



FEDERATION OF
HIGHER EDUCATION
FACULTY AND
PROFESSIONALS
AFT-IFT / AFL-CIO



ELGIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION Senate Meeting on Nov. 4, 2009

Sarah Dye, President, presiding

Elizabeth Becker	Dave Lawrence
Rick Bonnom	Marcia Luptak
Bill Demaree	Luis Martinez
Sarah Dye	Shawn Mikulay
Sue Ford	Gary Norden
Clark Hallpike	Howard Russo
Cindy Hutman	Manuel Salgado
Crystal Kerwin	Nicole Scherger
Dan Kocher	Scott Vaszily

Absent: Beverly Augustine, Sumitra Duggirala, Linda Hefferin, Tim Kaar, Mary Peterhans

Meeting called to order by Sarah Dye at: 3:03 p.m.

Guests: Brooke Transue regarding Administrative Effectiveness Project

Secretary's Report: Cindy Hutman

Marcia Luptak moved to approve the minutes from Oct. 21 with corrections. Howard Russo seconded.
Approved. 1 Abstention.

Treasurer's Report: Linda Hefferin

On back page of agenda. Accepted.

President's Report: Sarah Dye

Page 3: Sarah Dye's goal is make us as knowledgeable as she is regarding parking, constructions, etc.
We lost the overflow parking at old golf course.

Let Sarah Dye know when we get our IFT ID cards.

The Open House regarding the Master Plan is from 3-5 in UBC. All floor plans will be there as well as the architects. The design for the two new Renner buildings is very interesting--one of early projects. The far building will be done first, then one closer to campus done second. Plan for overflow for upper SRC if that isn't done in time. Included in the President's report is the minutes from meetings with all faculty groups. Sarah Dye hopes that faculty feel they have been heard. She will continue to put information into her report. Sharon Konny will give updates as it goes along. Shawn Mikulay asked why is the greenhouse going away? Sarah Dye said that it is not going away. Biology wanted a greenhouse or pavilion. Elizabeth Becker said they want to keep a working greenhouse on campus. If the current one goes away, they need a substitute. They have gone round and round about what will happen. Nothing has been decided. When they move, the greenhouse will be far away from where the faculty are. They have botany, environmental, etc., so the

need some green area. However, there is nothing in the design to be attached to their new facility in the Health Careers Center. Architects and planners do seem to understand that biology faculty have a need for a greenhouse. Jim Resser is very supportive.

Sarah Dye pointed out that it is three years before anything happens to biology. The whole point is that we need to give ideas because in the past, big decisions have been made before we get to give input.

Elizabeth Becker said that they made a lot of progress in the meeting on Friday. They did feel they were heard on some things that weren't being registered before. One issue that they seem to have problems understanding is that the bulk of their students are NOT health sciences students, so we need to serve the $\frac{3}{4}$ of the population that are not health sciences students.

Sue Ford wanted to add to the steering committee adjunct faculty meeting report a comment in her own report that shocked her. Vince Pelletier said that non-union adjuncts are not required to have office hours at all. So she wants to know why they are being assigned to office space. She believes that holding office hours is part of the job of teaching. Telling non-unit faculty they don't have to serve their students is appalling.

Elizabeth Becker said that she noticed on page 4 of the President's report that there is no one from biology on the health careers interior committee. Biology has 1/3 of the building—entire 2nd floor.

Sarah Dye said she is aware of this problem.

1st Vice President's Report: Luis Martinez

.No report.

2nd Vice President's Report: Sue Ford

No report. There is no new information about who is eligible for insurance. Sue Ford is dealing with inequities in pay for unit vs. non-unit. She reported that the new file cabinets are in the two new adjunct offices. However, that still doesn't give them enough drawers. We are getting more for the SRC room but no room for them in the ATC room. She sent out e-mails to those assigned to those rooms to get keys for the drawers. They did meet regarding sub pay and where able to fix that article of the contract. Adjuncts get sub-pay or own rate whichever is higher. Some deans think it is optional to switch to overload if subbing long-term. Must explain to the deans that this is not optional, it is new contract language. There is dues confusion. She is getting e-mails from adjuncts regarding dues. Confusion is because of change to new system.

Sarah Dye asked if it is worth sending out an e-mail to explain this.

3rd Vice President's Report: Dave Lawrence

See attached.

Committee Reports:

Academic Policy: Dawn Munson

See attached. Statement at the end that things are working smoothly this year.

Academic Computing: Mary Peterhans

No report.

Achieving the Dream: Sarah Dye and Linda Hefferin

Coordinators will get an e-mail from the team because the meeting for coordinators didn't go as well as we had hoped it would go. The e-mail will include an apology.

Alliance for College Readiness: Alison Douglas

See attached.

Amendments Committee: Dan Kocher

Mission completed.

Assessment Committee: Shawn Mikulay

No report.

BOT Finance Committee: Linda Hefferin

See attached.

Branding Committee: Tim Kaar

Suspended for the time being.

Communication Liaison: Gary Christenson

No report

COPE: Ron Kowalczyk
No report.

Curriculum Committee: Maureen Lange
No report.

Elections: Bill Demaree
No report.

Faculty Development: Beth Santell
All group proposals done, all three approved for some amount.

FAV's: Dan Kernler
No report.

GIST: David Burke
No report.

Grievance: Howard Russo and Sue Ford
Sue Ford announced that there is a counseling problem they are addressing. They will be filing a grievance because the Dean of Students is giving faculty work to non-unit faculty.
Load agreement is resolved. In fact, the dean in that area seems to be going over-board in the opposite direction.

Humanities Center: David Burke
No report.

Insurance: Sarah Dye and Howard Russo
No report.

IT: Tim Kaar, Dan Kocher and Sarah Dye
Committee on hold

Learning Communities (Steering): Alison Douglas
See attached.

MAGIC: Joyce Fountain
No report

Membership: Tim Anderson
See attached.

Negotiations: Luis Martinez
No report.

Sentinel: Bill Demaree
See attached.

Scholarship: Steve Trail
Sarah Dye reported that this committee is being put back together. Steve Trail has some ideas he wants to bring to us before spring semester.

Sick Bank: Ellie Swanson
.No report.

Strategic Planning Committee: Phil Garber and Elizabeth McNulty
See attached.

Student E-mail Rollout: Time Kaar and Dan Kocher
Charge is completed.

VP for TLSD Search: Roger Ramey
No report. Advertisement to be released on Monday.

Webmaster: Tim Kaar
No report.

Other Committees

Special Orders

Consent Agenda: *Committee Approvals Requested:*

1. **Radiology FT Faculty Member Search Committee:** Arturo Vazquez (MAGIC rep)
2. **VP for TLSD Search Committee:** Roger Ramey (Chair); Alice Biggers; Marcia Luptak
3. **ECCFA Scholarship Committee:** Steve Trail; Marilyn Binda; Beverly Augustine, Marc Healy
4. **Civility Initiative Committee:** Bill Demaree

Sarah Dye reported that on the VP search committee, each unit has only two representatives, Roger

Ramey doesn't count as a faculty representative because he is co-chair. This is a smaller committee with fewer tiers. The proposal in the consent agenda gives us a full-time and part-timer faculty member on the committee. President Sam decided he wanted a smaller committee this time. Rose Digerlando is co-chair from administration. On the Scholarship Committee we have traditionally had two faculty from the transfer area and two from the career tech side. Civility Committee request came from students, actually. Dr. Cowles will chair.

Dan Kocher moved to accept this as a consent agenda. Luis Martinez seconded. Approved
Manuel Salgado moved to approve the consent agenda. Sue Ford seconded. Approved.

Old Business

Brooke Transue is here to report on previous work on administrative effectiveness initiative. About 20 years ago, Dr. Heath along with the faculty senate were interested in developing an administrative evaluation tool. She was willing to work on this aside from her work at the college. Gathered information from the key groups about what they wanted to know about administrative performance. She provided a synopsis of the study. There was a small n at first. We developed a home-grown instrument. This is only done when committees want specific data. It included a questionnaire to be given to administrators. Originally ran in two cycles. She listed the categories that were included on the original questionnaire. Each one of eventual 33 administrators, had a whole cadre that were going to evaluate them. Committee and administrators identified supervisees, supervisors, peer group, outside individuals (community). Questionnaires were distributed. The last run was done in 1992, 1001 questionnaires went out 600+ came back. Each individual received back a manual with a whole profile of their assessments. They were evaluated on performance but respondents also assessed how important a particular function was to them. The original tool was very complex, customized to this institution. She turned over the data to Dr. Hood at NIU who ran statistics on the material. Got a really nice manual back for each administrator. Got back scattergrams so they could see where their strength was. Ran two full year cycles with a pilot. The committee stayed in contact with Senate and Dr. Heath's office. Afterwards, they conducted three workshops to meet with the different groups to help them understand the reports. They also linked the Myers-Briggs to some of the information from the study. Was well-received. A very nice piece of work. Very time-consuming project. It was customized. There are other 360 instruments that she uses. Do those because the factors line right up with the kinds of things typically companies and institutions want to know, including the 5 dimensions of managing people, leadership, communication, managing processes, costs, etc. On most of these instruments, administrators can rate themselves, cohorts can rate them, supervisees, supervisors can rate them. The response is on a Likert scale from nothing to outstanding. The one she read from is one she uses quite often. She turns the data into a Chicago company who do the analysis. Then she gets a profile book back. There are also five worksheets in the manual that will help with improvements.

Sue Ford asked what the consequences were.

Brooke Transue said the results were used for professional development. She and others were asked to come in and facilitate workshops for improvement. It turned out to be a real growing experience for administrators, particularly for the VP level and for administrators that deal with the community.

Sarah Dye commented that we have a larger group now.

Brooke Transue said we would need to decide who we want to assess. Originally we ran a pilot on a small group. We took this group through the whole process to catch glitches. NIU folks helped with explaining the statistics.

Sue Ford asked how much it cost.

Brooke Transue said it was very expensive

Sarah Dye asked if we want to get a small committee together to get a proposal together to take to administration. We need their agreement to pay for this.

Brooke Transue said we have so many more people in administration. She suggested we start in small areas and to have a goal over a period of a few years of evaluating everyone we want to evaluate. Don't do everyone all at once.

Sarah Dye asked if Brooke Transue would be available to help us get going on a proposal.

Brooke Transue said she would be available. She has done many of these for the state of

Illinois, governor's office, local hospitals, school districts, private companies.

Howard Russo asked if this type of evaluation is popular.

Brooke Transue said the 360 instruments are very popular to evaluate and help people grow in their jobs. They aren't just linear instruments. It is not just the supervisor evaluating the supervisee.

Sarah Dye asked for volunteers for a committee to work with Brooke Transue on getting a proposal going. Included in the planning needs to be figuring out who to present it to.

Sue Ford asked if the number-crunching would be done in-house.

Sarah Dye said no but we need administration to buy into it.

Sue Ford asked if we need to figure out who and why before we go forward.

Sarah Dye suggested that would be the committee's job.

Sue Ford asked who brought it up in the first place.

Luis Martinez said he did originally.

Sue Ford asked what made your constituents bring it up?

Luis Martinez said he doesn't know why it came up. The person just asked why we weren't doing this anymore.

Dan Kocher said this type of evaluation was very helpful for industry where some believe their job is just listening to supervisor and pass along the word to supervisees. Often they don't realize that they have to communicate and get peers and supervisors to listen as well as supervisees.

Brooke Transue said this 360 concept comes from the last 20 years in participatory management styles, where companies have people working in teams so perception and input are very important.

Dave Lawrence said this is very common in Engineering firms where many departments have conflicting goals.

Clark Hallpike said that in industry they often form cross-functional teams also and these teams have to learn to work together. 360 instruments really help those involved understand the nature of the relationships.

Sarah Dye said we don't have to form a committee to do a formal presentation. If we want, she can just float the idea with Dr. Sam and the VP's.

Clark Hallpike suggested that we need to have our ducks in a row before we do that.

Sumitra Duggirala asked if Brooke Transue's company is the only company that does this type of work.

Sarah Dye said we aren't even to the point of vetting companies yet. We just invited Brooke because of her involvement in the past. ECC seems really enamored with nationwide survey instruments so they may want to go outside the area completely.

Brooke Transue said that when faculty originally approached administration the proposal was declined. They then met at her office and understood that she is very discrete and the data would be kept confidential.

Sue Ford said why do we even want to suggest it. What is our motivation to do this?

Shawn Mikulay asked if it was enough to just promote professional development.

Sarah Dye said we needed to think about going into negotiations a year from now. If we propose an administrative evaluation at this time, would we be sending the wrong message to administration. Do we want to table and bring it back next time? Do we want to bring to constituents?

Sue Ford said that all faculty will want to evaluate their administrators.

Howard Russo said that our administration is going to change in the next year with a new VP's interim deans will go back.

Clark Hallpike said that by the time the new process gets into place, new people will be there.

Rick Bonnom said that we will always be in transition.

Sarah Dye asked how long will it take to get set up, budget-wise? We wouldn't be able to count on monies from this year's budget. We do budgets in March so we would have to get into the next budget cycle.

Sue Ford said that even if we got it started now, it would take a year before there would be actual paper around the campus.

Brooke Transue said that if the ground-work was laid and the committee decided which instrument to use and which factors, etc. it would take 6-9 months to implement. She believes that members of the administration are aware of the 360 instruments and the value of using these.

Sarah Dye said that she has no clear sense of what we want to do.
Luis Martinez said that we can table it and think about it and bring it back next time.
Sue Ford if the aggregate report was stellar, the administration could use it to promote the college.
Dan Kocher asked if we know for sure administrators are not being evaluated.
Howard Russo said it is not being done.
Luis Martinez moved to table the discussion of administrator evaluation. Dan Kocher seconded.
Approved.

New Business

End of semester party. Lonnie Keeler has been e-mailing Sarah Dye for information about a party for some time now. Administrators decided on Dec. 11, but have not chosen a location, yet. Try not to do it on the same day. Sarah Dye asked us to decide if we want a party and if we want to form a committee.
Sarah Dye asked specifically if we want an end of semester event? The consensus was yes
Howard Russo mentioned that would be the end of our food drive also
Sarah Dye said that Dan Kernler needs to be notified.
Luis Martinez said he was thinking about the same place, Carmina's.
Sue Ford said it was not as roomy for winter since we couldn't be out on the patio.
Luis Martinez said they have a big room inside. He will check with Carmina's.

Division Issues

Howard Russo moved to adjourn. Rick Bonnom seconded. Adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Lucinda Hutman, ECCFA secretary

1700 Spartan Drive Elgin, Illinois 60123-7193 FAX (847) 622-3060