**E-Board Committee Meeting Minutes**

**October 25, 2011**

**2:30-3:30 p.m.**

In Attendance: Joe Gryniuk, Heidi Shepherd, Mark Waddington, Jim Howe, George Dalich, Nolan Koreski, Cheyenne Roduin, Phil Snider, Jerry Peterson, Margo Toner

Absent:

Agenda:

* Last meeting minutes
* Introduction of confirmed / elected department E board members
* Prepare for the BOT Presidential search open comments forum scheduled for 10/27
* Updates to the about us web site
* Other
* Set date for Nov E-board
* adjourn

The meeting began at 2:40PM.

Nolan gave out a statement to present to the board with a national definition of Shared Governance.

Nolan emailed our letter to the AFT and we will send letter to Governor Gregoire as well. All agree to invite Sandra Schroeder and Joe Bernal Baca (AFT lobbyist) to Thursdays’ forum. Jim presented the idea that Sandra could help us setting up a senate for our faculty.

Nolan introduced Jerry Peterson and Margo Toner as e-board reps for the departments of Transportation and Allied Health.

Board accepts notes with changes and exceptions from meeting on 10-5-11.

Program Planning and Alignment committee (formerly Program viability committee) update - Mark Waddington attended meeting on 10-24-11. It was a good meeting, discussed program review. A decision was made not to consider Room Costs, but only include expenses that are not covered by lab fees. Committee will look at FTEs per instructor, graduation rates and industry viability for jobs available.

Heidi met with Dennis and he mentioned that tough cuts are needed. Dennis is on the Program Planning and Alignment committee and is looking from input from committees (program planning and alignment committee, SEM-Strategic Enrollment Management, and budget committee).

Everyone agrees that it is important to have people on Program Planning and Alignment committee as a check and balance so we have a say.

**Joe** - Why do the cuts have to come out of instruction?

**Mark** - Because that is where there is money and other areas have been cut too. Not all 23% is coming out of instruction.

**Joe** - suggests that the committee should be thinking outside the box and look at other options instead of just cutting programs.

**Mark** - This committee is making suggestions, not making final decisions. Just giving input and having discussion on options

**George** - We are putting the info out there, making comparisons and making considerations about present and future.

**Phil** - have to be careful about accepting a “too” subordinate role in this and other issues. Do we have any business positioning ourselves in presidential search processes or on committees? We need to speak up and be responsible when things don't look or sound right (presidential search, forum, committee involvement). It isn't spelled out in our constitution, but it is our responsibility to stand up and call in our part in these processes and decisions (board claims they involved us, but it was not the way we were told it would be).

**George** - We had our opportunity and we gave input into the Job description

**Phil** - They called for our input over the summer and came back with a description that didn’t reflect our input and was pushed thru quickly. The Federation should not allow ourselves to be USED

**Joe** - met with Bruce Reid last year and told him we demand an open process. Joe went to every board meeting to announce we are looking forward to participation with board and Dr. Woodall agreed. The board wanted to get a big group of federation e-board members together to have a closed meeting instead of following channels that would allow us to disseminate information in an organized way to members.

**Heidi** – We had input on job description, but no input on finalists and questioning multiple applicants

**George** – We have no problem with job description, but we are tired of everyone just getting appointed and we need this to be a process issue. We have to be very careful of our position and where we should be focused = curriculum. Pick our battles and choose things that should be coming from faculty like program and curriculum. Did they do a search when Woodall came on as interim?

**Phil** - No faculty or college input at all. All but 1 of our interim deans became permanent deans. It is important that we hold to the recommendations from the accreditation to make our point, we need to get the notes from the accreditation recommendations so we can research how many times they have dinged us for shared governance.

**George** - Wants to ask the board why the process has gone this way and tie it into accreditation recommendations. This decision to put Dr. Woodall as the only finalist undermines the president in the eyes of the faculty.

**PHIL’S QUESTION**: address to board specifically: “*Given the recommendation you have received from the NWCCU regarding shared governance, or the lack of shared governance, on this campus, can you please explain the boards unilateral decision to cancel the presidential search and abrogate the board’s promise to include the faculty federation in the search and interview process?*

Cheyenne asks for people to send questions that we can ask to the board

**Nolan** - our responses to the position the faculty are in could be 1) going to Governor or 2) a vote of no confidence in the board

**Jim** - Two leftover pieces of info from our contract: Tenure and faculty evaluations are supposed to be faculty driven. Suny said we make recommendations to changes to tenure process and faculty evaluations. Step 18 (we settled on 4 step 18 faculty) we only have 1 faculty right now

**Heidi -** All tenure reports are going online but nobody knows how that is going to look online (especially if you are part way thru process). If this is faculty driven, do the chairs or LMC meet to decide how this will look. Dr. Woodall says it will all be online but he is not faculty so it isn’t faculty driven.

**Jim** says Nolan should contact president about the online process of tenure books and how it was supposed to go to Instructional council instead of coming down from president.

Action Items:

* Nolan will invite Sandra and Bernal to the upcoming forum
* Nolan will add a citation to the letter that shows where the idea of Shared Governance comes from
* Phil has requested the purchase of a small, hand-held recorder for use in grievance interviews – all members agree to purchase

Meeting adjourned around 3:45 (note take had to leave prior to adjournment).

Respectfully submitted,

Cheyenne Roduin