

## AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Approval of the minutes for January 17, 2013.
3. Updates:
  - a. Faculty accomplishment announcements
  - b. The Swink Award
  - c. The Trustee Award
  - d. Items (3) on email
  - e. Faculty Handbook Committee update
4. Interest in visit by President Lewis at the beginning of the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting
5. Items for report to the Board of Trustees:
  - a. Handbook
  - b. Curriculum
  - c. Task Forces - follow up of faculty involvement on VGOPS
  - d. Senate activity – Swink & Trustee awards (no names; just purpose)
  - e. Smoke-free/tobacco-free surveys
  - f. Faculty involvement in recruitment
  - g. Appreciation for co-investment in partial retirement benefits
  - h. Appreciation for faculty-Trustee social
  - i. OTHER??
6. Adjourn
7. Next regularly scheduled meeting: **March 21, 2013.**

## 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES APPROVED

## 3. UPDATES

- a. Minutes moved to end of meeting
- b. Swink Awards: Two candidates have been nominated with adequate evidence.
  - a. It's okay that one of the candidates is a recent award winner under current policy.
  - b. It's possible that we may want to create a policy where someone has won and they have to wait a number of years prior to being nominated again. This may be something worth debating in the future.
  - c. Another issue: It's rare that we have the opportunity to observe each other in the classroom. Should we push ourselves to come up with ways of insuring that we see more of clients in action.

For one of our nominees (who's also a chair), we need to find out who he or she will use for their second letter of support.

Letters of support due on February 28.

- c. The Trustee Award
  - a. Thus far, there's one candidate. That said, however, the deadline isn't until February 28<sup>th</sup>.

### Items (3) on email

First:

Would it be a good idea to require or more strongly encourage Departmental Chair positions to rotate amongst department members? This seems healthy to me in a number of ways. The main problem I could imagine would be that we likely wouldn't want the chair to rotate to new hires too quickly, so we could say something like this:

The chair position will rotate within each department every (\_\_\_) years, beginning with the department member (with the most seniority, as defined by \_\_\_\_\_), and including all department members who (are tenured? Or who have been at Catawba [or in academia?] for \_\_\_ years?). Any department member may initially decline to accept the position; in that case, it will be offered to the person next in line, and so on. If all department members decline the position, it will be re-offered to the current chair. If the current chair also declines, the first in line (who initially declined the position) will be expected to accept it. The next time that the chair rotates, it will be offered to the second (most-senior?) department member, and so on with each rotation.

Second:

About the partial restoration of retirement benefits: since the Faculty Senate is the body charged with keeping watch over faculty benefits, we might want to consider the following. The current, partial restoration of retirement contributions is based on the ability and willingness of the faculty member to match the hoped-for College contribution – in fact, I believe that the faculty member must *double* the amount that the college is willing to contribute. This is partially based on a change that the College made (unilaterally and mid-year) a few short years ago (perhaps as a cost cutting measure at the beginning of the recession? I can't find the pertinent emails). Before that change, the college simply made required contributions without requiring faculty members to pony up contributions. In other words, the current system, while better than nothing, is less robust than the older system in that anyone who cannot, or prefers not, to put part of their salary in the hands of TIAA-CREF will be denied this benefit. (Note: The decision to offer a *half match* up to 50% of the contracted benefit -- as opposed to a *full match* up to that same amount -- is also, of course, a less robust choice, even if the "matching framework" is accepted.)

That brings up these questions:

- 1) Was the recent change to a matching system somehow required by law, or simply a cost-cutting measure on the part of the College?
- 2) If it is merely a cost-cutting measure, was it intended to be permanent, or was it a temporary effort to ride out a period of reduced income?
- 3) Does Brien, being so new, *know* that the College's retirement plan has only recently required matching? Further, if that plan is only temporary, does he know that we should be aiming toward a full restoration of the true (non-matching) plan? Even further, do the Trustees remember that the previous plan was recently changed? Did the quick acceptance of partial restoration at the last Trustees meeting (which, Brien noted, involved no discussion) omit attention to this issue?

Third – a quickie:

Regarding possible changes in the College's structure, corporate culture, etc. If I'm remembering correctly, about a year ago, an outside consulting group based at Lenoir-Rhyne visited with a number of constituencies in the school, even holding meetings from which Deans and other administrative people were barred so that we might speak freely. My sense was that a lot of important things that needed to be said under those circumstances were in fact raised by a number of faculty members. My question is this: have we heard anything about the report that this group presumably sent us? I can't remember seeing anything about it. If we *have* seen the report, where can I find it? If we haven't – why not???

### **Discussion of Items**

#### 1 – Department Chair Rotation

We'll send this item to the Faculty Handbook Committee for consideration.

A related issue: course releases for department chairs. It seems like an inequitable policy and this is something that should be investigated. It may already be being investigated by the new President.

**Suggestion:** Conversation about course-release should probably be put on hold until we understand the new academic structure.

#### 2 – Retirement Benefits

Q: Does anyone know the answers to these questions? Were they required by law?

A: Possibly. It seems like Larry Farmer mentioned the old way we were doing retirement was against the law because it wasn't equitable. It's unclear, really. So, we need to check and get a clear explanation of what's happening with our retirement.

**Action:** We'll request Larry Farmer to explain in writing. If we're not satisfied, then we'll have him come in and explain.

### 3 – College Consultant Reports

The strategic planning committee received an oral presentation from the consulting group, not a document. It's likely that we'll hear more from this group's report when the President makes a decision on academic structure.

**Action:** That said, however, we should request an update from the President about the consulting group's report.

### **3.E HANDBOOK UPDATE**

Thus far, we haven't seen too many concerns about the new handbook. The largest concern is about requesting minutes from committee meetings could lead to issues with FERPA.

February 12 is the deadline for suggestions. We'll update you after that date.

### **5. ITEMS TO REPORT TO THE BOT**

- a. Handbook
- b. Curriculum
- c. Task Forces - follow up of faculty involvement on VGOPS
- d. Senate activity – Swink & Trustee awards (no names; just purpose)
- e. Smoke-free/tobacco-free surveys
- f. Faculty involvement in recruitment
- g. Appreciation for co-investment in partial retirement benefits
- h. Appreciation for faculty-Trustee social
- i. OTHER??

Comments:

Don't be too appreciative of retirement benefits because it's miniscule. We need a better commitment from the BOT.

### **ELECTRONIC DISTRIBUTION OF AGENDA**

Kim Smith is for it, but she's against doing both paper and electronic. Kim prefers electronic and it would be easier for her as well.

### **NEXT MEETING MARCH 21**

President will speak to us about BOT Report. We'll ask him to keep it brief because we're losing two meetings to community meetings and the awards ceremony. Maybe we should ask him to come at the end of the meeting instead of the beginning.

**ADJOURNMENT**