

# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

<b>Members Present</b>	Mary Dodson, President Karen White, Vice President Nathan Fryml, Secretary Kati Alley Dan Ferguson Tammy Holmes Robert Johnson Amanda Lester-Chisum Robin Malone Sarah Milford Brandon Moore Bill Netherton Kim Pinter DeeAnne Sisco Sarah Uselding Dave Van Domelen Walter Webb
<b>Members Absent</b>	
<b>Guests</b>	BECKY EASTON ERIC WALLACE LYNDY FORRESTER

Topics	Discussion/Information	Actions/Decisions Recommendations/Timelines
<b>Call to Order</b>	President Mary Dodson called the meeting to order at 2:00pm.	

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**September 14, 2018**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

<b>Approval of Minutes</b>		MOTION to approve: Dave Van Domelen SECOND: Bill Netherton YEA: all NAY: none
<b>President's Report</b>	Review of Mission Statement. Introductions of Senators. Invitation to sign up to attend Board of Regents meetings.	
<b>Vice President's Report</b>	Explanation of the revised rotation dates.	
<b>Secretary's Report</b>	Review of Senate website and committee assignments (responsibilities, records, etc.). Discussion of creation of Parliamentarian position creation. Must be approved by faculty before updating bylaws. Bylaw updates will include minor changes to verbiage (gender neutral, etc.).	MOTION to create Parliamentarian position and confirm bylaw updates at next meeting, pending faculty approval of new position: Dave Van Domelen SECONDED: Kati Alley YEA: all NAY: none
<b>(Probationary) Parliamentarian's Report</b>	Sarah Uselding instated (probationary) during final Senate session of 2017-18 academic year. Discussion of balance between rigidity and formality in ensuring all matters have been sufficiently explored.  Sarah distributed a brief summary of pertinent procedures (drawn from Robert's Rules of Order).	
<b>Courtesy</b>		
<b>Elections</b>		

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**September 14, 2018**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

<b>Legislative</b>		
<b>Mead Award</b>		
<b>Professor Emeritus Award</b>		
Questions	Eight questions brought to the table by Dan Ferguson. Will be distributed to Questions Committee to be resolved before next Senate meeting (some partially addressed by guests later in meeting).	
<b>Technology</b>		
<b>Faculty Survey</b>		
<b>Hospitality</b>		
<b>Faculty Development</b>		
<b>Instructional Technology</b>		
<b>Pinning</b>		
<b>Faculty Committee Appointments</b>		
<b>New Business</b>	<p>[ Guest reports, etc. ]</p> <p>SENATE: Title IX recourse question: Tamara Clunis stated last year that there is no due process for Title IX infractions, sexual harassment, or illegalities.</p> <p>LYNDY FORRESTER (VP for EOD): There is no arbitrary removal of</p>	

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**September 14, 2018**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

	<p>faculty or staff. In issues of Title IX accusations, there are trained investigators who do a thorough investigation of the situation (students, AC employees, etc.) before any action is taken. Nobody is going to be escorted off with no chance of defense.</p> <p>SENATOR: But what happens to the faculty/staff member while investigation is going on?</p> <p>LYNDY: Nothing changes while investigation is underway. Title IX coordinator writes a lengthy report to President, and only then is any action taken. Don't refer to this as "due process, but there is an "alternate process" that endeavors to protect both school and the accused. Title IX coordinator communicates the process / rights to all parties involved.</p> <p>SENATOR: What if there is something naturally occurring in class content which could be perceived as offensive by a student (for example in English or other literature)? Is there protection for the faculty member?</p> <p>LYNDY: Literary content is not applicable under Title IX. Personal commentary would need to be more carefully handled, however.</p> <p>SENATOR: What is the meaning/point of a "trigger warning"?</p> <p>LYNDY: Very specific question. Needs to be addressed by Title IX Coordinator.</p>	
--	---	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>SENATOR: Trigger warnings have been very abused / weaponized of late. Were originally intended to protect victims of PTSD, rape, etc.</p> <p>SENATOR: Main issue is, what if you can't (didn't) foresee how a certain topic (e.g. a poem) will affect a student? Or if a student "takes offense" or "is uncomfortable" with the subject matter?</p> <p>LYNDY: Every claim has to be investigated, but in situations like literary discomfort, there is a certain amount of common sense. Seems very unlikely that situations of "discomfort" would carry any weight in a Title IX claim.</p> <p>SENATOR: Possible to give general trigger warning(s) in syllabus, in which case the student is making the decision themselves to continue in the course. This may be the best way to protect yourself as an instructor.</p> <p>At what point is the faculty member informed of the claim?</p> <p>LYNDY: Basically as soon as the complaint is made to Title IX coordinator. FAQ sheet can be issued by Title IX coordinator help to address all of this.</p> <p>SENATOR: Do we have any opportunity to give a personal defense?</p>	
--	--	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>LYNDY: Absolutely, particularly during talks directly with investigator. Conversations are recorded. Not rushed.</p> <p>SENATE: Merit pay question – how was 4% student evaluation factored into computations? If not statistically valid, was it factored in at all? What happened to the 4%?</p> <p>LYNDY: Will need to investigate to see who knows this, perhaps members of former Faculty Evaluation Committee.</p> <p>SENATE: Merit pay question – What is a “3”?</p> <p>LYNDY: Yes, a lot of conflict within both faculty and staff on this point. Originally was proposed as a 1 – 6 scale, but was replaced with 1 – 5 based on employee input. The problem came from failures in supervisor training, as there was no common understanding of what the various numbers meant, or how to use them properly. Last year, average ended up at a 4.4. Yes, we have great employees. But that just seems to be too high.</p> <p>SENATOR: There is some confusion about what constitutes meeting job requirements, as in the AC culture there are many things required of us (interaction with students, etc.) that are simply expected. High scores seem to be reflecting this normal</p>	
--	--	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>“above and beyond” mentality amongst both faculty and supervisors.</p> <p>LYNDY: Dr. Clunis is planning to have academic leadership workshop to try to get us all on same page about what the expectations are for jobs and what the number scale means.</p> <p>SENATOR: It was reported at VPAA meeting that some departments returned money to the general budget (with the understanding that they were supposed to do so).</p> <p>LYNDY: We need to get this nailed down. On the staff side, they used every penny. Supervisors really do need to use ALL of these approved funds.</p> <p>SENATOR: If we cannot fully fund the merit pay system, should the merit pay system exist at all?</p> <p>LYNDY: That question needs to be presented to the Board. Currently, it doesn't seem to be an option to go back to across-the-board raises. It is an issue that every person receiving over 2% necessitates another receiving less than 2%, which may or may not be entirely warranted. Lyndy wants to get more involved (than was allowed in the past) and be on the same page with faculty and staff.</p> <p>SENATOR: Doesn't seem fair that specific ratings (like a “4”)</p>	
--	--	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>translates differently into funds based on department allocations, or that a lower rating in one department may equal a higher rating in another, if majority in certain departments tend how or low in performance (compared to other departments). The comment at Faculty meeting was that we averaged a 4.4 and should have averaged a 3.</p> <p>BECKY: Important to restrict department funds to keep any supervisor bias (or general grading tendency) equalized.</p> <p><i>(Continued discussion of various possible scenarios, inequities, etc.)</i></p> <p>LYNDY: Biggest issue that needs to be addressed is supervisor training. Frustration is heard loud and clear. How can we get the necessary players to the table to get this clarified?</p> <p>SENATOR: Is it not possible that these problems are simply reflective of the fact that the merit system (with so many inherent biases) doesn't work? Meant to motivate, but doesn't appear to.</p> <p>LYNDY: Things that might help: Supervisor training plan for staff and faculty leadership (two separate trainings to deal with leadership). Address last year's snafu with the goal training portion of Cornerstone eval's. As far as the math portion of the discussion, can coordinate with Steve a visual presentation and careful explanation of how the money flow works. Also, clarification and OVER-clarification of how the rating system works</p>	
--	--	--



# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>and is to be used. And express to Board that if we have a merit pay system, we need to be able to fund it.</p> <p>SENATOR: But even if there is clarification, we still can't give above 2% without taking from someone else?</p> <p>LYNDY: A lot of companies use an A, B, C system (submitting ratings from various departments), but Amarillo College decided against this strongly to avoid having to rate down very qualified employees. Never meant to make anyone's lives harder or frustrating. Cornerstone is a great platform, but the program uploaded into it is far too complicated. Yes, it was said that certain ratings would equate to exact percentages, but that was before certain specifics were fully understood and made operational.</p> <p>SENATOR: Big problem in employee perception of inequity is because merit pay is supposed to replace cost of living increases.</p> <p>We hear from one part of administration how great we are and how this is reported around the country, and from another that many of us are "3s" (or below) and over-rating ourselves. There is a mixed message here.</p> <p>BECKY EASTON (Chair of Faculty Evaluation Committee): Committee received a charge to gain faculty feedback on</p>	
--	---	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Cornerstone and communicate to VPAA. Most recurring comment was that the Cornerstone evaluation questions were redundant. Also that percentages of percentages were very confusing. Fulfillment of goals, condition of student evaluation process, and iCare aspect further complicated matters.</p> <p><i>(Exploration of a printed example of a Cornerstone review).</i></p> <p>LYNDY: Goal was to simplify the evaluation process, not lengthen. Regarding “goals” in general, there are 5 main institutional goals. The goals are meant to align from top down (through assignment of goals from supervisor to lower levels). The individual is able to create additional goals, submitted for approval to supervisor.</p> <p><i>(Clarification: faculty is supposed to go by the iCare values, not the Wiffy values.)</i></p> <p>Faculty need training to access data in IDS system for that portion of the evaluation.</p> <p>Some changes that have been put in place already:</p> <p>Creating two separate categories for service (College vs. Community) to help with transition over to applications for rank and/or tenure.</p> <p>The length of the evaluation has been cut down considerably.</p>	
--	---	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

September 14, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Committee recommends allowing a March to March cycle (encompassing the summer) for accomplishment of faculty development and service goals. Perhaps allow new faculty to not set goals until March, towards following year?</p> <p>Any changes suggested by Senate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change "Other duties as assigned" to "Other duties" to better capture extent of work.</li> </ul> <p>Self-evaluations will benefit from much more clarification, delineation, etc.</p> <p>Possibility of doing away with self-evaluation percentage in the final calculation, if too complicated. Of course self-evaluation would still be <i>required</i>, just not factored into merit calculations.</p> <p>Senate will offer feedback on the 4 major points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change cycle to March-to-March</li> <li>- Change language as suggested above</li> <li>- Eliminate student evaluations as a separate category and integrating it in the teaching category.</li> <li>- Remove self-evaluation from the final calculation</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Unfinished Business</b></p>	<p>Dr. Dolby left a memo on meeting with Police Department. None of these items were addressed over summer. Turning over to Questions committee.</p>	

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**September 14, 2018**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

<b>Updates and Announcements</b>	Next meeting Oct. 5	
<b>Meeting Adjournment</b>	President Mary Dodson adjourned meeting at 4:50pm.	MOTION to adjourn: Tammy Holmes SECOND: Walter Webb

**Recorder: Nathaniel Fryml, Instructor, Senator for Liberal Arts**