



College Faculty Senate Draft Agenda

Date & Time: March 5, 2009, 2:00 pm – 4:30 pm

Location: Norfolk Campus, Martin Building, Room 2502

I. Call to Order

Pass around roster

II. Corrections and Approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting

Electronic copy provided via email with Draft Agenda

III. Reports of Senate Officers

A. Faculty Senate Chair Report, Chris Cartwright

1. Welcome and opening remarks
2. 2009-10 Senate Elections
 - (1) Designated senators must be in place by March 28, 2009
 - (2) Nominations will be opened at the April 2, 2009 meeting for College Faculty Senate Officers, and College Faculty Senate PAPC representative.
 - (3) Elections will be held on May 7, 2009
3. Executive Update and Review of Senate Log, posted on webpage <http://www.tcc.edu/welcome/collegeadmin/gov/facsen/SenateLOG.htm>
 - (1) Executive Committee held a meeting with Dr. DiCroce on February 12, 2009
 - (2) Email from Frank Dunn announcing new policy on Development and Maintenance of Policies and Procedures and a TCC Policy Website: Website: <http://www.tcc.edu/policies/> should be update with all TCC's currently policies in the new format by July 1, 2009.
 - (3) Academic Calendars for 2011-12 and 2012-13 approved by Executive Staff

B. Secretary, Kim Bovee

C. Treasurer, Steven Litherland

Budget Report

D. Faculty Senate Vice Chair Report

1. Chesapeake Campus, Carolyn Satz
2. Norfolk Campus, Sarah DiCalogero
3. Portsmouth Campus, Roberta Bernardini
4. Virginia Beach Campus, Gary Noah

IV. Reports of Faculty Senate Committees

- A. Long Term Planning Committee, Maureen Cahill**
- B. Communications and Public Relations Committee, Rosemary Hill**
- C. Adjunct Committee, Mike Adams**
- D. Awards Committee, Bill McNamara**
- E. Textbook Committee, Kim Bovee**
- F. Faculty Evaluation Committee, Maureen Cahill**
Presentation of final report, see attached

V. Reports from Other Committees or Groups

A. FSVA, Maureen Cahill

B. PAPC, Maureen Cahill

At the February 26, 2009 meeting of the PAPC the four motions related to TCC governance system. The Faculty Senate has 30 days to provide comment or objection. The motions are as follows

1. P APC Motion: To amend the meeting requirements of the proposed P APC bylaws to reflect the following: The P APC will meet the third Tuesday of the month in the months of September and November (first semester) at 2pm on the Norfolk campus. During the second semester the P APC meetings will be called as needed at the discretion of the President and the P APC Chair.
2. P APC Motion: To divide the Curriculum and Instruction Committee into two separate governance committees: a Curriculum Committee and an Instruction Committee.
3. P APC Motion: To redistribute the membership of the Internal Relations Committee to two faculty from each campus and add one college-wide librarian.
4. P APC Motion: To grant a one-time extension on the term of two individuals (a faculty member from Portsmouth and a Classified Association representative from the District Office) on the Internal Relations Committee if first approved by the Classified Association and the Portsmouth Faculty.

C. CFAC, **Gary Noah**

D. V CCS Professional Development Committee, **Marshall Ellis**

E. Computer Competencies, **Gary Noah**

VI. Unfinished Business

Final Grade Appeal Procedure

Copy of draft revised procedure is attached. The revisions are a culmination of the comments at the last Senate meeting and email recommendations received. If approved, the draft revisions will be presented to Dr. Summers for further action.

VII. New Business

A. New Hiring Procedures

A copy of the draft Procedures for Recruiting, Screening, Interviewing, and Selecting Full Time Teaching Faculty were distributed via email. Below is a summary of the comments received:

1. In the previous hiring procedures, the Dean extended an invitation “to all full-time faculty in the teaching discipline college-wide and other faculty and student services personnel as desired” and the committee chair was elected by the committee members. The new procedure has the Dean appointing the committee members and chair. The College Faculty Senate prefers to have an open and inclusive selection process and one in which the committee elects the committee chair.
2. Step 5 in the current procedures states that “all committee members are expected to be present at all meetings of the committee. If any committee member cannot participate in all interviews, then he or she cannot take part in the preparation of the committee’s final report.” This has been changed in step 6 of the new draft version to allow for missed interviews. The clause that “he or she cannot take part in the preparation of the committee’s final report for that candidate” does not ensure equity and transparency in the decision making. The College Faculty Senate would prefer that a committee member not able to participate in all candidate interviews, not be allowed to participate in the interview selection process and final report.
3. There are numerous steps (# 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15) where time limits could be put in place to prevent the type of lag that has often been part of the hiring process. The College Faculty Senate requests that appropriate time limits be put in place where applicable.

4. A Dean should not be able to override the selection committee's decision without proper justification. While the College Faculty Senate acknowledges the strength of the added statement "In the rare instance that the Dean does not agree with the committee's recommendation, the Dean meets with the committee to discuss their differences," we are also concerned with the removal of the requirement that the Dean put any differences between himself or herself and the committee in writing.
5. Number 2 on the proposed draft is written in such a way that it is unclear if faculty input is sought on the Position Description.
6. Number 6 should indicate if the Dean will be sitting in on the interviews.

VIII. Close

Date & Time: February 5, 2009, 2:00 pm – 4:30 pm

Location: Chesapeake Campus, Whitehurst Building Room 2056

Attending: Chris Cartwright (VB), Kim Bovee (VB), Bob Harrison (C), Kim Edwards(C), Carolyn Satz (C), Sarah DiCalogero (N), Lara Tedrow (N), Roberta Bernardini (P), Steven Litherland (P), Lorenz Drake (P), Tom Garrett (P), Mike Adams (Adj), Maureen Cahill (VB), Marshall Ellis (VB), Virginia (Bunny) May (VB), Bill McNamara (VB), Gary Noah (VB), Kathy Tilton (LRC), Jane Mosher (VB), Alison Harwell (Counseling), Rosemary Hill, (P), Bethany Wright (VB)

Non-Attending: Elynn Hodgis (VB), Jim Mahiman (N),

Visitors: Michael Summers

- I. **Call to order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:00 by Chris Cartwright, Chair
- II. **Corrections and Approval of the Minutes:** A motion was made and approved: To accept previous meeting's minutes with corrections.
- III. **Reports of Senate Officers:**
 - a. **Chair, Chris Cartwright:**
 - i. Welcome and opening remarks
 - ii. Review of Senate Log posted on webpage:
<http://www.tcc.edu/welcome/collegeadmin/gov/facsen/SenateLOG.htm>
 - b. **Secretary, Kim Bovee:**
 - i. Minutes from the 1/15/09 Executive Committee meeting and a summary from the 11/13/08 Executive Committee meeting with the President were presented.
 - ii. The proposed revisions to the Senate's Policy and Procedures were presented:
Motion: To approve draft revisions to College Faculty Senate Policy and Procedures document. The motion passed.
 - c. **Treasurer, Steven Litherland**
 - i. Budget Report (see attachment)
 - ii. **Motion: Due to the financial times that we currently find ourselves, we the College Faculty senate, have adjusted our expenditures in order to return \$3,000 of our allocated funds of \$5,000.** The motion passed.
 - d. **Faculty Senate Vice Chair Report**
 - i. **Chesapeake Campus, Carolyn Satz:** Work is continuing on by-laws.
 - ii. **Norfolk Campus, Sarah DiCalogero:** The future of the Moss Scholarship award is being considered.
 - iii. **Portsmouth Campus, Roberta Bernardini:** Concerns have been raised about math faculty accessing their student evaluations, and students being to classes after the add/drop date without faculty approval. Portsmouth is also looking at revising campus adjunct orientation.
 - iv. **Virginia Beach Campus, Gary Noah:** The campus senate met with George Okaty, the new college security officer.
- IV. **Reports of Faculty Senate Committees**
 - a. **Long Term Planning Committee, Maureen Cahill:** No report.

- b. **Communications and Public Relations Committee, Rosemary Hill:** New bookmarks are available 3/15. David Kiracofe will be adding more articles to the Senate Blog.
- c. **Adjunct Committee, Mike Adams:** A meeting has occurred in Chesapeake and meetings are scheduled for Norfolk and Portsmouth.
- d. **Awards Committee, Bill McNamara:** The committee has an early March meeting planned; 3/1/09 is the deadline for packages.
- e. **Textbook Committee, Kim Bovee:** The textbook committee met 12/18/08; the committee will begin drafting a report.
- f. **Faculty Evaluation Committee, Maureen Cahill:** The committee needs to write a final report.

V. Reports from Other Committees or Groups:

- a. **FSVA, Maureen Cahill:** No meeting
- b. **PAPC, Maureen Cahill:**
Motion: The College Faculty Senate does not have any objections or comments in regards to the new PAPC by-laws as presented. The motion passed.
- c. **CFAC, Gary Noah:** Gary Noah will be sending out an email asking for points of discussion for the next CFAC meeting.
- d. **VCCS Professional Development Committee, Marshall Ellis:** The New Horizons Conference will be in Roanoke this year. Please let Mike Williams know if you want to attend. The new peer groups will be approved at New Horizons.
- e. **Computer Competencies, Gary Noah:** Work is being done on developing a test for computer competencies, and Mike Summers is working on a grant to develop a TCC internal test.

VI. Unfinished Business: None

VII. New Business

- a. **Academic Calendar, Mike Summers:** Mike Summers presented the proposed 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic calendars.
Motion: To approve the proposed Academic Calendar for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. The motion passed.
- b. **Final Grade Appeal Procedure:** Concerns have been raised over the current procedure and the President has asked the senate to work offer suggestions for revision. The senate welcomes this opportunity. After a discussion the following points were raised:
 - i. The committee composition should be clarified.
 - 1. Faculty members should be from the same discipline or division as the faculty member involved in the appeal.
 - 2. Student members should come from the Student Federation
 - ii. Faculty should be able to appeal just as students should be able to appeal.
 - iii. A student making an appeal must provide specifics as part of their burden of proof.
The Senate Chair and Secretary will work on a draft along with anyone else who would like to participate.
- c. **Student Conduct:** The College does not have an honor code although we do have a code of conduct. The Student Conduct Committee is looking into what occurs when a teacher asks a student to leave.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30.

Final Report from the Faculty Evaluation Steering Committee

After two years of work, the Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) was approved by 61% of the voting faculty members with 53% of the overall full-time teaching faculty voting. The vote closed at the end of the business day, September 12, 2008. Chris Cartwright, the Faculty Senate Chair, presented the FEP to the Executive Committee October 7, 2008 and received oral approval for the plan.

Though well received by the Executive Committee and Dr. DiCroce, the FEP was disapproved via email December 1, 2008 citing the need to comply with Section 3.6.1.2b of the VCCS Policy Manual. This section of VCCS Policy states that the college's faculty evaluation plan must be approved by "a majority of faculty." Additionally, according to information provided by Dr. DiCroce, only teaching faculty should vote on the proposed revisions to the full-time teaching Faculty Evaluation Plan. As the surveys used by the Faculty Evaluation Steering Committee included all teaching faculty, librarians, and counselors, it is impossible to determine the number who voted from each group. According to Dr. DiCroce, the college had 324 full-time teaching faculty as of December 1, 2008. Using this number, the FEP would have needed 163 affirmative votes to pass. The final vote collected by the Faculty Evaluation Steering Committee, had 187 total votes, with 115 people voting yes.

As Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Steering Committee, I recommend tabling this plan for the present. Unless there is a change in the VCCS Policy, or in its interpretation, it is unlikely that the plan would pass. Throughout the work of this committee, Institutional Effectiveness indicated a 40% response rate was acceptable. Including librarians and counselors, the FEP had a response rate just over 50%; there is no way to predict how their removal would impact future voting. Moreover, the current VCCS Policy would appear to allow those who do not vote at all undue influence. Until this policy is changed, time and effort spent on this plan will likely be wasted.

The FEP developed by this committee is top-notch, despite the disapproval. It is a product of which we can be proud despite the disapproval. I would like to thank all of the people who participated in the surveys and meetings over the past two years, the faculty members who have served on the committee, Beth Lunde, Jim Perkinson, and Brenda Sedlacek, each who served as non-voting members of the committee for 2008-2009. Lisa Kleiman, Curt Aasen, and Michael Bryan also provided invaluable assistance in this process.

Data which drove the decision-making on the FEP was collected primarily using Survey Monkey, paper votes, and meetings on each campus. Summary reports and raw data were submitted to the Secretary of the College Faculty Senate for storage. At this time, I motion the Faculty Senate table the FEP.

Maureen A. Cahill, Ed. D.
Chair, Faculty Evaluation Steering Committee

TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FINAL COURSE GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURE

Faculty members at Tidewater Community College are responsible for assigning course grades and for advising students of the objective criteria on which those grades are assigned. As such, most student disagreements regarding course grades are best resolved informally between the student and faculty member.

The Final Course Grade Appeal Procedure provides a fair and orderly process for students who wish to pursue a formal appeal of their final course grade. In taking such action, students shall assume the burden of proof concerning any perceived error in the grade assigned. Further, they shall follow the sequence of steps outlined in this procedure with the presumption that, as a matter of rule, instructors do not assign arbitrary and capricious course grades.

Step One

Students are encouraged to resolve final course grade disagreements with their instructors on an informal basis. Should the dispute not be resolved at this level, the student may proceed to Step Two.

Step Two

The student shall submit a written appeal to the academic dean¹ under whose division the course was offered not later than ten (10) working days after the first day of classes for the next academic term. The academic dean will notify the faculty member a written appeal has been received and provide the faculty member a copy of the appeal within one (1) working day. Within five (5) working days of receiving the written appeal, the academic dean shall hold a conference with the student and instructor to consider the grade appeal. The dean shall provide a written report of his/her findings to both parties within five (5) working days of the conference. For the record, a copy of the report shall be kept on file in the division office.

~~Should the student wish to advance his/her appeal to the next level, he/she may submit a written appeal to the campus provost within five (5) working days of receipt of the dean's report.~~

Step Three

Should either the student or faculty member wish to appeal to the next level, he/she may submit a written appeal to the campus provost within five (5) working days of receipt of the dean's report.

¹ At the Visual Arts Center, the director functions as the academic dean.

Within five (5) working days of receiving the student's written appeal of the Step Two findings, the campus provost shall appoint a Grade Appeal Committee to consider the appeal. The committee shall consist of three (3) teaching faculty members, at least two (2) of whom must be from the same teaching discipline or division as the course and two (2) students who are not directly involved in the case. The provost shall notify the student, instructor, and academic dean of this action.

Within five (5) working days of its appointment, the Grade Appeal Committee shall hold at least one face-to-face meeting with the student and instructor. The committee shall conclude its deliberations within ~~ten working days a reasonable time period, and submit~~ submitting a written report of its findings to the provost within five (5) working days of the conclusion of its review. Based on this report, and within five (5) working days of receiving the committee's report, the provost shall render a written decision on the student's appeal. The decision shall be shared with the student, faculty member, and dean, as well as with the Grade Appeal Committee.

~~Should the student wish to advance his/her appeal to the next level, he/she may submit a written appeal to the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs within five (5) working days of receipt of the provost's written decision.~~

Step Four

Should the student or the faculty member wish to appeal the decision of the provost to the next level, he/she may submit a written appeal to the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs within five (5) working days of receipt of the provost's written decision.

At Step Four, the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs shall consider the student's final course grade appeal only within the context of assuring that the decision as rendered by the provost was supported by the evidence presented and, as such, was neither arbitrary nor capricious. The vice president shall issue his/her written ruling, sharing it with the student, faculty member, and provost within five (5) working days of receipt of the appeal. The ruling shall be considered final.

Time Limitations

The time limitations specified for the Final Course Grade Appeal Procedure are binding on all parties involved, unless they are extended by written mutual agreement.

Authorization: Michael D. Summers

Title: Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs

Date: February 1, 2008

Effective Date: March 1, 2008