



Presentation/Proposal From

[Add Title Here]

Name: _____

Date: _____

Department: _____

Contact Information: _____

- ❖ Complete Items 1–8 to the best of your ability (see Instructions form for reference).
- ❖ If an item listed is not relevant to your specific presentation to College Affairs, please mark it *N/A*.
- ❖ E-mail the completed checklist to the College Affairs committee support specialist by the specified deadline.

1. PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL ABSTRACT (150–250 words)

2. TYPE OF PRESENTATION/PROPOSAL

- ☐ Information Item (requires approval of CA Chair)
- ☐ Action Item
 - ☐ Information and committee feedback
 - ☐ Procedure—*revision* (Attach current procedure with proposed changes highlighted using track changes.)
 - ☐ Procedure—*new* (Attach proposed procedure separately.)
 - ☐ Identify suggested location in *General Procedures Manual*: _____

- ☐ Policy—*revision* (Attach current policy with proposed changes illustrated with track changes)
- ☐ Policy—*new* (Attach proposed policy separately.)
 - ☐ Identify suggested location in *General Policy Manual*: _____
- ☐ Other: _____

3. BUDGET IMPACT

4. INSTRUCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS/IMPACTS

5. OPERATIONAL IMPACT

6. STUDENT IMPACT

7. ANTICIPATED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

8. MOTION TO BE RECOMMENDED

PROPOSAL FOR FACULTY SENATE

(Pilot year 2019-20)

PROPOSAL OUTLINE

1. **Context (page 2):** This section explains why the proposal is being presented at this time.
2. **Considerations and Challenges (page 3):** This section explores some of the challenges we hope to address in creating a new faculty committee. This section also include a discussion of our first attempt and its shortfalls
3. **Faculty Senate (page 5):** This section outlines the scope of responsibility, the membership, and the charge for the pilot year.

This proposal argues for the creation of a new faculty organization at Central Oregon Community College (COCC) and the restructuring of the existing Faculty Forum. The purpose of this paper is to present the rational and the general structure to pilot a Faculty Senate during the 2019-20 academic year with the intent to create a formal committee the following year. This proposal has been informed by:

Faculty input:

- Nov. 30, 2018: Full forum meeting and brainstorming session
- Jan. 25, 2019: Full Forum meeting and discussion of initial proposal
- Jan. 26 – Feb. 8, 2019: Survey open to all Full Time and Adjunct faculty
- March 15, 2019: all faculty meeting and discussion

Labor Management Committee (LMC)

- Jan. 25, 2019: discussion of initial proposal at LMC meeting
- March 8, 2019: discussion of proposal and recommendations for a pilot year Faculty Senate
- April 3, 2019: discussion of Faculty Senate draft and discussion of next steps

Faculty Forum Executive Committee (FFEC)

- October – November 2018 (FFEC committee members contacted various Community Colleges that were unionized, had promotion, and had a faculty governance body. Given that COCC is the only Community College in Oregon that has promotion recognized within our Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) we did not contact Oregon CC. Rather we had conversations with our counterparts at institutions including Leeward CC in Hawai'i and Truckee Meadows CC in Reno, NV.)
- Dec. 7, 2018 (review of Faculty brainstorming posters)
- Jan. 18 , 2019 (feedback on initial proposal)
- Feb. 15, 2019 (discussion of scope of responsibilities)
- March 1, 2019 (discussion of results from survey, discussion of ideas regarding broader faculty involvement)

TIMELINE:

- March – April 2019, finalize proposal and bring to various interest groups for information and feedback
- Early- Mid May elections to fill membership for the pilot year.
- End of Winter Term 2020, finalize formal proposal for the Faculty Senate to present to College Affairs for approval and addition to the GPM and Committee Matrix.

CONTEXT

SUMMARY

The Central Oregon Community College Faculty Forum has functioned in a dual capacity, as a bargaining unit and as a faculty organization. As a result of the July 2018 ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court, this dual role is no longer feasible.

- The forum will refocus as a dues-based bargaining unit, whose role is to guide contract negotiations and to maintain and support the agreement during the contract period.
- A new committee will assume the duties that were associated more with a faculty organization.

This document establishes a pilot year committee to determine the appropriate membership and scope of responsibility for a Faculty Senate.

IN MORE DETAIL

THE JANUS DECISION

The impetus for this proposal was the June 27, 2018 Supreme Court ruling in JANUS v. AFSCME (American Federation of State, Country, and Municipal Employees). This ruling overturned the 1977 Supreme Court decision that allowed unions to collect “fair-share” fees from non-members. According to labor laws, bargaining units must bargain for all employees in an identified category, yet not all employees support the political leanings of unions and did not want their dues to contribute to lobbying efforts that were contrary to their political perspectives. In order to accommodate the first amendment rights of those employees, and in recognition of the fact that unions were responsible for negotiating on behalf of all employees regardless of union membership, the 1977 Supreme Court recognized fair share fees. These fees were a percentage of the union membership dues intended to cover costs of collective bargaining for individuals who felt obligatory dues infringed on their free speech. The June 27, 2018 ruling has reversed this position and deemed fair share fees an unconstitutional infringement on first amendment rights. Unions for public employees had to immediately stop collecting fair share fees and allow members to withdraw their union membership.

THE FACULTY FORUM PRE-JANUS

The Central Oregon Community College Faculty Forum is the bargaining unit for all full-time and adjunct faculty at COCC. The Forum is not affiliated with any other regional or national union organization. In addition to functioning as the bargaining unit, the Forum has also functioned as a way to provide a faculty voice, in particular, as related to the COCC value of shared governance. The forum was the body through which faculty were elected to campus wide positions, it held regular meetings to discuss a variety of concerns, not all related to workplace issues covered by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). We held faculty socials, ran Q&A sessions for faculty to provide input on instructional leadership and college presidents, and otherwise provided an opportunity for faculty conversations. Most faculty would probably consider negotiations just one aspect of the Forum and one that only occurred every few years. All faculty who were hired or transitioned into adjunct or full-time status were automatically added to the Forum and dues were withdrawn. The CBA did have a fair share clause but this clause was rarely used.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FORUM IN A POST-JANUS WORLD

As a result of Janus, Forum membership is no longer automatic. The Forum now has authorization forms that affirm a faculty member's membership status and approval for monthly deduction of dues from their paycheck (dues are deducted from October through June each year). Once a faculty member signs the authorization form, membership and dues deduction will be renewed automatically each year as long as the faculty member is a full-time or adjunct member of COCC. The forum also provides for a revocation window (August 18-Sept 17 of each year) in which a faculty member can revoke their membership and dues deduction. These changes are specifically in relation to the bargaining unit function of the forum (It is important to remember that the bargaining unit represents all full-time and adjunct faculty regardless of Forum membership). While this has addressed the immediate requirements resulting from Janus, there are more problems remaining. Specifically, the Forum, a dues-based membership organization, has significant non-CBA related functions which contribute to any individual faculty member's ability to succeed and advance in their jobs. For example, our promotion system requires college service and most committee positions are filled via Forum election.

The Forum is responsible for negotiation of the CBA and monitoring college and faculty adherence to CBA. This role does not encompass decision-making or advocate the specific ways in which articles of the CBA are implemented (unless so identified in the CBA). As a Collective Bargaining Unit, the Forum exists outside of the College Committee Structure. Forum leadership and constitution will need to be reworked to reflect the changes resulting from the reorganization. This discussion will occur within the membership and does not need campus wide input or approval as it exists outside of the college structure.

Clearly, the Forum can no longer function as both the bargaining unit and as a gathering for faculty discussion of everyday work issues, policies, and procedures. While the Forum will need to be restructured to focus on the negotiation of and adherence to the CBA, we must also provide a non-dues based organization to provide faculty discussion and input and to ensure that faculty have a place in the system of shared governance at the college.

CONSIDERATIONS AND CHALLENGES FOR THE NEW FACULTY COMMITTEE

Over the course of the Fall 2018 and Winter 2019 terms, the Faculty Forum and the Faculty Forum Executive Committee have worked to develop a committee structure that would advocate for faculty at COCC and would provide a clear pathway for discussion of and changes to faculty evaluation, professional improvement, sabbaticals, promotions, and tenure. In exploring these options, we also identified some of the challenges we wanted this new committee to address:

CHALLENGE 1: CONFUSION AS TO WHICH ENTITY "OWNS" POLICY AND PROCEDURE RELATED TO FACULTY EVALUATION, PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT, SABBATICALS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE.

Historically, COCC's instructional administration has been relatively stable. Vice Presidents for Instruction (as well as other high-level administrators) often occupied their positions for a decade or more. This, along with the relatively small size of the full-time faculty often resulted in practices that emerged from precedent and were not formalized. When the instructional administration's office began experiencing high turnover, in the absence of clearly defined procedures, each VPI brought their own interpretation into play. This resulted in a patchwork of practices and in some cases inertia as groups struggled to identify where to direct proposals and who and how to get approval. For instance, in the past, Chairmoot developed and approved changes to the ARA format, Chairmoot also initiated a restructuring of PIRT that had implications for how promotions and tenure assessed PIP plans in faculty files; changes to student evaluations have emerged variously from eLearning (before it was eLearning),

Charmoot, the VPI, and Faculty Forum. In some cases, Forum voted on these changes while at other times the changes were implemented without a vote in Forum.

CHALLENGE 2: CLARITY IN COMMUNICATION BETWEEN COMMITTEES THAT FOCUS ON FACULTY EVALUATION, PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT, SABBATICALS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE.

There are currently a variety of committees that address different pieces of faculty evaluation, professional improvement, sabbaticals, promotion, and tenure. These include; Charmoot (ARA, Peer Teams, student evaluations, Designated Evaluators who write letters in support of promotion, and tenure), Promotions Committee, Tenure Committee, and PIRT (Professional Improvement and Sabbatical). Charmoot is an administrative committee while the others are advisory committees yet each does work that has ripples into the other committees. For instance, a change in how the student evaluations are implemented has implications for the Promotions and Tenure committees. Often changes that are implemented are not clearly communicated to all invested groups.

CHALLENGE 3: A PLACE TO DISCUSS WORK PLACE ISSUES THAT INFLUENCE FACULTY WORK AND PERFORMANCE BUT ARE NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO FACULTY EVALUATION, PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT, SABBATICALS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE.

Historically, the Forum has provided the venue to discuss work place issues not directly related to the CBA. For instance, Kathy Walsh (former VPI) would come to FFEC and the Full Forum to discuss expectations of office hours, and on campus presence during the week. At one point Shirley Metcalf, as interim President, came to the Forum to address faculty concerns about CPS practices. If the Forum can no longer provide this function (as not all faculty are members), then we need a formalized place for these kinds of issues to be brought to faculty. Additionally, Faculty have identified the systematic documentation of course, program and Gen Ed assessment along with Annual Program Reviews, advising, travel to northern campuses, online and hybrid instructional challenges, and other non CBA related issues as having significant impact on our abilities to complete our primary assignment. Currently, discussions about these concerns take place within individual departments and diverse administrative and advisory committees. We need to have a more centralized and formalized place for these discussions and a way to better facilitate creative management of these concerns.

CHALLENGE 4: A SYSTEMATIC WAY TO COLLECT RESOURCES FOR FACULTY IN A SINGLE LOCATION

As our campus has grown and as different groups have created various forms, resources and procedures (from sick leave forms to PIRT final report forms, to the Peer Evaluation Handbook) faculty have struggled to know where to find relevant information. This has been further compounded by the transition to the intranet as some things are public while others are on the intranet.

CHALLENGE 5: ENSURE BROAD FACULTY INPUT AND ENGAGEMENT

A challenge all committees face on this campus is communication. For this new committee, the challenge will be how to ensure broad faculty engagement given our faculty numbers have increased and we are located on multiple campuses. The pilot membership for the Senate is based on a representational model, where different segments of faculty elect their representative. This is to help ensure that members to the senate recognize their responsibilities to represent the interests and concerns of their constituents.

FIRST PROPOSAL: FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

According to the Shared Governance Handbook (<https://www.cocc.edu/committees/college-affairs/shared-governance-work-group/files/shared-gov-handbook-june-2018.pdf>) there are three types of committees at COCC:

1. **Policy:** Committees with the authority to recommend policy, within their scope of responsibility, to the President. These committees implement current policies and procedures and plan for the future.
2. **Advisory:** Committees which provide guidance and recommendations to a specific entity of the college (such as Instructional Administration, Instructional Technology, etc.).
3. **Administrative:** Committees responsible for the various aspects of day-to-day administration of College policy and practice.

Currently there are three policy committees: College Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Student Affairs. The FFEC initially proposed the creation of a fourth policy committee, Faculty Affairs. We felt that by adding a fourth policy committee, we would have a clear trajectory by which various advisory groups tasked with faculty evaluation (i.e. promotions, tenure, and PIRT) can forward proposals for changes to their practices. At the time we worried that an advisory committee would not address our first and primary challenge and would thus continue to contribute to our patchwork approach and overall inertia as groups struggle to identify where to direct proposals and who and how to get changes approved.

However, as we received more feedback from different groups we re-evaluated the pros and cons of a policy committee model. While this model would provide a good structure for addressing challenges 1&2 and potentially 4, it did not address challenge 3 (as policy committees tend to be reactive rather than proactive) and could even make broad faculty engagement more difficult (challenge 5). In addition, administrators expressed concern that this committee would play more of an advocacy role than is intended for this type of committee. Other administrators worried that this would set precedence for other interested groups to develop their own policy committees and would change the committee distribution and ultimately change the purpose of policy committees. As a result, we returned to a faculty senate model that would create a new advisory group.

FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate model has the potential to address all 5 challenges.

- Challenge 1&2: Provides clear trajectory for decision-making and communication (see Appendices A&B)
- Challenge 3: We can be proactive in raising and discussing faculty-related issues including those not directly related to faculty evaluation, promotion, tenure, professional improvement and sabbatical
- Challenge 4: We could potentially create and maintain an intranet page with links to all relevant forms and resources. We could also explore the possibility of revamping the Faculty Forum Blackboard shell.
- Challenge 5: Advisory committees membership is primarily determined by the needs of the interest group it serves and as such faculty have better options for developing membership to ensure broad faculty engagement

SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITIES

This committee would act as the primary interface between faculty and the college administration. This committee would also facilitate and streamline decision-making in relation to faculty evaluation, promotions, tenure, professional improvement, and sabbaticals, and facilitate communication across the campus community on faculty-related issues.

PRIMARY FUNCTIONS:

- Act as the main clearinghouse/review committee for all policy and procedure related to faculty evaluation, professional improvement, sabbaticals, promotion, and tenure; specifically those outlined in the faculty policies and faculty procedures sections of the GPM (G-34). Proposed changes to the G-34 section would have to go through the senate before going to College Affairs for approval.
- Provide a forum to discuss issues relevant to faculty primary and secondary assignments (for example, discussions about faculty travel, support for online courses, or discussions about Chair and program director load). Proposals that emerge from these discussions would be forwarded to the appropriate college entity for consideration (see attached Appendix B for guidance).
- Initiate task forces or work groups, accept recommendations from committees or refer matters to other committees as appropriate.
- Run elections to fill faculty positions on campus committees, appoint members to work groups and task forces.
- Be responsible for communication across the campus community on faculty-related issues.
- Maintain a centralized faculty resource site.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND OVERLAP WITH OTHER COMMITTEES

See flow chart – Appendix A

See attached committee responsibility matrix – Appendix B

PILOT YEAR MEMBERSHIP

For the pilot year, we will work with a representational model for membership in which faculty are elected by predetermined clusters. Each Senate member should recognize that their role on the committee is to represent their particular group's interests. The direct election helps reinforce this relationship and reminds both the member and the electing bodies of their responsibility to their constituents.

NOTE: The membership is intended to apply to the pilot year only; during the pilot year, the committee will propose membership models for the Faculty Senate.

Pilot year membership	
CTE- 1 (NIR, BUS/AV, CIS)	Elected by faculty in NIR, BUS/AV, CIS
CTE - 2 (AH, NUR, CUL)	Elected by faculty in AH, NUR, CUL
TRF- 1 (SCI, MTH, HHP)	Elected by faculty in SCI, MTH, HHP
TRF-2 (SocSci, WLC, HUM, FAC)	Elected by faculty in SocSci, WLC, HUM, FAC
RMP (faculty who, at time of nomination have taught ½ load in one or more RMP campuses during the academic year)	Elected by faculty
DEV (faculty who teach dev MTH, dev WR, or Human Development)	Elected by faculty
ADJ/PT	Elected by ADJ/PT faculty
Forum representative	Appointed by FFEC
VPI or Instructional Administrator	Appointed by VPI

RATIONAL FOR THE PILOT YEAR MEMBERSHIP

- This model is based on the idea that different groups of faculty have different interests, concerns, and challenges, thus we chose to organize clusters that would represent common interests and concerns.
 - We included a RMP representative and a developmental representative.
 - We divided the CTE and Transfer clusters in groups that we felt had overlapping interests and teaching issues (we realize this is imperfect) rather than according to number of faculty.
 - There are departments (Social Science, CIS, and BUS for instance) that have a blend of CTE and Transfer programs. The Pilot year committee will need to keep this in mind in evaluating membership for the Faculty Senate.
 - The pilot year committee will need to evaluate this system to determine if it best fits our faculty needs.
- At a minimum, there should be 7 faculty members – 1 member would be the chair, 1 member represents ADJ/PT, and the remaining 5 members would liaison with one of the follow advisory committees (Promotion, Tenure, PIRT, RSC, TLC).
- Given that the Senate will discuss issues that have CBA implications, the FFEC representative will help identify and guide those discussions to ensure that the bargaining agreement is not compromised.
- The VPI or Instructional administrator provides broader context for discussions within the senate.

CHARGE FOR THE 2019-2020 PILOT YEAR

The goal of the pilot year is to determine the best way to ensure faculty discussion and input on important decisions relevant to faculty. During the pilot year, the Senate should consider the following issues:

1. **Evaluate the Senate membership.** Does the membership model as laid out in the pilot accurately represent the diverse interests, concerns, and challenges of the COCC faculty? For instance, should the senate also include ABS (Adult Basic Skills) Faculty?
2. **Establish terms and duties for members.** For instance the committee will need to think about the role of the Chair: Is the Chair elected by faculty (as is the president of the Forum) or should the Chair be selected from one of the members (as is practice for most other college committees)? The committee may also want to consider a stipend for the Adjunct/Part Time representative.
3. **Review and assess the scope of responsibilities,** and develop appropriate procedures and practices (formal proposal for committee should be prepared for review by end of Winter 2020)
4. **Develop some means of disseminating and centralizing information** (intranet presence, meeting agendas/minutes, forms, etc)
5. **Develop specific ways to encourage faculty engagement** and to ensure faculty voice. Some suggestions include reinstating a “Lunch” series (along the lines of College Hour during the 90s and early 2000s) that would be focused on outreach, discussion, research, and problem solving.