

Members Present: Stacey Deputy, Judy Gill, Siabhon Harris, Sarah DiCalogero, Maureen Cahill, Sean LaCroix Robyn Browder, Tom Siegmund, Lorenz Drake, Kathy Buhner, Ruth Shumate, David Kiracofe, Kevin Brady (voting for David Ring), Sharon Waters, Angela Bell, Dania Sinibaldi,

Guests Present: Elizabeth Harris, Geraldine Wright, Ellyn Hodgis, Jennifer Hopkins, Elizabeth Briggs, Sylvia Ross, Claudia Macon

- I. Call to Order
- II. Campus Motions* (See Appendix)
- III. Review and Approval of Minutes – **minutes approved**
- IV. Chair Report – Stacey Deputy –See Appendix
- V. Secretary Report – Judy Gill – **please sign in**
- VI. Treasurer Report – Tom Siegmund – **Budget is \$250 for the year**
- VII. Campus Reports – Campus Chairs –See Appendix

Motion: The Senate create an ad-hoc committee to bring a cohesive recommendation to the College for the academic restructure. Second 13 in favor, 1 abstention

Motion passed

Sarah will chair it and asks all campus chairs to serve.

VIII. Faculty Senate Meeting in November.

IX. Committee and Representative Reports

- A. Adjunct Committee –Elizabeth Harris (**see appendix**)
- B. Faculty Development and Evaluation Plan – Tom Siegmund
- C. Professional Development – Joe Joyner – **\$71,677 is award so far – about average**
- D. CFAC – Ellyn Hodgis – **needs funding to go to meetings, about \$180 per meeting. Meets 11/1-2.**

President's office paying for Ellyn to go to Chancellor's retreat.

- E. FSVA – Sean LaCroix – **meeting 10/20, he will attend**
- F. PAPC – Ruth Schumate – did not attend

Stacey Deputy attended: Updated bylaws of a committee. Considering combining OLC with CTLTC. They are holding joint meetings.

- G. Rewards and Recognition & Awards-Sarah Dicalogero – **has filled the positions on the committee**
- H. Parliamentary Rules Committee-**Tom Siegmund agreed to chair**
- I. Ad-Hoc Committee to streamline the Evaluation process and improve the e-Portfolio tool. – Judy Gill – Will be taking on the e-Portfolio tool but not the Evaluation process. **Chairs please find a rep from each campus.** The self-evaluation should consist of a holistic narrative and APPDP's and will try to align the e-Portfolio with this self-evaluation structure.

J. Ad Astra-Deborah Edson-**See Chair Report**

X. Initiative Updates

- A. Advising-See Chair Report

XI. Old Business

- A. Professional Development funding

Concerns about liability issues for mental health. Covered under 'Good Samaritan' laws.

Motion: CPDF funds may be used for Certification fees and Certification exam fees when funds are available. Vote: 9 in favor, 1 opposed, 4 abstentions Motion carries.

Motion: CPDF funds may be used for mandatory job related training such as first aid and mental health when funds are available. Motion tabled until next meeting.

Motion: CPDF funds may be used for entry fees, jury fees, and shipping costs associated with submitting creative work in peer reviewed exhibitions when funds are available.

XII. New Business

A. Does CWFS want to provide ideas on modification of the academic reorganization to Dr. DeCinque? He has indicated that he is open to ideas.

XIII. Items for the Board

XIV. Other items – Motions from the floor, etc.

XV. Close –Next meeting November 1, 2018 in Portsmouth (Room TBA)

Appendix

Motions

Chesapeake

1. Faculty Senate request that faculty receive a minimum of thirty (30) days to review and respond to the faculty advising component of the faculty advising plan before it is finalized.

Burden of faculty, extra work without additional compensation. Estimates have been for 28 students per faculty could be underrepresented. Concern about training and non-Pathway faculty.

Norfolk Chair report – faculty concerns regarding advising.

No way to quantify what is fair/equitable based on ratios that have been shared so far.

Time with each student has not been quantified.

Scope of follow up colleges requires vast knowledge base.

VB Campus – wait time is 2.5-3 hours.

Ratios seem misleading (ie health sciences listed as 5-1 but they are also responsible for pre-admission students, etc).

Career and Technical have specific advising needs that cannot be covered by other faculty.

No discussion in opposition.

Vote: 15 in favor, 1 abstention. Motion carries.

Portsmouth

1. That pathway deans and campus deans be required to complete ~~onboarding~~ training on best practices in leadership and scheduling, with significant input from faculty on training content.

Campus specific information can be included.

Clarification: This is for current and incoming deans as well as possibly department chairs. Strike 'onboarding' from motion.

Where would 'best practices' come from?

We have New Faculty Academy but nothing for deans.

Dean best practices can come from faculty. We understand what works and what does not work. Reinforce we need to take care of our students on each campus.

Guest speakers came for Effective Leadership (Phi Theta Kappa) through the Women's Center. Maybe that can be used here.

Concern about telling our deans they need to have training.

How receptive will the deans be? They may have a bad attitude.

Model what the President is doing – have the deans hold roundtables.

Concern with the word 'training' but deans have different practices for scheduling, teaching requirements, etc. How about collaborate or something to make sure things are more consistent. Maybe should address inconsistencies.

Why do we need training when we have policies?

Evaluation of dean can be instated and close the loop based on that.

Interpretation of policy is different from dean to dean.

Motion to table until better language is found. No second.

Reword: Motion **That Pathway deans and Campus deans be provided with sessions discussing best practices in leadership and scheduling with significant input on content from faculty.**

Too much of a change – dilutes original motion.

Concern: Senate chairs advocated for flexibility in scheduling policy based on program and campus needs.

Policies seem to be written for transfer programs and diminishes value and program viability.

Each Pathway has different issues.

Do we need to get into minutia of training? Just stick with basic idea.

Motion tabled by Portsmouth Senators.

2. That TCC and, if needed, the principle investigator on the Achieving the Dream grant, formally provide the impetus for inequitable campus representation even though faculty from the unrepresented campuses inquired prior to the first wave of applications and funding.

Background:

ATD grant from 2017. Two rounds of funding to help underrepresented population get access. 60% VB and Ches, 40% Norf and Port applied. 100% were accepted from VB and Ches. An explanation was provided. Second round, nobody got funding. Did not feel that courses offered were needed. Focused on Course Maps for first year courses instead. Potential for another round of funding is available.

Discussion around 2, 3, 4 ensued.

Amended Resolution and Motion: Whereas there are serious concerns about the way the ATD grant for Z-courses was administered and the selection process used, the TCC Faculty Senate requests a comprehensive report regarding the administration of the ATD grant for Z-courses. (seconded)

Vote: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Vote:

3. That TCC and, if needed, the principle investigator on the Achieving the Dream (ATD) grant, verifies that they were fully aware of the mission on ATD and still chose to move forward in a manner that excluded the campuses with demographics that specifically meet the mission of ATD.

Tabled by Portsmouth Senate Chair

4. That TCC ensure that faculty and campuses who were affected by being excluded from this Achieving the Dream (ATD) grant will receive first priority for future ATD grant funding opportunities and that TCC put a policy in place regarding college-wide grants that increases transparency and equity (even if that means it is a relative equity based on the weighted population/FTE representation) to prevent this from happening in the future.

Amended Motion: TCC modify current Policy 2400 – Administration of Public Grant and Sponsored Programs, to ensure transparency and equitable campus participation. (seconded)

Vote: 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions

Virginia Beach

1. In light of the inequity between the ratio of students to deans for each of the four campuses, we move that the Virginia Beach campus be allocated 3 campus deans as opposed to 1 campus dean.

	Norfolk	Chesapeake	Virginia Beach	Portsmouth
FTEs (as of Sept 5, 2018)	2120	2420	4955	2308
Deans (includes 1 campus dean)	3	3	4	3
Ratio of Students to Deans	2120 : 3 Reduces to 707 : 1	2420 : 3 Reduces to 807 : 1	4955 : 4 Reduces to 1239 : 1	2308 : 3 Reduces to 769 : 1
Proposed Ratio	No change	No change	4955 : 6 Reduces to 826 : 1	No change

- If we proceed with the structural reorganization of the college, we need to be certain to support and address the needs and concerns of our students. Under the proposed structure, students at the Beach campus will not have fair access to a dean. For the college to be at its best, each campus must be at their best.
- Each year a larger portion of our budget will be decided by performance-based metrics (PFM). In fiscal year 2018, 14% of our budget is to be decided by PFM, in fiscal year 2019, 16% will be from PFM. By 2020, 20% will be from PFM. The metrics primarily address student success and we need them to be successful; funding affects the whole college.

Motion Amended: In light of the inequity between the ratio of students to deans for each of the four campuses in the proposed Pathway reorganization, we move that all four campuses be allocated proportional leadership based on campus fte’s. (seconded)

Vote: 10 in favor, 7 opposed, 1 abstention; motion passed

2. Because TCC does not have a Professional Development Department and support to complete the e-portfolio requirements, use of the e-portfolio to complete summative evaluations will be optional.

Tabled – See chair report.

Collegewide Faculty Senate Chair Report

A. Update on CWFS Motions

1. That if faculty layoffs are anticipated, affected faculty be notified in writing when layoffs requests are sent to the VCCS. (September 2018)

Beth Lunde (AVP of Human Resources) responded, saying “Per our delegated authority agreement with the VCCS for human resource functions, we cannot provide any notification to affected faculty in writing until we have the Chancellor’s approval.” She provided the following excerpt from the VCCS: “Any lay-off of faculty or classified employees must be submitted to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resource Services in writing including all required documentation with reasonable time for a review and a timely **decision by the Chancellor prior to any communication with the local College Board or college employees.**” She also noted that she had spoken to Dr. DeCinque about the motion and that the President’s Cabinet would be sensitive to the spirit of our motion in the future, and provide notification as soon as possible.

2. Request to have the option for the VCCS phase retirement policy to be available to faculty at TCC. (May 2018)

Beth Lunde responded that she would explore this option. She gave the following information on NVCC’s use of phased retirement as well: “What I learned from NVCC is that they only had a few faculty take advantage of it. It turns out that employees must pay 100% of the health insurance premium without the State paying the State subsidy for health insurance under the pre-retirement workload reduction program. I think folks may be under the impression that the health benefits would be paid on a pro-rated basis equivalent to the percentage of the agreed upon contract (60% to 80%), but based upon information I received from our HR Consultant at the VCCS, that is not the case.”

3. Summative evaluations for 2018 shall consist only of the cumulative APPDPs for the evaluation period and the narrative; faculty usage of the E-Portfolio shall be optional. (September 2018)

Dr. Corey McCray responded on September 30th that “The eportfolio tool will remain optional for this academic year and will be revisited in 2019-2020.” He further indicated that he would inform the Deans of this change the week of October 1st and that I could announce to faculty after that had occurred.

B. Initiative Update: Advising

The Advising Implementation team held a WebEx meeting with the collegewide and campus Faculty Senate Chairs on September 10th to update us on the implementation plan. I sent an email to all faculty regarding this presentation on September 21st. After the college reopened from the hurricane Florence closure, the implementation team continued to gather feedback from other constituents. An updated plan has not been presented to the Faculty Senate and no confirmed implementation date has been provided.

C. Initiative Update: Ad Astra

Debbie Edson in the faculty representative on the Ad Astra committee. She provided the following update on September 28th: “In our meeting last week, we delved into the system to see what their patented algorithm will provide in terms of historical data and trending analyses. It was an overwhelming data snapshot, but I think we are beginning to

see the types of information they will provide us. It was stressed again that it is their job to provide data for us to then decide what to do with, i.e., that they are not the decision-makers. The degree audit still has not been completed, and it may be a month of more before that happens. We may not meet again until that occurs, so that we can see how the historical data and trending analyses plug into the algorithm to start creating some predictive analyses.”

D. Meeting with Dr. DeCinque and the campus and collegewide Faculty Senate Chairs.

The meeting occurred on September 25th. We discussed the academic reorganization and the need for a plan, or written description. We expressed some concerns about the reorganization, including size differences between pathways, Dean workload and travel between campuses, and the ability to give support to both students and faculty. Dr. DeCinque indicated that he is open to ideas about how to modify the plan. He also discussed the enrollment decline for Fall (roughly down 7% at the time of the meeting.) He plans to create a newsletter from the President’s office to disseminate information. We also discussed that the college’s planning for the year will be centered on Performance Based Funding metrics and that a new strategic plan would be developed by the next permanent President.

E. Employer Hiring Events-Distribution across campuses

The majority of the employer hiring events currently scheduled for Fall 2018 will be held at the Virginia Beach campus, with two scheduled for Chesapeake and none on Norfolk or Portsmouth. The Career Services Center (CSC) sends out information about these events. The senate chairs noticed the inequity of distribution and inquired about it. The CSC can only schedule events on the VB campus. Employers must contact the other campuses separately if they wish to hold hiring events there. The senate chairs asked that the contact information for the other campus offices be listed on the CSC Employer Services website, so that employers know up front whom to contact on other campuses to schedule events.

Chesapeake Chair Report

Chesapeake faculty senate passed one motion:

Faculty Senate request that faculty receive a minimum of thirty (30) days to review and respond to the faculty advising component of the faculty advising plan before it is finalized

Other issues that were addressed:

- IDS faculty seek to have their program moved to a Chesapeake based dean so that support comes from on-campus. This program is Chesapeake campus specific - all sections are taught on the Chesapeake campus and all equipment is housed there.
- Faculty expressed concerns regarding the proposed advising plans. In particular, student holds and workloads for faculty were both viewed as problematic.
- Faculty hosted Kurt Aasen and Kim Bovee October 1st to learn more about the PFM and its implications on the college. Faculty expressed an interest seeing disaggregated performance funding model data (i.e. pathway, program). The business pathway is now working with OIS to get more specific pathway data.
- Faculty continue to discuss and develop proposed recommendations regarding the administration reorganization/restructuring.
- Faculty are curious to learn the results of the “Great Colleges to work for” survey.

Updates:

- Faculty await word on the Adjunct evaluation plan and have concerns about adjunct scheduling under the new administrative structure.
- Faculty requested an update on TCC's enrollment and retention plan and await feedback from that request.
- Part of Whitehurst 2057 & associated kitchen may be repurposed for use as a food pantry – a collaborative project between campus administration, student government and Phi Theta Kappa.

Upcoming events

- Poverty Simulation – Wednesday, October 17th, 9am to noon, Chesapeake Bay Room
- Faculty have requested that the CAO schedule a campus visit for Q&A with faculty. We await a response.
- Chesapeake campus senate meeting - October 30, 2018 12:30 pm; Room 4202 (CAB)

Norfolk Campus Senate Chair Report - October 2018

Professional Development Funds

The following questions were discussed at the September 25 NFS meeting:

- Should certification fees and certification exam fees be funded? Some teaching positions have credentials that need to be updated (accounting, law, health professions, etc)
 - *The NFS agreed that Professional Development Funds should be permitted for all items listed above. However, if the credentials are **necessary** for the faculty member to teach in their given subject area these fees should (whenever possible) be paid for by the Pathway/Academic Area where the faculty member teaches. In terms of certification exams we recommend that they be reimbursed in the same manner as coursework - that the faculty member pay for the exam and be reimbursed after documentation is submitted indicating they have successfully passed the exam.*
- Should funds be able to be used for First aid (CPR, Mental Health first aid)
 - *Yes. A recommendation was made by a counselor that Mental Health First Aid be offered as a professional development opportunity to all faculty before Faculty Advising begins in 2019.*
- Should jury fees and shipping costs associated with exhibiting artwork in peer-reviewed exhibitions be funded? The College Art Association, the largest professional organization for higher education artists, considers this funding a best practice.
 - *Yes, as we consider peer-reviewed exhibitions as professional development.*

Performance Based Funding Sessions in Norfolk

- October 4, Thursday 5:00 – 6:00 PM, Student Center, 5th Floor, Multi-Purpose Room
- October 31, Wednesday 12:30 – 1:30 PM, Student Center, 5th Floor, Multi-Purpose Room
- At this time the NFS is not asking for another session to be scheduled in Norfolk.

Faculty Advising

Concerns & Questions

- Student holds at initial registration and 24 credit hours.
 - There are concerns that students will not even start at the college if the initial holds make getting their classes difficult. Additional concerns about needing to meet with faculty at the 24 hour mark.
 - Possible solution - no advising holds through spring 2021
- The ratio of faculty to student advisees.
 - Is the 28 to 1 number even possible (as some presentations have show as few a 3 to 1

and as large as 69 to 1 ratios in different pathways)

○ Is the 28 to 1 number based on any existing data?

○ No TCC data exists that can even give ballpark figures of the faculty time commitment.

● Although a timeline exists there is not a full implementation plan

■ Timing and extent of training

■ Confusion about when exactly faculty will first receive students

■ Confusion concerning how many students faculty receive at a time.

■ How students cycle in and out of a faculty advising placement - if a student

leaves/come back do they stay with faculty until the graduate? If they don't

graduate how is it determined that they move on?

● How do we quantify what is "fair and equitable" in terms of the number of advisees?

○ As the ratio of faculty to advisees is higher in general education/social sciences will

those faculty members end up with higher student loads? For example, health

professions had an ratio of 5 to 1, Manufacturing & Transportation 8 to 1, Maritime &

Skilled Trade 10 to 1. Social Sciences & Education as large as 75 to 1. While we may

be able to utilize faculty who teach in SEM (ratio approximately 9 to 1) to help advise

Social Science & Education faculty it is difficult to imagine faculty in the other three

pathways having the expertise to advise students in the Social Sciences and Education

pathway.

Pathways Redesign

As different campuses are proposing different modifications to the pathway model in order to address

issues concerning both faculty and students. We would like to recommend that a subcommittee be

created to meet during the month of October to bring a cohesive recommendation to the College

Faculty Senate Meeting in November. This committee would be comprised of no more than 2 faculty

members from each campus and they would be charged to review all of the proposals and motions

brought to the faculty senate in this academic year and work to create a recommendation to be

presented at the November meeting. The College Wide Meeting does not give the Senators enough

time to thoroughly vet proposals with their faculty nor make suggestions for modifications.

Portsmouth Chair Report

The Portsmouth Faculty Senate (PFS) meeting was held September 25, at 12:30 p.m. The Portsmouth Faculty Senate

passed the following motions:

- 1) That pathway deans and campus deans be required to complete onboarding training on best practices in leadership and scheduling, with significant input from faculty on training content.**
- 2) That TCC and, if needed, the principle investigator on the Achieving the Dream grant, formally provide the impetus for inequitable campus representation even though faculty from the unrepresented campuses inquired prior to the first wave of applications and funding.**
- 3) That TCC and, if needed, the principle investigator on the Achieving the Dream (ATD) grant, verifies that they were fully aware of the mission on ATD and still chose to move forward in a manner that excluded the campuses with demographics that specifically meet the mission of ATD.**
- 4) That TCC ensure that faculty and campuses who were affected by being excluded from this Achieving the Dream (ATD) grant will receive first priority for future ATD grant funding opportunities and that TCC put a policy in place regarding college-wide grants that increases transparency and equity (even if that means it is a**

relative equity based on the weighted population/FTE representation) to prevent this from happening in the future.

Interim Pathway Dean of Business, Nancy Prather-Johnson, was an invited guest. Nancy solicited feedback on whether the faculty felt they have clarity on the implementation of pathways and the reorganizational structure in terms of reporting lines, points of contact, and process. Following the chair report reviewing the Sept 2018 CWFS meetings, topics of discussion included the following:

- Faculty advising – The following advising recommendations were made:
 - New student orientations be modified to meet the needs of different subsets of students (e.g. first year students, transfer students)
 - Survey students to recommend orientation topics and session times
 - Permit students to waive their rights to attend orientation sessions
- While faculty understand the need for safety, faculty expressed issues with locked building doors near the parking entrances negatively affect students and faculty (especially those with disabilities). This was discussed with the Provost suggested adjustments and will investigate the use of card readers for faculty entry.
- Faculty discussed the need for onboarding/training for Pathway/Campus deans – ***Motion 1***
- Faculty informed of updates to handbook to address adjunct faculty promotions in rank with years of teaching and educational advances.
- Achieving the Dream Grant - Many faculty felt discontent regarding the fact that all applicants selected for this grant were from Chesapeake and Virginia Beach campuses. Why were Portsmouth and Norfolk faculty not properly advised on the criteria for this grant? Why were some faculty not selected despite submitting suitable application materials? Why was no one chosen for round two of selections or informed of the specific courses that needed to be assessed? - ***Motions 2-4***

Upcoming Meetings: October 26, 2018 at 12:30pm – Guest Speaker, Dr. Michelle Woodhouse
(Batten Center) November 23, 2018 at 12:30pm – Guest speaker(s), Curt Aasen and Kim Bovee

Virginia Beach Chair Report

The Virginia Beach Senate discussed the questions from the College Senate about the APPDP.

A date was set for Curt Aasen and Kim Bovee to present the Performance Metrics to faculty. (Nov. 8 during activity hour).

Dr. Summers will be invited to future VB Senate meetings, and Dr. DeCinque will attend the next VB Senate meeting on 10/25.

General Education Policies were discussed. The rubrics were described as extremely detailed. There is some concern about academic autonomy.

Health Science faculty hold faculty senate meetings to disseminate information in their discipline.

There are long waits for students to see counselors. Virginia Beach currently has fewer counselors than does the Chesapeake campus.

Current staffing for full-time and part-time counselors and advisors is as follows:

Chesapeake – 8

Norfolk – 6

Portsmouth – 7

VA Beach – 7

Total – 28

This is a dubious way of presenting data as part-time are not specified and can vary greatly in number of hours they work. Additionally, there is no differentiation between counselors and advisors.

Concerns about faculty advising were discussed.

The next CFAC meeting is Nov. 1.

Imbalances in the reorganization were discussed. As a result, motion 1 was brought forth.

Lack of support for faculty evaluations was discussed. As a result, motion 2 was brought forth.

MOTION 1 : In light of the inequity between the ratio of students to deans for each of the four campuses, we move that the Virginia Beach campus be allocated 3 campus deans as opposed to 1 campus dean.

	Norfolk	Chesapeake	Virginia Beach	Portsmouth
FTEs (as of Sept 5, 2018)	2120	2420	4955	2308
Deans (includes 1 campus dean)	3	3	4	3
Ratio of Students to Deans	2120 : 3 Reduces to 707 : 1	2420 : 3 Reduces to 807 : 1	4955 : 4 Reduces to 1239 : 1	2308 : 3 Reduces to 769 : 1
Proposed Ratio	No change	No change	4955 : 6 Reduces to 826 : 1	No change

- If we proceed with the structural reorganization of the college, we need to be certain to support and address the needs and concerns of our students. Under the proposed structure, students at the Beach campus will not have fair access to a dean. For the college to be at its best, each campus must be at their best.

- Each year a larger portion of our budget will be decided by performance-based metrics (PFM). In fiscal year 2018, 14% of our budget is to be decided by PFM, in fiscal year 2019, 16% will be from PFM. By 2020, 20% will be from PFM. The metrics primarily address student success and we need them to be successful; funding affects the whole college.

Motion 2: Because TCC does not have a Professional Development Department and support to complete the e-portfolio requirements, use of the e-portfolio to complete summative evaluations will be optional.

Adjunct Committee Report - College-wide Faculty Senate, 10-04-2018

Adjuncts did not propose any specific motions to the Adjunct Committee, but the following were the issues and concerns of the sent to the Adjunct Committee for review and consideration by the CWFS. **Additional members for the Adjunct Committee are being actively recruited and the hope is that we will have at least one member on the committee to represent each campus.**

1. **The proposal for the evaluation plan for adjuncts.** Some adjuncts have expressed opposition to using student grades and withdrawal rates as data in evaluating teaching effectiveness.
2. **The policy of “bumping” adjunct faculty from their courses for full-time instructors.** Does the TCC administration consider that students may have specifically signed up for a particular instructor after having had him or her for another course? Are schedules changed at times because full-time faculty do not “feel” like teaching at the time that was assigned to him or her?
3. **The computers at the Norfolk campus are too slow for effective use, particularly with elements of the newer text books.**
4. **Lack of communication regarding the lead person for the entire physical education staff.** A long-time adjunct teaching PE at the Norfolk campus also works for public school and teaches in the late afternoons for TCC and never sees anyone except security guards. The head administrator for this adjunct is in Virginia Beach and the adjunct is not able to attend daytime meetings due to public school teaching commitments. Who is the lead person for the entire physical education staff?
5. **The 60-hour required training course to teach online without compensation.** The course is 6 weeks with an 8-10 hour per week commitment. Some adjuncts have already had advanced graduate work in pedagogy and instructional design that are duplicated in the course. In addition, the time commitment is excessive for adjuncts who are working full-time jobs or completing doctoral coursework.
 - a. Is there an assessment tool that could be used to align training for online teaching with current skills or a prior assessment to see what instructors already know before launching them into a lengthy training program?
 - b. Is it possible to arrange a self-paced course that could be completed before the semester starts?
 - c. Many of the materials in the training course are from the 1990s. Why does the course not use current materials if the goal is to update credentials?
 - d. Is it possible to host one-day workshops (face-to-face or via webinar) for exchanging best practices among online instructors to learn from their experience what actually works in practice?
6. **Questions about the reorganization – this adjunct is asking for specific answers and is joined by others with the same questions:**
 - a. If an adjunct faculty member teaches at one campus, will they be assigned to a Campus Dean or an Academic Dean for their discipline at another campus? Who will make this determination? Will this individual be responsible for determining if the adjunct will continue teaching at TCC (e.g., contracted service)? What will be the criterion allowing for an adjunct faculty member to continue teaching if the enrollment is sufficient or above the baseline for enrollment?
 - b. If adjuncts are to be evaluated in a classroom teaching setting who will be the observer of their instruction? Will it be someone within their particular division, such as Humanities and Social Sciences?
 - c. Will the adjuncts be notified in advance who will conduct their in-class evaluation, will they know the evaluator's credentials and knowledge of the subject or discipline that is being taught?
 - d. What will be the outcome of any evaluation conducted by an adjunct faculty members' peer group or someone within the discipline or division? Will the Campus Dean or Academic Dean determine whether this faculty member will be approved?

The following comments were presented at the September meeting, but time ran short so they are being re-entered this month. (Note: they refer to the evaluation plan *VCCS Administrative and Professional Faculty Development, Evaluation, and Recognition Model Plan 2016* "which has since been updated with another proposal for adjunct evaluation, but the concerns remain the same.)

- It is not fair to elevate adjunct responsibilities without elevating adjunct pay. For example we are already restricted to teaching 12 semester hours a semester. We should be allowed to teach 9 semester hours, and be credited and paid for 3 semester hours when taking a required developmental course.
- It is wrong to expect a whole new layer of adjunct participation while academic and technical support is being laid off at unprecedented levels. Deans and department chairs are over-extended as is.
- **Adjuncts should not be held accountable to standards that are more stringent than those of full-time faculty - i.e. evaluating adjuncts on their grade distributions/delete & withdrawal rates.**

- Adjuncts who are full-time educators at local middle and high schools and adjuncts at TCC have already completed many of the educational requirements/professional development courses listed in the plan. They should be given credit for any and all education courses they already have taken.
- It is recommended that the issues listed above be addressed by the full TCC Faculty Senate before this plan is implemented. If this plan is implemented as written the number of adjunct faculty at TCC will drop dramatically putting further stress on the current limited number of full-time faculty and number of courses that can be offered at TCC. This in turn will result in further drops in enrollment and retention.
- The adjunct faculty at ODU already are paid more money than their counter parts at TCC and there are no certification requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Harris, History and Humanities Adjunct (TCC-P) for the Adjunct Committee