

Faculty Senate Minutes
December 7, 2018
Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Members Present	Mary Dodson, President Karen White, Vice President Nathan Fryml, Secretary Sarah Uselding, Parliamentarian Kati Alley Dan Ferguson Robert Johnson Amanda Lester-Chisum Robin Malone Brandon Moore Bill Netherton Kim Pinter DeeAnne Sisco Dave Van Domelen Walter Webb Tammy Holmes
Members Absent	Sarah Milford DeeAnne Sisco
Guests	RUSSELL LOWERY-HART (BRIEF VISIT TO WISH US AND THE REST OF THE FACULTY HAPPY HOLIDAYS AND MUCH NEEDED REST)

Topics	Discussion/Information	Actions/Decisions Recommendations/Timelines
Call to Order	President Mary Dodson called the meeting to order at 2:00pm.	
Approval of Minutes	Approval of 11/2/2018 meeting minutes.	MOTION to approve: Bill Netherton SECOND: Kim Pinter

Faculty Senate Minutes
December 7, 2018
Ware Student Commons, Room 207

		YEA: all NAY: none
President's Report	<p>Title IX update: Lyndy Forrester reported that she had compiled a process and sent it to Tamara. Mary never got a response from Tamara after asking her where this stood, but Frank Sobey said it was with Mark White for review.</p> <p>Suggestions for increasing Summer enrollment compiled and distributed. Sent on to Frank Sobey for his consideration.</p> <p>UPDATE: Statement on merit pay to President, Board of Regents, and Cabinet was altered very slightly upon request from Dr. Lowery-Hart (address line and bullet point 3) and then officially submitted. Dr. Lowery-Hart indicated he shared it with the Board. Attached to the current minutes.</p>	
Vice President's Report	<p>Is it possible for faculty to exit Commencement through the same gate they entered, and so have a better chance to see their students at the student reception rather than fighting crowds? Will make suggestion to Commencement Committee and see what their response is. Also will be interesting to see how the new split ceremony affects things in the spring and beyond.</p>	
Secretary's Report		
Parliamentarian's Report		
Courtesy	<p>Can we access faculty birthdays to allow for congratulations, etc.? Also, now sure why Badger Buzz is so much less frequent now. Will</p>	

Faculty Senate Minutes
December 7, 2018
Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	ask Will Ratliff about it.	
Elections	Does a Senate vacancy have to be filled mid-year, for example in the event of a department change of a faculty member? Or can faculty member continue to represent their original department for the remainder of the year? Seems this is the precedent. We need to be notified, also, when new divisions are created and new deans are appointed (e.g. Creative Arts).	
Legislative	It would seem that Title IX protocol does not HAVE to be followed for off-campus incidents. Seeing as we don't have much on-campus residential community, it's a bit of a moot point. However, recent state-level policy changes may translate into some general procedural changes.	
Mead Award	<p>20 people who responded wanted 2 separate awards (for the split ceremony). 10 wanted 1, with reasonably solid arguments for it. A couple of people suggested removing it from Commencement entirely and moving it to General Assembly.</p> <p>Mead award is open to students as well, so the logic was that the presentation should be in front of them. Currently faculty nominations are received as well.</p> <p>Another option is to move it to Honors Convocation, which is intrinsically student-centered.</p> <p>Or just leave it as 1 and present it at the appropriate</p>	

Faculty Senate Minutes
December 7, 2018
Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	Commencement ceremony (depending on their area). We can poll faculty with the more specific options.	
Professor Emeritus Award	Sorting through many, many lists, trying to get the final eligibility list pared down. Have two solid nominations with (necessary) accompanying narrative. Waiting for more by next Friday, then will be voted on next meeting.	
Questions	SEE QUESTIONS / ANSWERS for <u>November</u> in attached document.	
Technology		
Faculty Survey		
Hospitality	Lovely Christmas treats. Thanks!	
Faculty Development		
Instructional Technology		
Pinning		
Faculty Committee Appointments		
Guest report(s)		
New Business	There is a subcommittee of the Senate that is working on Frank's request that we address faculty and student engagement in online classes. Parallel contracts for faculty and students for 48-hour response time have been proposed. We will have something for the Senate to consider at the next meeting.	

Faculty Senate Minutes
December 7, 2018
Ware Student Commons, Room 207

<p>Unfinished Business</p>	<p>Brandon Moore gave report on discussions with faculty on Hereford and Dumas campuses and challenges and representation. [See document attached] <i>Note: While these campuses are financially independent, they receive services from various departments within AC and are bound AC policies.</i> What can we do to foster greater communication with these groups? Start by making a special invitation to participate in our discussions, and see where things go.</p> <p>Also, Senate has recently become aware that academic freedom resides not with faculty but with the institution (state attorney general, etc.). As we go through course redesign, we are being told by administrators (CTL, etc.) what must and cannot be included. We need to keep our eyes open to the ramifications of this influence, though this may not be the time to draw undue attention to ourselves and run the risk of having definitions and rulings go specifically against us. The original Title V course redesign was totally faculty driven. Why has this changed?</p>	
<p>Updates and Announcements</p>	<p>Tamara and Frank will be here in January.: Title IX, survey, and evaluations</p> <p>Invite new EOD director to visit in March or April.</p>	
<p>Meeting Adjournment</p>	<p>Next meeting scheduled for January 18.</p>	<p>MOTION to adjourn: Mary Dodson SECOND: Nathan Fryml</p>

Faculty Senate Minutes

December 7, 2018

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Recorder: Nathaniel Fryml, Instructor, Senator for Liberal Arts

NOVEMBER 2018 QUESTIONS

Report for Faculty Senate Meeting on 12/7/18

1. **What is the breakdown of travel money spent last year for administration, faculty, students, and staff?**

[Response from Steve Smith] I have no way of breaking down travel down to the employee class. Our GL object codes are not set up by class for travel, they are set up by purpose of the travel. Below are the Travel object codes.

- a. 523100-Travel Professional
- b. 523210-Travel Instit Local Mileage
- c. 523220-Travel Instit Req. – Other
- d. 523300-Travel Instructional
- e. 523400-Travel Student
- f. 523401-Travel Stdnt Class Required
- g. 523500-Travel Interviewing/Hiring
- h. 523600-Training

I have provided you with the budget and expenses by division **[see document attached to this report]**. I hope this will be satisfactory for your uses.

[Senate commentary] Very shocking the dollar amounts. Appears that the same group is travelling quite a bit. Is it truly necessary? And so much on student trips, etc.? Why so little support for faculty professional development? It's not right to consider faculty participation on these trips sufficient travel.

We need to follow up and address concerns to the specific departments to determine how and why these dollars are being spent. Also, need at least one further level of breakdown of this budget/expense record.

Big concern also is that every dollar spent on travel comes out of merit pay. We have no power to change policy, but it is important to ask the question.

2. **What is the breakdown of merit pay percentages last year? We know that faculty got 40% of the total money. What portion did administration get? What portion did staff get?**

[Response from Steve Smith]

This is a complete list of raises for 2018 into 2019. Raises for Job audits or promotions to new positions are not included.

Employee Classification	Merit Eligible Employees	Class % of Total	Total Raise	Merit Aw
510-Administrators	56	14%	\$ 108,911	\$
5110-Classified Appointed	296	34%	\$ 260,017	\$
5120-Faculty Appointed	183	51%	\$ 386,493	\$

Notes:

1. The amounts are above include all sources, grant and budget.
2. All amounts are actual with the exception of overload hours and summer parity pay. These amounts are based on the budget and not actuals as I do not yet know in 2019 how many overload hours or summer hours will be taught.
 - a. Merit raise applied to the base pay also increases the pay for overload hours and summer parity.
3. When comparing the total awarded to faculty and other classes remember that the % of the overall raise will be skewed higher towards the classified and faculty. This is for 2 reasons.
 - a. The largest population is classified employees. This population includes some of our lower paid employees but there are more in total.
 - b. Faculty base salaries are calculated based on 9 months of work (allocated and paid over 12 months) while classified and admin salaries and wages are calculated based on 12 months or work.

See example below.

Both employees are paid \$5000 for a month of work. As one employee works 12 months and the other works 9 months they have a different total pay even though they are paid the same for each month worked.

When you apply the same raise % to each employee, a higher amount is applied to the Classified/Admin employee because their total pay is higher. If the faculty member were to work the 3 additional months, the raise would increase the pay for the additional months as well and effectively they would have the same raise.

Employee Classification	Months Worked	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Classified/Admin	12 Month	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Faculty	9 Month	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000

Employee Classification	Months Worked	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Classified/Admin	12 Month	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Faculty	12 Month	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000

[Senate commentary] We are currently at approximately 1 administrator per 3 faculty. And were there not several administrators reclassified as “classified” employees?

3. Is it possible to have a final exam schedule (2-hour block) for eight week classes?

[Dan Ferguson relayed progress on discussion] No solid answer as yet. There is no good way to do this because the number of exam days are already truncated. This is particularly an issue as

more and more classes become 8-wk. This is a room-availability issue only to the extent that the exam does not conflict with another lecture class on the student's schedule, which creates an entirely different problem. Brandon Moore is going to meet with Diane Brice to try to come up with something and make some headway.

We also need clarity on why grade submission cannot be extended until Monday, as students are not handed diplomas at Commencement anyway.

4. Who has the authority to cancel classes?

[Response from Tamara Clunis] Thank you for sending forward this question, Dan. Amarillo College does not have a formal policy regarding course cancellations. For the ACES conference last week, I met with the deans of faculty slated to receive the training and requested that the training be mandatory for all full-time faculty in their respective areas.

Course cancellations for this purpose are not out of the ordinary and consistent with historical practice for professional learning. It is no different than a faculty member who cancels a class to attend a conference for professional learning, accreditation meetings, or even an illness. Please note: In the case of this request, the faculty were notified 4 weeks in advance and asked to build this cancellation into their calendaring and provide students with an out-of-class assignment.

Some may ask about the need to do this in the middle of the semester. AC has grant funds for professional development that are going to expire this year. We wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to provide the faculty training. We will provide follow-up training to faculty in January 2019 and have already put those dates on the calendar.

I am glad the question about course cancellations was raised. While this cancellation was squarely within the purview of historical and allowable practice at AC, I am concerned about the faculty who are cancelling classes for reasons other than professional learning and illness. I have seen documentation where faculty are taking an 8-week course that meets M-R and cancelling as much as 50% of the class. This means that a 4-day-a-week class is meeting only 2 days a week and the students are being instructed to work on a major assignment during the cancelled class periods.

We also have faculty who are ending their classes for an 8-week term 2-3 days early and holding final exams during scheduled class time. The registrar expressed concern that 18 sections had final grades submitted before the final exam period for 1st 8-week classes.

If the faculty senators would like to engage in a discussion to codify a formal cancellation policy, I am more than happy to participate. I am concerned with what I am seeing regarding faculty cancelling classes for reasons other than professional learning and illness. When is the next faculty senate meeting? Let me know if the senators would like to discuss this further.

If you have any other questions, please let me know.

Best regards,

Tamara Clunis

[Faculty commentary] This goes back to how the most recent ACES conference was handled. There was some pushback from faculty even at that point wanting to know whether it is appropriate and legal to cancel classes in this way.

5. **In the past, chairs were annually evaluated by faculty. Now in light of chairs having 70% say-so over salary increases (rumor has it this will soon be 100%), this is ever more needful. However, somehow, this practice has been dropped. Would Faculty Senate please see that evaluations of chairs is put back in place?**

[Response from Tamara Clunis] Thank you for the question, Dan. The former department chair and coordinator evaluation process was lost during the transition to Cornerstone. Under the current system, department chairs and coordinators are to integrate accomplishments regarding their administrative duties into the current faculty evaluation template submitted through Cornerstone. While this allows the dean to evaluate for the position, it doesn't allow the faculty to have input.

I fully support faculty having the opportunity to provide feedback on how they view the work of their academic leaders. I would like to give the academic leaders the opportunity to have input on the evaluation tool. Faculty will have an opportunity to provide feedback on the process and the tool. We will begin work on this in January to implement for the next academic year. Mary has me on the schedule to address a few topics at the January faculty senate meeting. I will ask her to add this to my list of discussion topics.

Don't forget that the faculty will submit their feedback regarding my performance in January 2019.

6. **Where are our student evaluations for the last three semesters?**

[Response from Cheryl Oldham] Cheryl Oldham sets them up for distribution in Class Climate, but then the department chairs must send them out to faculty through Class Climate. So if some people are not getting their student evaluations, they need to check with their department chair. If faculty aren't sure if they have them, they can search their email for "Class Climate."

7. **Does the Faculty Senate let the Cabinet and Board of Regents know the questions submitted to them? Does the Board get copies of Senate minutes?**

[Response from Joy Brenneman] Russell tells me that he sent to the Cabinet and the Board the faculty senate minutes, the questions, and the senate memo addressed to him [recently]. The Senate should not send anything directly to the Board. Protocol is that all communication to the Board goes through the President's office. Many Cabinet members are also on the faculty list and receive the minutes, etc. when they are sent out.

[Senate commentary] We absolutely can send Minutes and Q's Committee report to President's office each month and asking that he share them with Board. Will do that

8. **How much does Cornerstone cost per year?**

[Response from Ina Fiel and Fran Garcia, EOD] Cornerstone is paid yearly based on the number of users. There is a set amount for 600 users. Anything over that is adjusted. The college pays \$17,000 per year for Cornerstone.

9. Have EOD policies been followed for the posting of all administrative positions?

[Dan Ferguson relayed progress on discussion] No answer yet from EOD.

[Senate commentary] Was partially addressed by Lyndy Forrester during her visit to Faculty Senate in September. Gist was that they always SHOULD BE. Relates to the concerns expressed in the most recent questions received about Faculty Senate pressing harder into these and like issues. We need further clarity, especially if policies are not being followed.

10. Where is our personal profile aka beeper? We're 10 weeks into the semester....

[Dan Ferguson relayed progress on discussion] The answer to Sarah Milford was that the “beeper” would be sent to us by December 1. They have not seen anything here at West campus. She also looked on Cornerstone to see if anything had been added there, but no such luck.

11. It has come to my attention through a few others...that our Social Security number is available for alllll to see on Colleague. I am super uncomfortable with that. Anyone that has a beef could get in and wreak havoc on peoples credit. Obviously—we would hope no one would do that. But frankly—a few people I wouldn't put it past them. And oddly I understand that our address is not mandatory. So...if anything could be changed so not all of the College has access to everyone's social...that would be great.

[Response from Fran Garcia in EOD] Each employee, no matter the level, is talked to about confidentiality and the importance of adhering to it in orientation. Additionally, it is presumed that in department orientation it is revisited. However; in speaking with Diane Brice, FERPA Compliance officer, she mentioned she had intentions of working with our training department in EOD to conduct a FERPA training for the college.

I do know that Ask AC, EOD and Financial Aid potentially use the last 4 of someone's social to verify them prior to giving out any information. But it is my understanding that sensitive data is not made visible to the masses.

[Senate commentary] Answer is not satisfactory. Question has been forwarded to Russell Lowery-Hart and Joy Brenneman.

12. Our students do not check email. One of the main reasons for this is that WAY TOO MUCH is sent to DL-All AC Family and/or DL-Students. When these emails and the inevitable reply all responses fill up student inboxes, most students do not wade through and ignore all emails. Can we at least limit emails sent to these distribution lists to those that are AC related and vital for students? I am receiving emails in my google apps email that are for community events not related to AC and multiple reply all responses.

[Robin Malone relayed progress on discussion] Seeking response from Russell L-H at suggestion from Heather Voran.

[Senate commentary] Is certain communication being cut back too much, though? Do we need training on how to use Master Calendar, and have Student Life calendar synced up with it somehow? Master Calendar should absolutely be better utilized.

13. Thanks in advance for taking the time to address the issue below.

It appears that the published Census Date is not completely accurate. I pull the listed date from the email sent by the Assistant Registrar:

Important 2018FA Dates*			
View "My Important Course Section Dates" in ACConnect to Confirm the Dates for Your Classes and Please Mark Your Calendar			
Term	Census Date – Has student attended class (lecture, lab, or hybrid class) or submitted work or participated (online class) by the end of this date? (See "Census Roster...Instructions...")	Last Day to Withdraw (i.e. Day Forms Should Be Signed and Submitted) – Student responsible for submitting on time, but instructor must sign. Dual Credit has a different process than submitting this form (see Jason or Becky) (See "Academic Withdrawal Request Form.." or Link in Syllabi)	Grades Due – For Dual Credit Due Dates Visit with Jason Norman or Becky Burton (See "Preparing Grade Centers..." Instructions)
2018FA: 1st 8-Week Term (August 20 th – October 11 th)	August 27 th (Due by noon – August 28 th)	October 2 nd (Students need to complete process by this date)	October 12 th (Grades due by noon – October 13 th)
2018FA: 16-Week Term (August 20 th – December 14 th)	September 5 th (Due by noon – September 6 th)	November 20 th (Students need to complete process by this date)	December 14 th (Due by noon – Grades due this date/time so we can proceed with fall graduation processes)
2018FA: 2nd 8-Week Term (October 22 nd – December 14 th)	October 29 th (Due by noon – October 30 th)	December 5 th (Students need to complete process by this date)	December 14 th (Due by noon – Grades due this date/time so we can proceed with fall graduation processes)

*Census Date: Instructor submits census information following census class day (follows instructions on the attachment)
 *Withdrawal: Registrar can withdraw through census without form. After census, the instructor either supplies the student the withdrawal form with their approval signature or the student prints the form and gets all required signatures (Access in Syllabi). After the instructor/student agree on the drop, the student is responsible for getting all other needed signatures and submitting the form to the AskAC counter (see attached form). Contact Kristin McDonald-Willey when special accommodations are needed.
 *Grades Due: Instructor submits this information following the last class day (follow instructions on attachment). Student cannot be given extended time for finals and all non-dual credit grades must be in by the designated "Grades Due" date.

As noted above, the due date for rosters is noon, October 30, 2018. However, by 11 a.m. this morning, I had already received notes asking me to get these submitted ASAP. When asked about this rushed effort, it was indicated that the rush was coming from the Registrar and VPAA offices.

If faculty need to get these done sooner, then the announced due date needs to be moved up on the published materials. Based on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Boards [Glossary of Terms](#) under "CBM001" the "official census date, which is the 12th class day for the Fall and Spring semesters (16-week session) and the 4th class day for each of the summer terms (6-week session)." The definition does not give a specific "12th class day" for 8 week courses. Based on the listed date above, it appears faculty members have 8 and a half days to report final rosters. Should it be only 8 days, with a half day for reporting? This time frame does matter. I teach hybrid courses where I only see students twice a week. By allowing for one more set of meetings, I can potentially catch one more student and encourage them to attend. However, if the extra time doesn't matter, I could have turned in my roster last week.

[Response from Diane Brice]

Census Date Issues:

- a. According to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) the census date is attached according to the following information. Rosters should be submitted based on the attendance on or before the census date. Attendance should not be submitted based on attendance after the census date, even if you submit your roster the day following census or after. To further answer questions related to census, I would need to look at each course individually. I am happy to do this. Just have the faculty members contact me and we'll see if we can get to the bottom of the discrepancies.
- b. As far as the rush to get the rosters certified, 2nd 8 week classes now have a really tight turn around. AC has been granted special permission to include these enrollment counts in the semester in which they are being taught. Historically, these enrollments would have been considered flexible entry and reported in the following semesters enrollment counts. The staff at the THECB have notified us that missing a deadline on reporting will forfeit this special permission. We have been given a charge that we will not miss this deadline.

Official Reporting Date The following schedule will be used to determine the official census date for terms of various lengths:

Census Dates for Other Term Lengths

Fall and Spring Semesters		Summer Semester
Length of Term (Weeks)	Census Date	Length of Term (Weeks)
Census Date		
2 or less	1st Class Day	2 or less
1st Class day		
3	2nd Class Day	3
2nd Class Day		
4	3rd Class Day	4
3rd Class Day		
5 – 6	4th Class Day	5 – 6
4th Cass Day		
7	5th Class Day	7
5th Class Day		
8	6th Class Day	8
6th Class Day		
9 – 10	7th Class Day	9
7th Class Day		
11	8th Class Day	10 or more
12th Class Day		
12	9th Class Day	
13 – 14	10th Class Day	
15	11th Class Day	
16	12th Class Day	

The count of class days begins on the first day that classes are held in the term and includes each calendar day on which classes are normally held at the institution (e.g., Monday through Friday) until the official census date is reached. The official census day must be on a day that the Registrar’s office is scheduled to be open so that a student will be able to drop or withdraw from class.

[Senate commentary] This is a funding issue and a lot of pressure to get info in on time. It is very important that we DO get these rosters in, so the email reminders are probably essential.

NEW QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IMMEDIATELY

[see scanned document attached]

1. Lowery-Hart / Merit Pay as “dead issue” / Clunis regarding survey

Russell is aware of this document. The way these are addressed/delivered/phrased speak a lot about the culture of fear. We have been pushing hard in communicating with administration. We do address every question. Perhaps we should make it more clear in reporting when we feel an answer is incomplete or evasive. For instance, we generally agree that the survey tool is ineffective, but also that Tamara should have been more direct in her answers. Perhaps we (Senate) should plan to more aggressively pursue specifics from the administrators answering the questions. We can't control how they answer, but it is incumbent on us to ask respective, pointed questions.

Is it fair, though, for the faculty to ask us to put ourselves on the line (without anonymity) on these volatile issues? We've never seen such a constant stream of anonymous, faculty concerns. Frustration seems to be rising.

Bear in mind, Senate serves at the President's pleasure. We can be disbanded at any time.

These anonymous questions are a symptom of a genuine breakdown of trust between faculty and administration. We are currently serving as the go-between in this situation, reporting both sides as accurately as possible. Are we, as the "messengers," getting shot here?

Is this serving as a replacement for a faculty grievance process?

Is it possible to have a general meeting (as requested by the questioner) with a system in place for submission of anonymous questions and follow-up questions? Russell, Tamara, rep from EOD, and Cabinet? Can we set it up as a live-stream (for other campuses, etc.)?

Is week before classes start feasible for this meeting? Or at general faculty meeting?

Typical for a panel to address several major issues, with questions following.

Goal is for openness and transparency, but also to bring moral back up. Start on a path of reparation of relationships.

Also, request that faculty continue to send questions but endeavor to make them more direct and less like a rant (though the latter is telling in itself).

2. Faculty being made fun of by administrators and cabinet.

Needs to be sent to Russell. Cabinet absolutely needs to be aware this is going on and the effect it is having.

New Questions - December

Questions Committee:

We read the latest minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting, November 02, 2018, and had several conversations with other faculty who share concerns about the answers Lowery-Hart and Clunis provided. It seems they do everything in their power to provide jargon that is meant to redirect the faculty. We want true answers from them and ones that are not self-serving. We want real respect from them, not political rhetoric that buys them some time to address..

Dr. Lowery-Hart's explanation about the search for the VP of EOD seems to resolve him of all accountability from the mistakes he made when hand-choosing Lyndy Forrester. He's known for several years that things were not working in EOD, because the faculty surveys show evidence. Rumor has it that search committees for the VP positions and others are orchestrated by him so that he gets the person he wants, rather than the right candidate.

We are skeptical about the next candidate he is interviewing for the VP of EOD. Rumor has it that he has already decided about who he wants, because of friendship, which was the case with Forrester, too.

How can we be sure he is serving us best? History of his actions serves well here.

How can we trust his decision? Are his decisions ever questioned by the Board of Regents?

Also, on B (2) of the questions, Dr. Lowery-Hart has sufficiently used political savvy and rhetoric to try to derail us into not thinking that administration messed up the merit raise processes. In consideration of his remark concerning the merit pay for staff two years ago, "We learned that we needed to have better training for the supervisors and staff, more conversations about the rating scales, and to simplify the system. We are evaluating these same lessons for the faculty implementation." According to his statements and based on "evaluating these same lessons for faculty", why wasn't administration more proactive in a timely fashion so that faculty did not receive the brunt of previous mistakes?

Administration has not been fair with us and rolled this out without addressing previous concerns. Also, Dr. Lowery-Hart states, "We didn't have a plethora (sic) of best practices to pull from within our context." Really, Dr. Lowery-Hart? We are educated individuals who deserve better answers than this. Relating back to the Faculty Senate Minutes from November 2, under "Unfinished Business", we cannot accept that the Faculty Senate would even consider that merit pay concerns could be a "dead issue." As a representative body for all faculty, are you all satisfied with these answers? We will not let this go.

In consideration of Dr. Clunis' remarks, the faculty survey tool has now become ineffective and another tool is being considered. Does this mean she does not have to answer the original question "effectively" and provide timelines to address faculty concerns? Seems the tool has been effective in the past.

Also, Dr. Clunis states in C. (1) she "believes that smaller department meetings are more effective" when answering questions about college business. She overlooked the statement that some faculty are likely to share concerns anonymously where they can be addressed anonymously at a public meeting with the board of regents and the news media present due to fear in the college culture. Dr. Clunis, will you respect this request as originally given to the Questions Committee? We are not satisfied with your answer. The original question asked for the board of regents to be on the panel, not the Cabinet, and we want the media to be there. Also, on question E, Dr. Clunis has not addressed the question about the faculty survey being sent to the Board of Regents or Dr. Lowery-Hart addressing the concerns with faculty, but instead refers us to the newly proposed survey tool, again. Will you address properly?

New Questions - December

FOR THE FACULTY SENATE QUESTIONS COMMITTEE

Amarillo College's NO EXCUSES Philosophy includes:

Caring through FAMILY

We will find ways to show we care about our student and each other.

We will readily and effectively share information with each other.

We will approach our interactions with each other with trust and openness.

We will put the needs of others before our own.

How can such a philosophy serve us well when our administrators, the President, certain members of the Cabinet, the VPAA and Associate VPAA, and some of the Deans are known to talk about others negatively and openly at the college. For instance, the word is out that several employees are "not liked" by some of these individuals. It is also reported that people are made fun of and laughed at. May I suggest that you all be careful about sharing your negative thoughts to those who you think are in your circles? It is very hurtful when this information gets back to employees (me for one), and it is bad for morale, too (including mine and others). Please be the leaders we can respect. Really show that you all CARE THROUGH FAMILY, otherwise, it is just a lame philosophy for others to read that we really do not follow or believe in.

Summary of Faculty Ideas re Summer Enrollment and Frank Sobey's response (October, 2018)

Scheduling/Offerings

- Offer flexibility—15 day classes; 3 ½ week classes, 1 day a week classes, etc. We can look into this. I wonder what Odessa is doing here. It will be important, however, to have some consistency. I am not sure that, for a sequence, it would be good for a student to move from a 3 ½ week Comp I into, say, a 5 ½ week Comp II. Plus, multiple start and end points create confusion on the advising and registration side of the house. The FWA (pay) would be much more difficult, as well. I wonder what a three term summer would look like with 3 ½ week classes, though. That's intriguing. A student enrolled in all three terms could earn at least 9 credits or get through a developmental sequence before fall.
- Increase the number of online classes So summer online is actually pretty good in terms of course success across most disciplines. However, one thing we are wanting to change is the summer atmosphere. It's like a ghost town. However, increasing face-to-face offerings wouldn't necessarily mean decreasing online, if the enrollments were there to be had.
- Offer hybrid courses I am not so sure about the shortened hybrids. Of course, we don't have a whole lot of data on them. Right now, a 5 ½ week hybrid creates scheduling issues for students looking to take more than one class in any given term. However, a three-term summer might alleviate that.
- Increase dual credit offerings These have steadily increased in certain areas over the last three years. Certainly, increasing the GenEd core DC offerings makes sense, with the right marketing strategy.
- Offer FYS classes At some point, FT faculty are going to have to start teaching more of the FYS sections. Right now, it's mostly staff and some FT faculty who take on overloads. But yes, taking FYS before fall would most likely enable students to hit the ground running in fall.

Marketing

- Visit high schools in the spring and encourage students to take summer classes We are planning on doing some targeted spring activities with regional ISDs. This could be done quite easily.
- Utilize Coaches and Champions Program to follow up with interested students A Denese Skinner question...
- Develop a program to target students at universities who come home in the summer to pick up courses here The first step would be to see how many of these students we have served historically. But yes, I am sure C&M could come up with something.

Financial Assistance

- Extend Financial Aid to summer students I think we do have this available...
- Offer some sort of summer discount ("WT is doing something like this.") Brilliant. The one problem with it, however, is 100% summer parity. I would have to get with Steve to see how the break-even point would change.
- Create a "summer" scholarship program Definitely doable with the Foundation's help.

Student Survey

- Design a student survey and ask current students, as well as AIDS high school seniors, for input as to what might encourage them to become summer school students **I bet Bob Austin could work something up.**

All good ideas. I'll pass them along to the higher-ups for some additional feedback.

**Notes from Discussion with some AC Faculty that Teach at Dumas and Hereford
B. Moore, Nov. 2018**

[I asked 3 questions; my comments are in brackets.]

1. Do the Hereford and Dumas campuses have unique problems or challenges?

[Yes, most definitely. This applies at the institutional level as well as the faculty level.]

(A) The Hereford and Dumas campuses are financially separate from AC, but they must follow AC rules.

[This has created a number of problems for their faculty.]

- By enforcing an 8 week class schedule, enrollment at Hereford has decreased by a lot.

They now have only 4 full time faculty versus 6-7 previously.

To enable their biology class to be held, they have class periods lasting 4 hour 45 min, which meets 2X/wk.

[To have this arrangement on a routine basis becomes a challenging, difficult schedule both for faculty and students.]

They have had to go to ITV courses for other subjects (instructional tv).

[This might be more of a faculty recruitment issue, but eliminating direct faculty-student contact is seldom a good thing.]

- Dumas has 6 full time faculty.

Some courses require tutoring of students that make below 70 on exams. However, Dumas has only 3 tutors for science classes, and they apparently each work only ~ 6 hours/week.

[Therefore, faculty have to do a lot of tutoring as extra work, which is not the case at least for Science faculty on the Washington St campus.]

Hereford also has an insufficient number of tutors, so faculty there have to do much of their own tutoring as well.

[This causes a significant increase in faculty workload at both locations, which is not compensated.]

- Course instruction is to be equivalent on these campuses to what is taught on the Washington St campus, but their resources are not equivalent.

There is no lab prep person in Dumas for biology classes.

[Again, this causes an increase in faculty workload, which is not compensated.]

There are insufficient models and a general lack of out of class access to these and other related course materials.

[Student learning opportunities are not the same as on the Washington street campus. This creates more difficult challenges for faculty to achieve student success goals.]

- All hiring and payroll has to go thru HR at AC, even though they have separate budgets.

A recent important hire for a part time lab prep position at Hereford took 6 months to get through HR.

[This caused a significant increase in faculty workload, which was not compensated.]

A recent payroll snafu resulted in a long time employee at Dumas not being paid the first of October. Only with heroic efforts was the employee able to get paid a few days later.

[This could have been handled much more readily if this did not have to go through AC payroll.]

(B) The Dumas and Hereford campuses do not currently administer programs or classes distinct from those offered at AC, but they possibly could.

- Hereford does have a lot of equipment and major invested resources for training in HVAC and forklift operations, along with a well-equipped machine shop.

They are struggling to find people to train these types of students, as well as finding students to enroll.

[There would seem to be good training and job opportunities locally in these areas, but this is more of an institutional issue for now.]

2. Do faculty at the Hereford and Dumas campuses often feel left out or ignored?

[Yes, definitely. The amount of gratitude they expressed that anyone would be asking about their teaching activities and unique challenges was by my view a surprising and strong take home message.]

3. Do the Hereford and Dumas campuses merit representation on Faculty Senate?

- The interviewed faculty absolutely feel that representation is merited.

The interviewed faculty would have no issue in attending Senate meetings and as feasible other related campus activities. Some of these faculty live in Amarillo, others in Canyon.

[Perhaps the Senate could revisit this issue and consider having even a single, at-large representative (?).]

TO: Dr. Russell Lowery-Hart, Cabinet, and Board of Regents
FROM: Faculty Senate
RE: Amarillo College Merit Pay
DATE: November 30, 2018

As we are elected representatives of the faculty at large—and in light of the significant and recurring questions and complaints sent to us by faculty regarding merit pay—we feel compelled to communicate some of these concerns to you. By respectfully doing so, we hope to eliminate faculty responses being directed your way that may be neither gracious nor unbiased.

We are involved in an on-going effort to improve the merit pay process. However, the concerns outlined below go beyond process:

- Concisely put, there is not enough money in the bucket for the system to work. On the one hand, supervisors must necessarily take funds from lower ranking but solid faculty members in order to more substantially reward the “highest” performers. Conversely, supervisors generally agree that if a faculty member is worth keeping, they deserve not to “lose” and should be compensated at least somewhat in line with cost of living variables. This results in having to “rob those at the top” from fitting compensation in order to give an adequate increase to those at the bottom. As a result, the system disincentivizes high performance rather than motivating it, while also discouraging faculty who may not be in a position to go as far “above and beyond” as their high-achieving colleagues.
- The ranking system ranges between 1 and 5. This translates into percentages which vary from department to department. For example, a 4.0 performance ranking in one department could result in a 3.2% increase. The same 4.0 performance ranking in another department could result in a 1.8% increase. This inequity is problematic.
- The five member task force working with Dr. Vess to design AC’s merit pay system had insufficient knowledge and, therefore, could not answer questions as to the above voiced by faculty during preliminary meetings.

These are just some of the basic concerns expressed by numerous faculty members and sent to the Senate. Faculty Senate is at somewhat at a loss as to how to improve the merit pay system and faculty perception of it. We respectfully ask for your consideration of the above.

Travel Review

2019 - 2015

Budgeted Funds Only

Initial Budget	2018-2019	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015
AMA					
523000-Travel Expense	\$ 729,156	\$ 704,278	\$ 532,996	\$ 520,921	\$ 506,711
Academic Affairs	\$ 250,500	\$ 242,914	\$ 189,318	\$ 193,018	\$ 194,593
Business Affairs	\$ 19,200	\$ 17,450	\$ 13,068	\$ 13,068	\$ 14,108
Enrollment Management	\$ 40,500	\$ 40,150	\$ 30,590	\$ 27,990	\$ 27,990
EOD	\$ 120,456	\$ 121,919	\$ 50,970	\$ 50,970	\$ 51,395
Executive VP	\$ 10,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
Marketing and Communications	\$ 14,000	\$ 10,500	\$ 15,200	\$ 15,200	\$ 14,200
President	\$ 50,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 17,650	\$ 14,325	\$ 13,775
Strategic Initiatives	\$ 34,500	\$ 34,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 11,000	\$ 4,000
Student Services	\$ 16,000	\$ 18,845	\$ 16,700	\$ 18,550	\$ 13,950
Student Travel	\$ 174,000	\$ 179,000	\$ 174,000	\$ 172,800	\$ 168,700
MCC					
523000-Travel Expense	\$ 16,000	\$ 29,087	\$ 20,187	\$ 20,187	\$ 29,021
Academic Affairs	\$ 16,000	\$ 25,087	\$ 16,187	\$ 16,187	\$ 22,541
Student Travel	\$ -	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 6,480
HER					
523000-Travel Expense	\$ 14,000	\$ 25,600	\$ 18,735	\$ 18,735	\$ 18,635
Academic Affairs	\$ 14,000	\$ 24,600	\$ 18,235	\$ 18,235	\$ 18,135
Student Travel	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500
Grand Total	\$ 759,156	\$ 758,965	\$ 571,918	\$ 559,843	\$ 554,367

Actual Spending	2018-2019	2017-2018	2016-2017	2015-2016	2014-2015
AMA					
523000-Travel Expense	Not Complete	\$ 608,393	\$ 538,672	\$ 469,589	\$ 574,272
Academic Affairs	Not Complete	\$ 209,737	\$ 131,288	\$ 83,800	\$ 125,394
Business Affairs	Not Complete	\$ 9,514	\$ 15,254	\$ 8,999	\$ 5,281
Enrollment Management	Not Complete	\$ 27,935	\$ 29,972	\$ 26,419	\$ 23,882
EOD	Not Complete	\$ 97,487	\$ 104,594	\$ 115,071	\$ 119,461
Executive VP	Not Complete	\$ 2,155	\$ 12,358	\$ 3,391	\$ 19,360
Marketing	Not Complete	\$ 2,773	\$ 2,653	\$ 7,542	\$ 18,988
President	Not Complete	\$ 46,377	\$ 39,578	\$ 17,839	\$ 33,354
Strategic Initiatives	Not Complete	\$ 30,789	\$ 25,041	\$ 15,413	\$ 4,160
Student Services	Not Complete	\$ 21,517	\$ 9,739	\$ 16,247	\$ 15,113
Student Travel	Not Complete	\$ 160,109	\$ 168,196	\$ 174,869	\$ 209,279
MCC					
523000-Travel Expense	Not Complete	\$ 28,192	\$ 21,069	\$ 22,339	\$ 24,438
Academic Affairs	Not Complete	\$ 27,064	\$ 20,944	\$ 20,406	\$ 23,599
Student Travel	Not Complete	\$ 1,128	\$ 125	\$ 1,933	\$ 839
HER					
523000-Travel Expense	Not Complete	\$ 28,151	\$ 30,810	\$ 28,518	\$ 24,102
Academic Affairs	Not Complete	\$ 28,151	\$ 30,810	\$ 28,518	\$ 24,102
Student Travel	Not Complete	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grand Total	Not Complete	\$ 664,736	\$ 590,551	\$ 520,446	\$ 622,812