

PROPOSAL FROM COLLEGE SENATE TO ADMINISTRATION

INTRODUCTION

This proposal goes to the heart of why the College Senate is here at CPCC.

SACS requires that this body exist so that it may become the liaison for all faculty and professional staff to the administration. We must therefore bring forth recurring issues that spring up that are contrary to the standard policies and procedures we are governed by.

I expect that most of your Division directors and Supervisors follow these policies and treat you with respect and dignity. But, like all organizations there are those Supervisors or Division Directors with their own particular agenda that cause inequities and discontent. These can sometimes be dealt with on an individual basis, but when it becomes more widespread and occurs repeatedly, it is our job to formally take issue and bring them to the administration. This is what this proposal is all about.

These issues may only be impacting 15% of our colleagues, but because we are only aware of what is happening to our own group, most of us have no idea that these inequities exist.

Please believe us that our proposal is not based on isolated incidences but is the result of repeated disregard by some supervisors.

BACKGROUND

In compliance with SACS guidelines referencing the Senate's responsibility to actively participate in the governance of this college, we are presenting our views on the perceived direction of issues directly relating to the welfare of the faculty and professional staff of Central Piedmont Community College. In addition, we wish to present our views on possible solutions for these issues.

Over the last few years, it appears that CPCC has been moving toward a more corporate environment at the potential expense of an academic one. This perceived development, if valid and if continued, could lead to a climate of fear, distrust, anxiety, and stress, rather than the more desirable and creative one of optimism, inclusiveness, enthusiasm, and a desire to contribute.

The perception of this climate stems from directives that are sent with no foreknowledge and with an expectation of immediate compliance with little consideration of timing or the impact on our jobs. As Faculty and Professional Staff, we feel a need to be more directly involved in the policy making/changing process that directly affects our jobs. This would provide us the opportunity to be more aware of what is going to happen and be in a position to offer suggestions before a directive is issued.

We propose the following changes to remedy some of our more contentious issues:

LOAD AND OVERLOAD POLICY

It is evident that the driving force behind issues about Faculty loads stem from SACS. This one issue impacts four areas where CPCC may fall outside SACS guidelines. Those areas are (1) full time load, (2) total load including overloads, (3) the ratio between the number of sections taught by full-time vs. part-time faculty, and (4) the ratio between full-time faculty and non-faculty at the college.

Some SACS guidelines are as follows:

- Full time Faculty workload of 15 hours/semester
- Full time Faculty load + overload not to exceed an average of 21 hours/semester
- Full time Faculty teach at least 50% of all sections taught
- A ratio of 1/3 – 2/3 number of full-time to part-time faculty

College Senate proposes the following remedies to address these concerns:

- Hire additional full-time faculty to cover reduced loads of current faculty and reduce the number of classes taught by part-time faculty
- Change full-time faculty load to 15 hours according to SACS guidelines
- Maintain the current overload policy of two courses

This process would (1) reduce full time and total load of faculty, (2) help reduce the part time/full time ratio, (3) help reduce the ratio between faculty and non-faculty, and (4) accomplish this without a reduction of current full time faculty pay, since raises are lacking.

We recommend the development of policy supporting growth in full-time faculty proportional to the increase in FTEs.

ATTENDANCE PROCESS

It is understood that attendance is necessary for Financial Aid student tracking; however, the current system in place is cumbersome and confusing. Financial Aid requires faculty to report students who have stopped attending on a regular basis. Veterans Affairs needs to be informed of the grade the instructor plans to record at the end of the semester. As Faculty we suggest the following:

An S will be entered on the attendance roster for those students who have stopped attending for 3 weeks (for 16 week classes) and 2 weeks (for 8 week classes) at the end of weeks 3, 6, 9, & 12 (for 16 week classes) and weeks 2, 4, & 6 (for 8 week classes).

INVOLUNTARY ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE

It is our perception that involuntary administrative leave is a common method of progressing toward termination of an employee with an extendible contract. When this occurs the employee is stripped of keys, office, Email account, asked to leave campus and not return unless contacted. The specific reason for this action is not always given, and sometimes the reason changes over time.

As Faculty and Professional Staff, we feel that the following changes need to be made:

- An employee being considered for involuntary administrative leave will first be provided with a “needs to improve” document indicating specific objectives and given an opportunity to comply prior to being placed on involuntary administrative leave except in extreme circumstances.
- When an employee is placed on involuntary administrative leave the employee will be presented with a letter from the president specifically detailing the reasons for taking this action.
- The employee will retain all rights and privileges of the college with the exception of work responsibilities unless this action is the result of some act or threat that would endanger college employees or students.
- Communication with the employee will be with Human Resources or the relevant Vice President.
- A maximum time limit (for example, 30 days) be established for the leave period.

FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF PDP

PDP stands for Professional Development Plan, yet over time there have been instances where managers/directors have chosen to ignore PDP guidelines, using the PDP as a punitive tool rather than one of positive reinforcement. The employee’s only recourse is to refuse to sign, but it still is placed in the employee’s permanent record.

Suggestions for improving the PDP process:

- Provide and require proper training for all supervisors and employees on the purpose, intent, and process of the PDP
- Provide an operational definition for what constitutes the “documentation” that is required for any mark lower than 3
- Craft clear guidelines for a process that employees may follow if they do not agree with the evaluation on the final PDP
- Craft guidelines regarding the handling of performance issues separate from the PDP process

In conclusion, it is our hope that these observations and possible solutions be considered an opportunity for constructive dialogue for the betterment of the college and for the student population we endeavor to serve. We look forward to a positive joint effort to this end