

**Notes and Actions from our meeting with Dr. Rosen  
on Monday (10/15) at 3 p.m.**

1. Dr. Rosen went over his justification for putting through the three proposals. He sent a letter to all faculty after our meeting. He had already discussed the proposals with the Deans, and things were decided. To recap: Because he needed input from faculty early in the semester, he approached Senate about his proposals. We sent them to faculty. He came to present the proposals to the faculty who attended the two meetings. We voted at the meetings to show the true breakdown concerning faculty input on the proposals noting that he mentioned the all or nothing clause regarding the implementation of the proposals. The rest you know as Dr. Rosen wrote in his letter.
2. We brought up the issue of the 85% and how it is tied to everything – “the admission to the dance.” I mentioned that this is the *real* issue coming from faculty. I asked if it would be possible to look into a two bridge scenario. Something like this: Currently we have to have 85% and some number of activities from the A, B, and C groups. I proposed scenario II: a lower number than 85%, something like 75 – 80 or 80 – 85 and an abundance of activity in the category of SPD (conferences and coursework, etc.). Then a chair could look at that person and suggest doing less on the activities and more on the teaching, yet that one semester would not screw up a faculty member’s teaching merit.

**RESULT:** He stated that this year we could not do that as the year has already begun.

**ACTION:** A task force could be formed through senate to propose this scenario and possible other options.

3. The student evaluation instrument: Dr. Rosen handed this out. He suggested that senate get faculty input on what works, what needs changed, and how to go about making these changes in terms of the instrument’s structure. We must remember that we need to measure the student response to courses.

**ACTION:** A taskforce was recommended.

4. Dr. Rosen handed out a huge packet of info. regarding faculty compensation across the CC system in Florida.

**ACTION:** He wants us to get a taskforce together to crunch the numbers and come up with a proposal that will support giving faculty raises that will place MCC in the top tier of the CC system. This one will be a challenge, so we will want to have some math wizards on this “taskforce.”

To clarify: The study that Dr Rosen is proposing is a comparative analysis of MCC versus other CC in Florida, or in Southwest Florida, or MCC versus other < 10,000 enrollment size CCs in Florida, vis-à-vis faculty compensation.

So we need some volunteers for these taskforces. We figure 4 faculty to a taskforce. This will be easier to schedule meetings, and everyone on the taskforce will have the opportunity to play an integral part in developing / facilitating a system from which input from all faculty can be ascertained. If you are interested in working on one of these taskforces and you have time to devote to the taskforce, are motivated and organized and have some background on the particular issue you wish to work with, please send me an email. The slots will be filled as emails come in.

<b>The 85% Alt. Options</b>	<b>Student Eval. Instrument</b>	<b>Faculty Compensation</b>
1. Faculty senate board member	1. Faculty senate board member	1. Faculty senate board member
2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.