Faculty Senate
Minutes of the 8 NOV 06 meeting


Guests: Jim Johnson, Janusz Polonowski, Michele Singletary.

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m., and a quorum was declared.

The following changes were made to the agenda:
1. “New Faculty Evaluation (IDEA)” was changed to just “New Faculty Evaluation.” IDEA does not refer to the faculty evaluation, but rather the student one.
2. Under Old Business, add “Senate Constitution.”
3. Under New Business, add (a) “Approval of PTEC program” and (b) “Salary Listings from the Chronicle of Higher Education.”

The agenda was approved as amended.

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved. The secretary will send out the minutes to each meeting twice: as soon as they have been compiled, and then the day of the next meeting for another look.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Jim Johnson presented a proposed Industrial Process Control Technology (PTEC) AAS degree program for approval. He gave a summary of the history of this program and how the need for it arose. It will only be given at the Waverly campus for the time being. He answered questions from the Senate. The program was approved. (Although this item is under “New Business” on the agenda, it was discussed before “Old Business” to accommodate Jim Johnson’s schedule.)

2. A Senate member stated that one of his constituents asked if the Senate constitution issue would be revisited. Proposed changes to the constitution were not approved in a campus-wide faculty vote last year. It was determined that the majority of the changes in last year’s vote could be addressed by writing them as by-laws, which would not require approval of the entire faculty but rather the Senate. Judy Kane will resend the most current version of the Senate constitution, with all of last year’s proposed changes, to the Senate for review at the next meeting.
NEW BUSINESS

1. The QEP (Quality Enhancement Program) Committee needs a Senate replacement for Bill Kitchen, Senate Chair, who cannot make the scheduled meeting time due to a class he teaches. Scott McRoberts volunteered to take his place.

2. Diane Eagle presented the current, revised Faculty Evaluation for Senate approval. Michele Singletary and Janusz Polonowski, who served with Diane on the sub-committee tasked with this project, were present to help answer questions. Michele stated that this was the 7th version of the form, and that many changes had been made from the original, based on the pilot administration of it in the spring of 2006 and faculty in-service sessions given in the fall. Several Senate members suggested a few more corrections, which will be incorporated into the form, and the form was approved.

3. There still seem to be some problems, which were discussed at the last Senate meeting, regarding TIAA-CREF contributions to faculty accounts. Bill Kitchen stated that he had inquired about this, and was instructed to inform all affected faculty members to contact Payroll about this, since it does not seem to be an institution-wide problem but one that is affecting only a few faculty. Since this is the second time a problem has been reported, the Senate is recommending Human Resources or the Internal Auditor to address an official letter of inquiry to TIAA-CREF, asking when contributions are made and posted to accounts. The Chair will be in charge of this.

4. Howard Doty, NSCC’s Faculty Representative to the Academic Faculty Sub-council to TBR, reported on the most recent meeting he attended. He stated that the information he was presenting was also contained in an email he sent to faculty. Specific items he addressed were:
   - teaching load of science instructors
   - tuition caps
   - common calendar
   - DSP Taskforce
   - new AS degree in Teaching
   - Perkins financial aid

5. Scott McRoberts stated that one of his constituents read an article which appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education that contained average faculty salaries for different disciplines, and that his salary was $5,000 less. There was a brief discussion on this topic.
There was a question as to whether the last date to withdraw was set by TBR and was the same for all schools, or whether that date was set institutionally. The date is set by each school.

Since the December Senate meeting falls during finals week, and the January meeting falls during a busy week of the semester, the Chair announced that the next Senate meeting would be in February.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.