

Faculty Council Minutes: 12/4/15 • 3:00-4:30 • Boardroom

Attendees

Members: Hyla Rosenberg, Sheila Broderick, Lee Imonen, Jody Anderson, Brooke Taylor, Jessica Alvarado, Russell Shitabata, Phil Moore, Jim Salt, Steve McQuiddy. *Admin. Representatives:* Jennifer Frei, Dawn DeWolf. *Non-members:* Kelly Collins, Christina Howard, Tricia Tully, Wendy Simmons, Shawn Goddard, Dale Green, André Casey.

Meeting called to order at 3:10. No quorum, so unable to vote on appointments. During Current Topics discussion, enough members joined to constitute quorum. Vote on committee appointment was taken at end of meeting.

Co-chair Business

--Appointed Gerry Meenaghan to Curriculum Committee. Yea: 8. Nay: 0.

Current Topics

Role of Program Review in Structural Decision Making

--Jim Salt asked to speak, as he needed to leave the meeting early. He reported on the LCCEA grievance concerning the recent posting for Program Coordinator (PC) of the Medical Office Assistant (MOA) program. He said the union tried to reach an agreement, but the Administration was unresponsive except for a willingness for the current program coordinator to keep her title with a different job description. LCCEA recommended a vote to condemn the Administration's act of posting the position, and asked members to consult the grievance sent by email to faculty.

--Christina Howard presented her concerns about the MOA posting, saying it is unprecedented, and it makes her nervous as a program coordinator. She thought it was decided in the spring that Program Review (PR) would be piloted this year, and that programs considered for cuts would be identified to undergo PR. But she learned there was a focus group for MOA over the summer, and that when fall term began the process was already happening without faculty input. She also has concerns as a program coordinator with a list of items that need to be done for the program. Such changes can take up to three years, and we already have systems to move these things forward. But she is concerned that she could be told her job is suddenly changed. The college is not private industry. We have a responsibility to follow institutional guidelines. Administration said it was an urgent clinical need from employers. She is a health care professional, and nothing in health care administration is urgent. This is a term used by managers to take control from faculty, by claiming that the "house is on fire." She noted that she is taking a huge personal risk, speaking with administrators in the room. But she feels what is happening is not right.

Comments and questions following:

--There was no due process in the MOA decision and position posting. It is wrong ethically and contractually.

--The outside consultant's report from the summer said of the Lane program that Lane graduates are the first ones they hire. No other comment was made on Lane. Other comments made were in regard to all office assistants, not just Lane graduates.

--Is there an option for slowing down the hiring process? Yes, searches are stopped all the time.

--The formal grievance sent by LCCEA shows that this is about retaliation from a manager. That is what should be investigated.

--Concerns about hiring. Some departments have vacancies, but they have to beg to have them filled while Admin. hires in another area. Thought Program Review was going to be part of this. Results in very little faith in outside classroom work.

--People ask, "Could this happen to me, too? Should I be doing something else?" Doesn't help morale.

--It's not just a feeling; it's violation of the contract, a violation of due process. This can happen to anyone. A faculty member should not be removed from their position without undergoing corrective evaluation as a prior intervention.

Chair noted that this topic was taking more time than allotted, and asked if FC wanted to continue. Informal affirmation around the room.

Vice President Dawn DeWolf offered the Administration perspective. She thanked Christina for sharing her concerns. Things are not so bad in MOA that they are replacing a faculty member. The focus groups from the summer said good things about the program. MOA was on the list for closure. Admin. heard from employers and removed MOA from the list. But it needed changes. Hired an outside consultant from Linn-Benton Community College (LBCC), which had renovated their program. Sense of urgency because Admin. had promised employers changes for fall term. We are doubling the program, intention is to add enhanced resources, grow the program.

Comments and questions following:

--Current PC is being changed in her job. Someone is being hired to "revise" the program, not "enhance" it.

--Where is the urgency from employers? Where did they say it must be Fall 2016? If so important, where is the documentation?

--When asked if the current PC will retain her position, VP declined to answer, citing principles of the grievance. It was pointed out that the grievance had been sent via email to all faculty, and was therefore available. Also pointed out that if the faculty member was continuing in her position, there would be no grievance.

--Did this person go through a corrective evaluation? No answer.

--No urgent needs from employers have been listed, no written agreements. How can this supercede faculty contract? People can recognize when there is no validity. Faculty are troubled, and Admin. should consider how they want to function.

--How can MOA program go from slated for closure to being doubled? How can curriculum be changed for Fall 2016 but the person to do it not hired until January, the deadline for curriculum committee approval? There seems to be a separate process being hidden from the rest of us who have to follow deadlines.

--What is the posted position title? Program Coordinator. Can there be two Program Coordinators? No, according to accreditation policy.

--By what authority does the college function to deliver on promises to employers? Board determines college policy, Admin. carries out Board directives. How can we make promises to an outside party? It has no authority.

VP DeWolf says it's not about governance, but credibility. A promise was made by the president. The college is saying to employers, "We heard you and are addressing your needs."

Comments and questions following:

--The president makes a promise that supplants authority? This bypasses all the processes.

--Where is the documentation for this promise to employers?

--The issue is internal credibility, with the faculty and the internal college.

--Only meetings with MOA faculty were informational, not discussion. It sounds like an unwritten, unnamed policy is driving everything.

--MOA program has almost 100% graduation and 100% employment. Employers said they hire Lane graduates first. These are facts.

Chair noted the time and asked if FC wanted to suggest slowing the hiring process. Informal agreement that FC would draft a statement and vote via email. To be sent Monday or Tuesday at the latest, as next week is finals week.

[On December 8, 2015, Faculty Council issued the following statement:

Lane Community College Administration should immediately halt the hiring process for a Medical Office Assistant (MOA) Program Coordinator until all contractual obligations have been met and institutional processes followed.

The college's handling of the MOA program, including removal of the current program coordinator, ignores due process as guaranteed by the faculty contract. The Administration's plan to hire a new program coordinator who will be charged with revising the full curriculum by Fall 2016 is not physically possible unless Curriculum Committee deadlines and the Program Review process are also ignored. The Administration's claim that the "urgency" of the hiring is due to a promise made by the college president to unnamed employers further disregards the institutional standards outlined in the college's Core Values.

As stated in May 2015, "Faculty Council strongly condemns any administrative action to remove, supplant, circumvent or bypass the faculty role in reviewing and designing

curriculum, an example of which is the college administration's treatment of the Medical Office Assistant program. Any process involving program restructure at Lane must be led by the program faculty, as well as follow the Program Review process and long-established academic and empirical data standards.”]

Council, Committee, Team Reports

--No reports due to time.

Division Reports

--No reports due to time.