

# Faculty Senate Minutes

**April 7, 2017**

**Lynn Library, Room 207**

<b>Members Present</b>	Nancy Forrest, Jodi Lindseth, Scott Beckett, Marcia Julian, Deborah Harding, Bob Gustin, Brian Jacob, Donna Cleere, Emily Gilbert, Shawna Lopez, Tara Meraz, Susan McClure, Bob Gustin
<b>Members Absent</b>	Brant Davis, Mary Dodson, Courtney Milleson, LaVon Barrett, Nichol Dolby,
<b>Guests</b>	Dr. Tamara Clunis, Frank Sobey, Heather Voran, Reem Witherspoon

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Discussion/Information</b>	<b>Actions/Decisions Recommendations/Timelines</b>
<b>Call to Order</b>	President Nancy Forrest called the meeting to order at 2:03 PM	
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	March 3 minutes were approved by consensus via email.	
<b>Special Guest Report</b>	<p>Dr. Tamara Clunis, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs -</p> <p>Faculty Compensation Model Update:</p> <p>This group was created to try and increase the pay to get us more equitable across the state. The idea came from Steve during a Faculty Senate meeting.</p> <p>While there has been a lot of feedback in support of the overarching goal, there are some faculty who are not happy about it. Now, we need help in how to approach these unhappy folks.</p> <p>We have hit a few bumps in the road. For instance, year-round Pell is not happening; Federal Government is not into the Summer Pell handout. This really hurts our ability to have students take classes in the Summer. All is not lost though, as there is growing bi-partisan support in Washington to bring back Summer Pell. If that happens,</p>	

# Faculty Senate Minutes

April 7, 2017

Lynn Library, Room 207

it could go into effect next year.

All is not lost, however. The AC Foundation is looking into what they can contribute should Summer Pell not go through. The current idea is to ask students who are on track and committed to taking summer classes to submit an application to the foundation. This will also help with the count of students who are interested in Summer.

Additionally, the compensation model did not address Chair, Coordinators, etc. – the faculty leaders. Nor did it take into account NCBO faculty, stipends, release time and other “band-aids”. Also unaddressed: what happens if you don’t want to teach 18 hours? What about the overall cost per credit hour?

Right now, Our contact hours are going down because we cannot offer enough classes. Students are taking fewer hours. We have to have more faculty available in order to increase contact hours.

Senator discussion regarding, can we offer a 30 hour (15 per semester) and a 36 hour contract (18 hours per semester)? What about people who are getting release time? What about “non-teaching” faculty, where do we put them?

Dr. Clunis and Frank are meeting with Academic Deans and Department Chairs on April 21<sup>st</sup> to discuss class offerings and hours. They would like to come back to the May Senate meeting to discuss

# Faculty Senate Minutes

April 7, 2017

Lynn Library, Room 207

this. 74% of faculty already teach 18 hours or more. The problem is that they need to find out how much of that is actual teaching vs. release time.

Senator question: What about people whose program only has 14 hours? They might want to teach more, but what if they don't qualify to work in any other department? If we move to an 18 hour full time load, would that punish them for not having the extra hours? How do we accommodate them?

Answer: They would still be affected by the 1 to 1 lab payment versus half or  $\frac{3}{4}$  pay for a lab, they would still get an across the board raise if given, and they would still get the step.

Money would never be "owed back". If you were compensated for a class that did not make, there would be options.

Dr. Clunis suggested that her office could send out a survey to the faculty regarding 18 hours vs. 15 hours. She emphasized that she would need as many faculty as possible to fill it out. Questions like the following would be asked: If your department cannot fill up the 18 hours, would you be willing to work in another way to make up the extra money? Faculty Advising/Mentoring has been coming up repeatedly. Also, if you sign to do 18 hours, it would need to be COURSES, not more release time, because we need to offer more sections to meet the demand.

# Faculty Senate Minutes

April 7, 2017

Lynn Library, Room 207

Senator Comment: Faculty advising would allow for more one-on-one connections for our students, which research shows is the best factor when it comes to retention and doing well in college.

“Stepping out” will go away under the new plan. Additionally, as merit pay has not started yet, everyone will receive the raise applied to their Base Pay and then \$500 added to the Step, as well as 1-to-1 lab ratio.

In the past, most of the money would go to Step and the rest to raise. Now, the bulk of the money will go into the base pay. Right now, Summer will stay 75% parity pay.

Many of the savings are coming from paring down the VPAA budget, specifically money to cover the Steps and the 1-to-1 lab ratio. Levelling and raises will come from a hopefully larger Summer. Remember that increasing our students from 2,000 to 3,000 in Summer would net \$1 million.

8 week offerings in the Fall:

The Strategic Plan states that this Fall, 80% of all classes need to be 8 week. We need to formalize which programs WILL be 8 week and which WILL NOT be, instead of the haphazard way we have been doing it. Dr. Clunis would like to see the Core classes go fully 8 week, so students can finish their Core easier and faster. Right now, the offerings are clashing in terms of date and time they are

# Faculty Senate Minutes

April 7, 2017

Lynn Library, Room 207

	<p>offered and 8 vs. 16 week.</p> <p>Frank Sobey, Interim Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs -</p> <p>Rank and Tenure Committee Membership Update:</p> <p>[See attachment] This document represents the Faculty Handbook committee response to Faculty Senate feedback. The underlined portions are links to other documents.</p> <p>The two main things that came out of it: last Senate meeting the Senators felt that the value of Rank should have more attention than the value of equity. Additionally, it was questioned that the Chairs were disallowed from the process. In every other evaluative process at the College, Chairs and Program Coordinators are allowed to serve, so why are they not in this one?</p> <p>The Handbook committee agreed that the Chairs should serve, therefore, if someone in their area is applying, Chairs will now have a “voice but no vote”.</p> <p>Senator concern regarding the “voice with no vote”. Specifically in terms of creating a similar problem for faculty in areas where it may be difficult to achieve rank and tenure. Sobey acknowledged this issue and explained that he and Dr. Clunis want to adjust the ways that faculty can achieve Rank and Tenure, so as to make it a more equitable process. In the future, there may be alternative pathways</p>	<p>Motion carries for support of the RAT resolution as presented to go to the Board.</p>
--	---	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

April 7, 2017

Lynn Library, Room 207

	<p>for some faculty members – technical, NCBO, etc. In the case of the alternative pathways, the idea would be to look at professional field experience, CE, etc. – all balanced against what Rank means for an academic institution. This is just an idea for now, though, and needs extensive discussion with Dr. Clunis and Dr. Lowery-Hart.</p> <p>In the past, if there was an area that had no one with Rank or Tenure an interim person with Rank or Tenure was appointed to represent that area. This new way ensures that all areas are represented.</p> <p>Another big change is that the RAT committee will host workshops and provide example portfolios to faculty who want to apply.</p> <p>We are aware that notifications need to come out earlier in the year, so faculty have the maximum ability to work on their notebook/submission.</p> <p>Heather Voran, Director of Blackboard, representative of the Faculty Handbook Committee:</p> <p>The size of the committee will change as well. If you see Section B, it will follow the Senate By-Laws in terms of how many people will serve on the committee.</p>	
<b>President's Report</b>	The Board is discussing a slight increase (about \$60 per semester for average load) moving the cost from \$83.75 to \$89 per credit	

# Faculty Senate Minutes

**April 7, 2017**

**Lynn Library, Room 207**

	<p>hour. This would still be the lowest cost in the high plains. This increase will produce \$900,000 revenue which will cover additional tutors for English, rise in subscriptions for Ellucian and Bb, increase in utility costs. There would be no increase for dual credit.</p> <p>The BoR expects the Texas State Congress to require a \$1.5 M reduction of funding over next biennium.</p> <p>AC has spent \$2M less than last year by mid-year. We have cut as much as we can. Now we need to focus on revenue and intentional internal marketing. We are currently focusing on summer classes.</p> <p>In conjunction with our focus on summer offerings, the AC Foundation has increased margins to allow for more scholarships.</p>	
<b>Secretary's Report</b>	None.	
<b>Courtesy</b>	None.	
<b>Elections</b>	<p>Call for Senate Secretary and Vice-President nominations for 2017-2018 school year.</p> <p>Surveys will be going out in divisions soon for Senators that need to be replaced.</p>	
<b>Legislative</b>	There are multiple bills promoting a tuition freeze until 2022.	
<b>Mead Award</b>	Forms can now be reviewed by the committee electronically. There are a lot of responses so far! Cory Willis is the person who helped with the electronic forms.	

# Faculty Senate Minutes

April 7, 2017

Lynn Library, Room 207

<b>Professor Emeritus Award</b>	Moselle Ford is this year's recipient.  Reception will take place April 27 <sup>th</sup> from 2-3pm. It will be in the Badger Corner, which is on the second floor of the CUB.	
<b>Questions</b>	None this time.	
<b>Salary</b>	Presentation for Cabinet was presented and discussed.	
<b>Technology</b>	None.	
<b>Faculty Survey</b>		
<b>Hospitality</b>	Delicious amazing food made by Marcia!	
<b>Faculty Development</b>		
<b>Instructional Technology</b>		
<b>Pinning</b>		
<b>Faculty Committee Appointments</b>	The committee is currently compiling a list of which committees need faculty representation and the number needed. The survey will be out soon.	
<b>New Business</b>	Senate recommendation for donation of platform flowers from graduation.	Georgia Manor decided by acclamation.
<b>Unfinished Business</b>	Merit Pay Model presentation: Please see attached pdf. This will be presented to Cabinet on April 11 <sup>th</sup> . <b>[DONE]</b>	
<b>Updates and Announcements</b>	None.	

# Faculty Senate Minutes

April 7, 2017

Lynn Library, Room 207

--	--	--

Recorder: Emily Gilbert, Director of Information Services, Senator for Academic Outreach and Support Services

## RANK AND TENURE COMMITTEE POLICY

- A. The purpose of the Rank and Tenure Committee is to review petitions in a collegial and impartial manner, ensuring that faculty follow the established Faculty Handbook Policy. The Committee makes recommendations for or against advancement to Tenure and promotion in Professorial Rank to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs.
- B. The Rank and Tenure Committee consists of faculty membership selected through an election process mirroring that of the Faculty Senate By-Laws Article I Section I. Each area elects faculty to serve on the committee. Each area will have an alternate in the event an elected member cannot serve.
- C. Committee members serve a three-year term with one third of the membership elected each year. Committee members may not serve consecutive three-year terms. Committee members must have served at Amarillo College for at least three years and have advanced in professorial rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Practitioner Professor) or attained tenure while serving at the college. If there are no faculty members that meet all of these criteria in their department or division, faculty members who have served at AC for at least 4 years shall be allowed to serve and may offer a "voice but no vote."
- D. In the event a Committee member petitions for Tenure and/or Professorial Rank, that Committee member must recuse themselves from the semester of their petition and the alternate faculty representative for that area will serve during that semester's respective evaluation process. In the event that a program director, chair, or coordinator has been elected to serve, they may offer a "voice but no vote" for any petitioner in their program area.
- E. The Rank and Tenure Committee Chair will meet at the discretion of its Chair according to the timetables listed in the Policy to Petition for Tenure and Policy to Petition for Professorial Rank. The committee will select a new Chair for the next academic year at its last meeting in the spring.
- F. The Committee will not vote on rank/tenure petitions or elect the Chair without a quorum. A quorum for the Rank and Tenure Committee will be defined as 51% or more of its members in attendance.
- G. The Committee Chair will select meeting dates, prepare agendas, and maintain meeting minutes.
- H. The Committee members will be required to host informative sessions for petitioning faculty. Notifications for deadline dates will be sent to prospective petitioners according to the timetables listed in the Policy to Petition for Tenure and Policy to Petition for Professorial Rank.

- I. The Committee must read and adhere to the stated policies for Tenure and Professorial Rank.
- J. The Chair will be responsible that all electronic petitions, approved or denied, will be placed in the Amarillo College Archives for the legal duration of five years.

Faculty

# Merit Pay

# Faculty Input

- Committee consists of 3 Washington Street Campus faculty, 2 West Campus Faculty, and 1 East Campus faculty
- 3 full faculty workshops (1 in 2015, 2 in 2016)
- Individual e-mails, discussions, and phone calls
- Faculty Senate discussions
- Department Meetings (late 2016, early 2017)

# Concerns addressed (page 1)

- Favoritism
  - Metrics-based
  - Rubric for Supervisor rating
- Heavy workload on Supervisors
  - Limited narrative in the self-review
  - Rubric
- Money source
  - Steve Smith is working on this
- Self-promotion with Faculty Ideals
  - Checklist of measurable tasks written by faculty
  - No narrative or documentation required

# Concerns addressed (page 2)

- Professional Development Opportunities
  - Dr. Clunis is addressing this
- Lack of Participation in the Student Evaluations
  - Worked with Dr. Beth Rodriguez to craft better student evaluation (opinion) questions
  - Wrote 10 questions that will appear at the beginning of the student evaluation (opinion) questionnaire
- Measurement of community service
  - Faculty self-report (1 or a 5)
  - Justified with narrative; no documentation required

# The Model

- Self-review & Supervisor Review
- Rated on 1-5 scale as required by SACS
- Performance Review is 70% of overall rating
- Faculty Ideals checklist is 30% of overall rating

# Self-Review

- Heavily based on the current PR
- Added in areas for the components faculty chose
  - instructional design
  - instructional delivery
  - assessment
  - resource management
- Added in a rating for previous goals
- Narrative limited to 250 words per rating
- Will be completed in Cornerstone

# Supervisor Review

- Supervisor is notified through Cornerstone when faculty member submits their self-review
- Supervisor rates each component 1-5 based on a rubric
  - Faculty will have access to the rubric
  - Ratings are entered into Cornerstone
- Narrative is *required* for a rating of 1 or 5; otherwise *optional*