Job Specs Committee Minutes - February 20, 2006

I. Nominations
II. Meeting Times, Schedules, Agenda
III. Professional Certification
IV. Items to Discuss
V. Agenda
VI. Agenda for Next Meeting

Job Specs Committee Minutes – March 27, 2006

I. Meeting called to order:
II. Meeting Minutes
III. Agenda
IV. Adjournment

Job Specs Committee Minutes - February 20, 2006

I. Nominations
- Barry Mead agreed to chair committee temporarily until someone else is found
- Lolita Reyes will serve as Recorder

II. Meeting Times, Schedules, Agenda
- Agreed to discuss Schedules and best time to meet later in meeting
- Setting agenda suggested: Why are we meeting? What are we discussing? What are we going to do? What will we succeed at this semester?
  - Review all old Job Specs; more specifically, identifying the job description so there is a better connection to workload and the evaluation process.
  - Review a set of job descriptions relative to non-instructional faculty, and look for the similarities that will help us illustrate a non-instructional faculty
  - Separate teaching responsibilities from non-instructional faculty responsibilities (p. 103)
  - How do you determine what a full load is? Hours? Students?

III. Professional Certification
- During negotiation of the new contract, it was determined that Professional Certification would be revisited when the Job Specs Committee convened. Not clear if this should be handled by a subcommittee?
- Certifications bound by 2002 Guide
- Certifications are currently capped at two for compensation purposes.
- Withhold review of Professional Certifications until after review of Job Specs.

IV. Items to Discuss
- Do not go over instructional component, focus on Job Specs and implement changes to Job Specs first.
- Revisit credit part and make adjustments there first.
- Revisit professional rank minimum requirements, especially after their Master's, because the equivalency of what is being asked is a Doctorate. There are not two categories (Doctorate and Masters) – Category #2 under Associate Professor's.
- Current requirements are preventing GCC from hiring good people who have the experience elsewhere
- Do the requirements also make it harder for current instructors to move up in the ranks?
- Job Specs have been cleaned up so there is a clear difference between what is required of an instructor versus an assistant instructor.
- Assistant Professor requirements too tight, lost good people during recruitment
- UOG recruits at the Instructor/Assistant Professor level, internal movement from Assistant Professor

- HR only certifies at the minimum requirements, next level to go to search committee, get input from faculty within different departments
- Should HR certify only minimum requirements and then have a promotion committee determine if they get to be an Assistant Professor.
- Consider what the needs of the college will be in the future
- When corrections are made, need to identify what the cascading effect will be on other areas
- Quality of instruction needs to be maintained at a high level
- Anticipating that Math and Science positions will need to be filled soon, and there may be a problem bringing in people at levels and compensating them appropriately
- In comparison to others, candidate pool is very different, but not out of line
- Minimum requirements for faculty is very different from DOE system
- Over past four years, minimum requirements for Assistant Professor has impacted our ability to recruit
- Couple issues in addition to the Job Specs; greatest issue has nothing to do with the rank, but the money. Look at different areas without having to give up what has been established in terms of quality?

V. Agenda
- Address the non-teaching faculty specs
- Streamline the different ranks
- Revise illustrative examples of work (separating teaching and non-teaching)
- Educational requirements
- Incorporate language regarding teaching concerning the mission of the College and language that ties into technology and general education goals
- Include assessment and include in IFP
- Reword some of the language (p. 103 too wordy)
- Revision to illustrate samples of work, every level to include assessment, curriculum issues
- Another issue is time – minimal amount of money in Professional Development
- Catalog needs to reflect more instructor levels
- Teaching and advising – practice what they preach
- Focus on classroom instruction/assessment
- Have College offer institutional support to take classes
- Employees of the College/spouse not have to pay tuition? What will College fund?
- Need to focus on salary structure without having to give up quality. Salary issue is long overdue.
- Increase job specs by 20% -- something has to give time/money? Office hours increase?
- We need more faculty, we need more money, we need to be more systematic

VI. Agenda for Next Meeting
- Review handouts from Karen

- Start work on illustrative examples of work
- Separating the teaching and non-teaching and different categories in non-teaching
- Have proposals to work with
- Next Meeting: March 27, 2006 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Subsequent Meeting: April 10, 11, & 12 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Proposal to Dr. Rider will be submitted by Barry

Job Specs Committee Minutes – March 27, 2006

I. Meeting called to order: March 27, 2006 at 10:40 a.m.

II. Meeting Minutes
- Item III (Professional Certification), second bullet will be updated to indicate: National Guide to Professional Certification
- Format (bullet points) approved, with the understanding that everyone has the opportunity to review in detail and make corrections and clarifications at the next meeting

III. Agenda
- Need uniformity in Job Specs and to differentiate between Instructional and Non-Instructional (ex. Enrollment Services – standardize and maintain consistent verbage)
- Need to be clear about separating job description and evaluation:
- Problem with evaluations -- need to provide descriptions of what they do? What is goal, impact, outcome? How do you annotate it in a work load sheet and evaluate it? Need to determine what is appropriate for each area
- Define job description first before we define workload – may have to expand to have more options of illustrative examples
- Look at what teaching responsibilities are and separate in each area in terms of what they're doing
- Uniformity with titles (i.e., Career Counselor, Vocational Counselor, etc.)
- Separate category for assessment or curriculum writing?
- Faculty Learning, Student Excellence, Institutional Excellence, Academic Excellence – do we want to go in that direction?
- Faculty Senate draft – 80% complete – take ideas and use parts of the draft? Might generate other ideas
- Curriculum needs to be across the board for everyone, not just assessment
- Need things spelled out better in terms of building workload; cannot build workload until we define what they have to do
- Important to standardize description of what they do
- Separate teaching faculty and non-teaching faculty, some duties will overlap
- Page 103: Teaching Responsibilities – gives examples of work, need to separate teaching faculty and non-teaching
- Rank – non-teaching never defined, "For non-teaching faculty advises and counsels students…." (p. 106, ¶ 1), define up front
- Non-teaching folks have very different descriptions (i.e., counselor description would be different from librarian, etc.), cannot be lumped into one description
- Language will overlap – start thinking of catagories to change or keep, maintain catagories with columns
- Come up with individual recommendations/drafts on April 10th

- In terms of rank, what degree/scope will they be involved in? Some departments only have one rank, some don't have writing skills, what are we doing to address this? Provide workshops, effective teaching strategies?
- 3-4 day event – off campus? Try to fit everything into 3 days. Use Tech center – 2nd floor conference room: April 10-12 from 8:00 – 5:00, with coffee and refreshments