

FACC MEETING
February 22, 2016

MINUTES

PRESENT: Dr. Bob Hoar, Dr. Tony Hecimovic, Dr. Keith Edgerton, Dr. Joy Honea, Dr. Paul Pope, Dr. Michael Barber, Mr. Michael Campbell, Dr. Matt Redinger

Minutes: Recorded by Connie Nelson, Administrative Associate in the Provost Office

Order of Business:

Agenda Item 1: Review of minutes from the February 8, 2016 meeting.

- Mark said Waded did not know anything about the FMLA issue. We should assume we can get this item on the May BOR agenda if not, then the September meeting will be the next opportunity.
- Jackie Salveson said the CBA was ready to go to the Commissioner when the table of contents and index were inserted. A signature page was prepared for this to be signed by Tony and the Commissioner.
- Minutes passed.

New Issues / Business:

Agenda Item 3A: Credit for prior service (only new).

Bob met with Mike and Dean Wheeling regarding the two COB faculty that were hired given two (2) years credit toward their tenure and are now faced with the issue of whether the scholarly research done in those two (2) years prior to MSUB will be considered here toward their tenure & promotion application.

- In order to meet the AACSB productivity requirement, MSUB needs to look at the last 6 years of scholarly productivity.
- At MSUB there is an expectation there would be faculty productivity that would out-balance the prior years of service.
- Scholarly research cannot be based solely on what was done before coming here.
- The COB DRTC requires two (2) publications in six years so the question is what can be used to satisfy the requirements? This needs to be clarified going forward.
- Mike said members of the URTC said they do consider scholarly work in the two (2) years prior to MSUB.
 - The answer is some work done prior to MSUB can and will be considered.
- There is also an expectation of four years of scholarly work is to be done here at MSUB.

Decision of the group: The group agreed these two COB faculty members can use the scholarly work they did in the two (2) years prior to MSUB, and this work can be applied toward their overall MSUB requirement of scholarship work toward tenure & promotion.

- Continuing issue. Tony wants a timeline. This will be discussed again at the next meeting.

The language in the CBA appears different after bargaining which stated “all work had to be done at MSUB.” Keith said he does not recall this being agreed to during bargaining. Bob recalls the discussion but not any finalization of it.

- The bargaining discussion was centered more toward Lecturer scholarship.
- Keith proposed removing this language from the CBA, Tony agreed with this.
- CBA 7.111 may also need to be addressed. Keith doesn't think there is any other place where the language specifically applies to tenure and/or promotion. Tony said in 7.111, he doesn't see this would have effects on other portions of the contract.
 - The option of the faculty member who wants to bring forth prior MSUB employment scholarship and expectation information (see CBA 9.450-2) has to be exercised in writing by the first year evaluation.
 - It is incumbent upon the faculty association, department chair, dean and mentor to make sure this is done in the contractual timeline.
- CBA 9.333 and 9.334B were read for additional clarification. The old contract is identical to the new contract.
- It was mentioned about the possibility there should be a disclaimer in the contract where the FACC has the authority to make changes to clarify language prior to bargaining.
- For the next meeting, Tony will look at definitions to see if any other areas need to be addressed.

Group Decision: Tony & Bob will draft some language to strike the requirement that all work had to be done at MSUB. Keith suggests notifying the department chairs of this change.

- Continuing Issue.

Agenda Item 3B: Overload Policy.

- A draft of an overload policy was done a couple years ago that Bob has and he is cleaning it up.

Question: How do the chairs plan for fall semester? There are extra sessions available, they only need qualified teachers.

Answer: They can teach overload as long as they are not on reassigned time. That is a default.

- Special requests can be made if it is an emergency, starting with the dean.
- Joy has two requests for overload for two upper level classes in the criminal justice program for fall that Bob needs to re-review (\$2,500 would be the cap) and approve or disapprove this. He will do this and get back with Dean Shearer and Joy. Bob said he would be more apt to approve overload for face to face classes.
- Overload cannot be the only plan.

Question: Only two (2) departments in CAS, history and criminal justice are growing. How can resources be directed toward these departments?

Answer: Cut somewhere and award the growing. Bob said if enrollment was up 5% we could argue for the extra dollars. Bob will get a well-worded policy written and present at the next meeting.

- Continuing issue.

Continuing Agenda Issues:

Agenda Item 2A: Non-teaching functions served by faculty – Software.

- Michael will present the options at the dean's meeting on Feb. 29th.
- Continuing issue.

Agenda Item 2B: FMLA leave implications (FA requested).

- Joy sent out the information to faculty and received a total of 2 items of feedback.
- Notify the department chair if the member wants to keep the original timeline.

Question: Joy & Tony received an email that questioned if a faculty member is on modified duties & colleagues have to take up the slack, what about service requirements and advising loads that balloon?

Answer: Possibly offer a one-course reassigned time would be a good alternative.

- All faculty were emailed the draft. This is a case by case.
- Sabbatical like in terms of structure.
- If a faculty member is not gone from campus and faculty doing part of their duties, service obligations are still required if all teaching is put on hold.
- No reduction in the person's salary during the period of modified duties.
- IT sends out a survey to the deans & chairs asking for leave information.
- This is a talking points with Martha Potvin and Waded.

Question: Is there a commitment to funding?

Answer: Bob asked for an estimate of the projected costs.

- Continuing issue.

Corrected Agenda Item 2C: Array of ranks and titles.

- Ranks & titles union group members met one week ago.
- Continuing issue.

Corrected Agenda Item 2D: Proctoring of Online Exams.

- Developing, will be done sometime after spring break.
- Continuing issue.

Agenda Item 2E: Chair summer stipends in CAS.

- The method Tony said MEA & MFT recommended to handle this would be an MOU and attach it to the CBA.
- Keith said one problem is faculty should not have to assist administration in reducing salaries, this task is up to administration. Put a plan on the table and the faculty/committee will discuss it.
- Tony said the document needs a time limit and responsibilities need to be outlined specifically.
- What do the reduced responsibilities look like?
 - The detail needed is how would reduced responsibilities be defined? CBA 8.200 referenced.

Decision of the group: Bob will do the MOU. The background would refer to the budget reductions, and language for the current 2-year period. The timeline only applies for the contract length of two (2) years. Tony will work on this with Bob.

- Continuing issue.

Adjourned: 4:00 P.M.

Next Meeting: March 14, 2016 - Confirmed
2:30 – 4:00 p.m. CCR