

# PRESIDENT'S CABINET MEETING

April 11, 2017

## MINUTES

### CALLED TO ORDER

10:35 am on 04/11/2017

### ADJOURNED

12:20 am on 04/11/2017

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Austin, Tamara Clunis, Cara Crowley, Lyndy Forrester, Russell Lowery-Hart, Chris Hays, Steve Smith, Mark White

### MEMBERS ABSENT

### OTHERS PRESENT

Kevin Ball, Joy Brenneman, Frank Sobey, Merit Pay Faculty Committee: Donna Cleere, Nancy Forrest, Emily Gilbert, Shawna Lopez, Reem Witherspoon

### DISCUSSION:

1. MERIT PAY MODEL	Faculty Committee
<p>Members of the Committee (listed above plus Brian Jacob, who was unable to attend) presented their finalized merit pay model. The committee received faculty input from three full faculty workshops, which were held to present information, work on pieces of the model, address issues, and find answers to concerns. All members of the committee visited with faculty via emails, phone calls, and Faculty Senate discussions. They have visited every department and presented the model which has alleviated some concerns. Concerns voiced by faculty have been addressed in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Favoritism – use of a metrics-based rubric for the supervisor rating</li><li>• Heavy workload for supervisors – limiting the length of the self-review narrative to 250 words</li><li>• Adequate funding – Steve Smith is working on this</li><li>• Dislike of self-promotion – checklist of measurable tasks, written by faculty, with no narrative or documentation required</li><li>• Limited opportunities for Professional Development – Dr. Clunis is working on creating more opportunities</li><li>• Lack of participation in student evaluations – Beth Rodriguez worked with the task force to craft 10 student evaluation questions and the committee has requested that these be placed at the beginning of the survey</li><li>• Difficulty measuring community service – self-report with narrative</li></ul> <p>The Model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Self and Supervisor Reviews have a scale of 1 – 5 as required by SACS</li><li>• Performance is 70%; Ideals are 30%</li><li>• Self-review is based heavily on current performance review</li><li>• Instructional Design, Instructional Delivery, Assessment, and Resource Management have been added</li><li>• Narrative is limited to 250 words per rating</li><li>• Performance improvement plans will be left up to the supervisor</li><li>• Checklists have been created for supervisors to make the process easier</li></ul> <p>The evaluation will be implemented in Cornerstone and supervisors will receive notice when self-reviews have been completed. A narrative is required for a rating of 1 or 5.</p>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> None	

<b>2. FACULTY SENATE SALARY PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Faculty Committee</b>
<p>Nancy Forrest presented this proposal and thanked the cabinet for persevering through the process and hearing their concerns. The model they are considering honors faculty. With regard to salaries, Amarillo College ranks 33rd out of 50 in the state which is about 6% below the State average. The college ranks 41/50 in adjunct faculty pay. Faculty Senate requests a pay increase of 6% to bring Amarillo College up to the State average and an additional \$75/load hour for adjunct pay. Ms. Forrest reviewed what those amounts looked like and what it would take to bring AC up to the State average. The committee members are Jodi Lindseth – chair, Shawna Lopez, Scott Beckett, and Bob Gustin.</p> <p>Cabinet and the committee discussed how this proposal compares with Steve Smith’s plan. This would be an interim plan until the other could be implemented. The Faculty Senate proposal is a standard process each year. Parts of Mr. Smith’s plan are close to implementation with the exception of the 5 and 6 year term agreements. This plan does not adjust the adjunct pay scale. Historically, the value of benefits has not been part of this discussion and could be added in the future.</p>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> None	

<b>3. RANK AND TENURE MEMBERSHIP POLICY</b>	<b>Sobey</b>
<p>Dr. Vess had charged the Rank and Tenure Committee to change the policy related to inequitable representation on the committee. In the past, an interim member would be appointed to fill a spot, but this a violation of the existing policy. Mr. Sobey presented the revised policy to Faculty Senate who noted that having attained rank is an important criteria to be a voting member of this committee. He took their recommendations back to the Faculty Handbook Committee. Faculty Senate has approved revised policy.</p> <p>Mr. Sobey reviewed a few of the changes. Section B will increase the size of the committee and membership will mirror Senate elections. Section C adds attaining tenure as a qualifying criteria for membership on the committee which will expand the pool of candidates. Areas that do not have faculty with rank or tenure would have a voice on the committee but no vote. Department chairs and coordinators may serve on the committee and have a voice but no vote if someone in their department is petitioning.</p> <p>The Cabinet had no concerns with the policies and noted that it clarifies timelines. The new Rank and Tenure committee may make recommendations for changes in the process of attaining rank and tenure in the future and will bring those to cabinet at that time.</p>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> Mark and Lyndy will take this policy to the Board Policy Committee. Cabinet directed the committee to move forward.	Mark Lyndy

<b>4. TRIGGER POINTS</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
<p>Cabinet members related some of the trigger/action points they had considered. Lyndy suggested department turnover data might trigger supervisor training and/or actions plans. Staffing might be also be triggered by student numbers. Bob noted examples of this in his area. Cara told cabinet that the ARC has experienced a 150% growth which is an example of a trigger point for staff or facility increases.</p>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> Cabinet will continue considering trigger points and discuss further at the Cabinet Budget Retreat.	All Cabinet

<b>5. FRINGE BENEFIT ON ACBP</b>	<b>Smith</b>
Steve has learned that AC has a program that runs in the background for payroll and the 2.5% fringe. IT first runs the process, then applies the fringe to insurance, life insurance, dental, and finally to the ACBP. He recommends applying this as a stipend and then taking out the cost of benefits which would allow better recording and correct budget reports. Currently, the process is run twice a month. Changing it to bi-weekly to correspond with pay periods would equal out employees paychecks so that they would be the same year round. Cabinet had no issue with this change in processes as long as it is well-communicated first.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> Mr. Smith will move forward and explain the change to everyone affected. Change will take effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year – September 2017.	Steve
<b>6. MULTIPLE DISBURSEMENTS – FINANCIAL AID</b>	<b>Lowery-Hart</b>
Bob reported that Kelly Prater had talked to MDRC who requested that this be called multiple disbursements rather than aid-like-a-paycheck. It is possible to do this if it benefits the students and not the college. Shane Hepler and Tim Hicks have been working to determine how to make this work with our system and plan to go live with two disbursements in Fall 2017. The Business Office staff are aware of this change and will help manage the disbursements. This should help raise the enrollments in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> eight week courses. Summer funds are available to students who are not full-time but that does not fit with pathways. There is some state money that may be available in the summer and we need to continue working on summer scholarships.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> None	
<b>7. ENROLLMENT UPDATE</b>	<b>Austin</b>
No report	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> n/a	
<b>8. BRAGGING ON EMPLOYEES</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
No report	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> n/a	
<b>9. COMMUNICATION POINTS</b>	<b>Forrester</b>
Lyndy reviewed the items to be covered in her report.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> Lyndy will send email.	Forrester
<b>10. POSITION JUSTIFICATIONS</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
None	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> n/a	
<b>11. COMMUNICATION POINTS</b>	<b>Forrester</b>
Lyndy reviewed the items to be covered in her report.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b> Lyndy will send email.	Forrester

**12. OTHER DISCUSSION****Forrester**

1. Chris and Kevin briefly discussed a new process under consideration by Communications and Marketing to route "All AC" emails through their office. This will help their department be apprised of events taking place on campus. – Put on the next cabinet agenda.
2. The Board will discuss Russell's evaluation in closed session during the next regular Board meeting.
3. The AGN is producing a voters' guide and will be interviewing candidates. AGN will then make endorsements. Panhandle PBS is filming AC & AISD candidates for two minutes statements to air.