posting e-mail messages. Communication is being addressed by one of the AQIP focus groups.

Lovell has told Admin she can't add faculty to committees; that should be done by deans and or committee chairs.

Discussion followed of the nuances of sharing Senate reports with departments, e.g., Lovell's presidential reports. The Senate is receiving information from Dr. Tuthill and Dr. Ates, but should everything be shared? Should information be shared by departmental representatives? Albright encouraged sharing material, letting people know the Senate is working on issues.

**VIII. First Faculty Survey**

The survey was distributed at the beginning of the semester, asking faculty about the Tuesday Thursday 3:00 to 4:15 slot as a possible blocked meeting time, with only adjuncts teaching during that time. Apparently the deans were surprised by the low number of full time faculty (41) who took the survey. While this time has been approved by Dr. Ates, some areas, such as Nursing, Adult Education, and science labs will find it impossible. There are various other problems, such as conflicting meeting times, child care, prior time commitments. The TR 3:00 to 4:15 time will be used in the spring of 2008,

**IX. Set Agenda for Faculty Business Meeting**

1. Scheduled exchange and Q/&A with John Tuthill from 3:00 to 3:30
2. Curriculum Committee Proposals (Since the Senate has already approved the changes, this will be "Curriculum Committee Results")
3. TR Open Time 3:00-4:15 beginning in Spring
4. Adjunct faculty—Free Use of NWACC Fitness Center
5. Conflict of Interest Resolution/Policy of Faculty Royalties
6. Answers to Faculty Issues Raised?
7. Index Card Feed back

**X. Review from Faculty Senate Retreat, August 7**

Lovell inquired if everyone had received the notes from the retreat, as not everyone is on the Faculty Senate e-mail list. Everyone had received them.

There was a question about the time set for the Faculty Business meeting, whether it had been announced prior to this week.

Lovell was presented a card from the Faculty Senate, recognizing her hard work and wishing her success in her year as president.

**The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.**



PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com