

# Faculty Senate Minutes

May 3, 2019

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 Dave Van Domelen Walter Webb
<b>Members Absent</b>	Sarah Uselding, Parliamentarian Robert Johnson Amanda Lester-Chisum DeeAnne Sisco
<b>Guests</b>	<b>CAMILLE NIES</b> <b>SIMONE BUYS</b> <b>BERNARDINO (J.R.) GONZALES</b> <b>DON ABEL</b>

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**May 3, 2019**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

Topics	Discussion/Information	Actions/Decisions Recommendations/Timelines
<b>Call to Order</b>	President Mary Dodson called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.	
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	Approval of 4/5/2019 meeting minutes.	MOTION to approve: Walt Webb SECOND: Dave Van Domelen YEA: all NAY: none
<b>President's Report</b>	Committee assignments organized by Mary and Karen. Compiling list of 2018-19 Senate activities, and unfinished business.	
<b>Vice President's Report</b>	Importance of full committee involvement in the year's work.	
<b>Secretary's Report</b>	Senate website will be updated with new senator, committee, and by-laws information.	
<b>Parliamentarian's Report</b>		
<b>Courtesy</b>		
<b>Elections</b>	<p>Faculty officer elections last month did not strictly follow senate by-laws (elections were held one meeting too early ... outgoing senators should not be allowed to vote, incoming members should have opportunity to vote on their officers).</p> <p>For election of new senators, department chairs better suited than deans to have conversations with potential senate nominees for each division.</p> <p>A couple of by-laws changes regarding elections procedures need to be addressed. <b>See attached.</b></p>	MOTION to adopt changes as proposed: Bill Netherton

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**May 3, 2019**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

	[ Procedural clarification: Changes to <u>constitution</u> must be ratified by all faculty. Changes to <u>by-laws</u> can be done internally by Senate. ]	SECOND: Kim Pinter YEA: all NAY: none
<b>Legislative</b>	No dramatic changes from last discussion regarding college free-speech legislation. We currently do not need to be worried about suppliers engaged in boycotts to be cut off.	
<b>Mead Award</b>	Thanks to the award committee for their work in organizing this. Two \$1,000 awards will be presented at the Commencement ceremonies next Friday. Funding is dwindling at this point. \$13,000 left, so only 6 years remaining under current model. Joy Breneman says Senate needs to start seeking additional funding. Ask Tracy Dougherty if the Foundation can support. Committee will work with Joy to send letters of recognition to the other nominees.	
<b>Professor Emeritus Award</b>		
<b>Questions</b>	<b>SEE QUESTIONS / ANSWERS for <u>April</u> in attached document. Summary and discussion as follows:</b>  1. Question involving faculty having reached ABD (“all but dissertation”) status (officially considered “masters plus 60 hours”). Asked Cindy Landham for salary adjustment, but was told that placement on the salary schedule is only for new faculty. Dr.	

# Faculty Senate Minutes

May 3, 2019

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

Clunis had same answer. Doesn't seem right. Dr. Clunis said that relevant material will be presented at fall faculty meeting.

DISCUSSION: This does need to be locked into policy. Issue seems to emerge from comparison to 4-year universities where ABD hires are "provisional," versus 2-year schools where it goes above minimum qualifications. Current restrictions/delays seem to fly in the face of stated support for faculty development.

Dr. Clunis is working on faculty handbook.  
Mark White working on Board Policy Manual.

Handbook, Board Policy Manual, and EOD statements should align in this regard.

Faculty input in the faculty handbook would be a good step towards shared governance. New faculty handbook is supposed to pass through faculty senate.

Letter will be drafted by Dan Ferguson requesting attention to these details. **See attached (separate document).**

2. Process for salary adjustment after course achievement is being slowed down now (several months). Next year, procedure is changing such that adjustments will only be made following academic year. Handbook is being changed. Do faculty have any input on this benefits hit?

# Faculty Senate Minutes

May 3, 2019

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Delays in salary adjustment seem to be rather standard here at AC. Process is unclear at best. Faculty shouldn't have to "go to battle" to receive proper compensation for their work.</p> <p>Perhaps the delays result from the new zero-budget model? No, in specific cases of faculty senators, money was budgeted.</p> <p>Anyone anticipating completion of courses needs to inform department chairs in time to be budgeted for following year.</p> <p>Need for clarification of policies needs to be included in Dan's letter.</p> <p>3. Last faculty meeting, Dr. Clunis mentioned wanting to have faculty sign a contract guaranteeing a certain percentage of completion for their classes.</p> <p>Not quite what faculty senators recall. Dr. Clunis wants to increase faculty/student one-on-one engagement, with faculty contract for minimum student success rate being a part of this (seems to be modeled after Odessa College policies ... raise faculty salary based on student retention, etc.). Tone seemed like intention was for faculty pledges of good will, rather than strict contract with punitive repercussions for failure. Also, part of ongoing efforts to address excessive faculty overloads, which hinders students.</p>	
--	---	--

# Faculty Senate Minutes

May 3, 2019

Ware Student Commons, Room 207

	<p>Future developments will need to be carefully watched by Senate and faculty in general.</p> <p>4. Concern has been expressed regarding faculty office hour policies.</p> <p>Some expectations by department chairs / deans seem not to be following board policy manual. The exact policy states:</p> <p><i>Full-time faculty members must have regular office hours for teaching preparation, student advising, and other incidental tasks required for teaching. The schedule of classroom and office hours must be posted as soon after registration as possible.</i></p> <p>More info on faculty work load can be found here: <a href="https://www.actx.edu/president/dj-work-load">https://www.actx.edu/president/dj-work-load</a></p>	
<b>Technology</b>	<p>Brandon Moore expressed concerns regarding usability/navigability of the AC website. Seems to be far more cumbersome than other college websites.</p> <p>Who is in charge of AC website now? Comm's and Marketing? Focus currently seems to be more on appearance than practicality. Mary will take charge of this.</p>	
<b>Faculty Survey</b>	<p>Mary, Karen, Nathan, Becky Burton, and Tamara Clunis (exact team</p>	

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**May 3, 2019**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

	TBD) will be attending the COACHE summit in August and producing report for faculty, driving creation of follow-up survey and action plans. Won't really know issues until we get back results of the past survey.	
<b>Hospitality</b>		
<b>Faculty Development</b>		
<b>Instructional Technology</b>		
<b>Pinning</b>		
<b>Faculty Committee Appointments</b>	<p>Sarah Uselding carefully prepared the committee list. Feedback from Senate?</p> <p>In light of above discussions, what is the function of the Faculty Handbook Committee? Sub-committee chair needs to reach out to Dr. Clunis for involvement in the ongoing revisions.</p> <p>Are all new Rank and Tenure Committee members actually eligible? Have the committee policies been updated online? Mary Dodson will double check this and send out revised list.</p> <p>Faculty senators who are members of other committees should be reporting on said committee proceedings, as appropriate and relevant.</p>	
<b>Guest report(s)</b>		
<b>New Business</b>		

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**May 3, 2019**  
**Ware Student Commons, Room 207**

<p><b>Unfinished Business</b></p>	<p>Mary Dodson presented draft of a renewed request to Cheryl Jones (EOD) for employee organizational directory presented to Senate. <b>See attached.</b></p> <p>AC Committee Assignment List will be sent to Senate via email for vote.</p> <p>Accomplished and 'to do' list ("Senate Activity Summary" ... <b>See attached</b>) and Senate Sub-Committee List will be sent to Senators for input and review.</p> <p>Please send Nathan Fryml your committee handbooks. Include committee chair information at the top, for future interaction as necessary.</p>	<p>MOTION to send: Kim Pinter          SECOND: Sarah Milford          YEA: all          NAY: none</p>
<p><b>Updates and Announcements</b></p>		
<p><b>Meeting Adjournment</b></p>	<p>Next meeting scheduled for: Fall, 2019!!          Meeting adjourned at 4:33pm.</p>	<p>MOTION to adjourn: Walt Webb          SECOND: Sarah Milford          YEA: all          NAY: none</p>

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



## APRIL 2019 QUESTIONS

*Report for Faculty Senate Meeting on 5/3/19*

1. I recently reached ABD status and asked for salary adjustment. Cindy Lanham replied and told me that from her interpretation, this M+60 ABD placement on the salary schedule was only for new faculty when placing them on the salary scale.

I met with Dr. Clunis 4/29, and she told me the same thing, that under the handbook, it is listed in the new faculty placement section, and that I would not get any credit for reaching ABD status. As of now, with my own situation of reaching ABD, I am getting M + 48 hours.

So if I quit AC today, and came on as a new hire tomorrow, I would be given M+ 60 for ABD. This can't be right, can it?

I informed Dr. Clunis that there are at least 2 other existing faculty that I know of that did get this ABD M+60 credit as soon as they became ABD while working here and getting their doctorate. I made Cindy Lanham aware of this also, so she could check their files and find out if they did get the ABD credit. Lana Jackson was one of them, and there are others that I will not name as I don't want to bring any attention to anyone.

I was told that even though others have gotten it in the past, it was because someone misinterpreted the policy, and that they shouldn't have gotten it. And that unfortunately I am just slipping through the cracks here.

Would you please support me in this pursuit?

[ Response from Cheryl Jones, VP of EOD ] Dr. Clunis and I have previously discussed these topics. I will be attending the faculty meeting in August with Dr. Clunis and we will be co-presenting material related to these topics below.

2. I have been submitting paperwork and transcripts each time I finish a 3 hour course for my education. Usually it is a slow process for getting signatures and finally getting reimbursed, but generally the money is received within 2-3 months. I was told in my meeting with Dr. Clunis that starting next year, they are going to change it so that no matter when you take a class and submit the paperwork, credit will not be given until Sept 1 of the following year. Faculty are encouraged to get more education, but now they are going to have to wait even longer to get the education step added to their salary.

She said they are changing these things in the handbook.....so who is making these changes, and do faculty have a say in this? I am very concerned that faculty are losing these existing benefits for education. Getting more education has always been a way for faculty to insure their own raises based on the salary steps for education. Now it looks like we are going to take a hit here. Can anything be done? Thank you.

[ **Response from Cheryl Jones, VP of EOD** ] Dr. Clunis and I have previously discussed these topics. I will be attending the faculty meeting in August with Dr. Clunis and we will be co-presenting material related to these topics below.

- 3. At the last faculty meeting, several faculty members were shocked to hear Dr. Clunis say that she wanted to have faculty sign a contract promising to retain 10%% more students and, in return, faculty would receive compensation they needed/wanted. In other words, it sounded as if she was establishing a "Pass for Pay" scenario, which would seem to violate academic integrity and force faculty into an immoral, unprincipled position. Can we get clarification on that, and will faculty be allowed to refuse to sign on moral grounds?**

[ **Response from Tamara Clunis, VPAA** ] Thank you for the note. I am sorry to hear that this is the take away from the last all-faculty meeting. I do not feel it is productive to answer this question via email. I will address this question at the all faculty meeting in August. Currently, I have added education advancement and faculty workload to the agenda for my fall meeting.

- 4. I have a question for faculty senate. I understand that faculty should maintain their posted office hours and be available to students. Many faculty work at different times throughout the day. This is not an 8-5 job. Some faculty are at the school at 6 am or they come back and stay late in the evening. It is different on every campus. Some do work on the weekends. Sometimes we work longer days. Many times we answer email in the evenings and on the weekends. Some faculty have some virtual office hours for students outside of a 8-5 M-F schedule. I do not see anything in the Faculty Handbook regarding having to record our hours of work. As long as the academic work, committee work, and student needs are being met, is it acceptable to take a shorter work day (not 8-5)? There is some perception that because faculty are not sitting in their offices that they are not doing their work adequately. Would Dr. Clunis be able to shed some light on this situation. It would be helpful if this information was disseminated to directors and program heads as well as faculty so that everyone understands what is expected.**

[ **Response from Frank Sobey, Assistant VPAA** ] The only question in that paragraph concerns a shorter work day. I take it the submitter is really asking about regular/normal business hours, as no employee should be working less than the job requires. If y'all want admin to address this formally through Senate, so be it. If you want me to take this to the deans and Dr. Clunis for a discussion, no problem. [But] why put it on anyone's radar? In asking for clarity, you might get more than you bargained for. Right now, the policy is squishy and allows departments to define the terms.

TO: Ms. Cheryl Jones  
FROM: Faculty Senate  
RE: Request for Employee Directory and Updated Global Address List  
DATE: May 3, 2019

The Senate, on behalf of all AC faculty, would much appreciate an employee directory as well as an updated Outlook global address book.

We suggest that the directory be available via a link on the AC homepage. Such would enhance understanding of relationships at AC as well as its overall design. Included you will find a rather outdated "in print" version for your review.

In addition, updating the global address book will save everyone much time and energy when needing to contact "the right person" for immediate pursuits.

Thank you.

May 8, 2019

Dear Administrators:

Recently two issues involving [faculty pay for advancement](#) have come to our attention. These issues involve faculty taking advanced courses and getting their additional compensation per the Faculty Pay Scale. Let us explain the prior procedure first.

If a faculty member wanted to take more courses above the requirements for their job, faculty would first get permission from their immediate supervisor using the Faculty Academic Advancement Approval Form, found in the Forms page for faculty. Then faculty would begin taking classes. As each class was finished, the faculty would submit their official transcript noting completion of the class, the department would process a 310 with the extra pay for the course immediately for signatures up the chain, and then the faculty would see their pay increase with the next paycheck if possible. This process worked well and incentivized faculty to get a healthy dose of professional development in their area.

Now come the problems. Problem 1 is that it is now taking months to process the additional pay. In fact, some faculty have been told that their pay will not increase until next academic year. This is not fair and represents a shift in policy that faculty were not aware of.

Problem 2 deals with ABD (All But Dissertation) status. When a faculty member reaches this status, according to the Faculty Pay Scale, they should receive credit for 60 hours above the Master's degree. Some faculty have told us that they have been denied this credit. Even upon receiving a doctorate, some faculty have told us that they have had to struggle to get proper credit for it. Again, this is not fair and represents a shift in policy that faculty were not aware of.

What is the solution? It seems that we need in writing the new policy and procedure for faculty gaining credit for advanced courses in their areas. The Faculty Senate Handbook Committee would like to be a part of writing or at least vetting this new policy. If it needs to be in both the Faculty Handbook and Board Policy Manual, we ask that the language be consistent for clear interpretation. As official representatives of the faculty at large, we would greatly appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Faculty Senate

## Spring Election Procedure For New Senate Members

**05/2019 – Faculty Elections Committee**  
**Brandon Moore, Chair**

### I. Gathering information

(A) In early March, the Elections Committee chair shall contact the VPAA's office for 2 sets of information. First is to obtain a current list of Department Chairs / Program Heads within each Academic Division. Second is to obtain a current number of full time faculty in the different Academic Divisions to be represented in Senate.

The Elections Committee chair also shall contact the Hereford and Moore County branch campuses to obtain a current number of full time faculty in the different Academic Divisions to be represented in Senate.

The obtained information on number of full time faculty will be used to determine the number of senators that each Academic Division can have. According to the Senate By-Laws, representation is based on the number of full time faculty as follows:

1 – 18 = 1 representative	43 – 54 = 4 representatives
19 – 30 = 2 representatives	55 – 66 = 5 representatives
31 – 42 = 3 representatives	

Current Numbers of Full Time AC Faculty (Fall 2019):

Main campuses:		Branch campuses:	
Academic Success	9	Hereford	2
Health Sciences	55	Moore County	3
Liberal Arts	47 *		
STEM	53 *		
Technical Education	27		
[Continuing Education]	0		

\* Including full time faculty that teach at Hereford + Moore County, the number of AC Liberal Arts faculty is 48 and the number of AC STEM faculty is 57.

### II. The Selection Procedure

(A) The Election Committee chair shall send a group email by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of March to all of the Department Chairs and Program Heads within any division that needs to hold a spring election. An example beginning of the email follows:

<It is time to nominate Faculty Senate representatives from Academic divisions that have 1 or more openings, per the Senate constitution. Please see the list below of Senator(s) in your division that are being replaced and the total number of new Senators to be selected.>

(B) Some guidance for conducting the selection process shall also be provided, along the lines as follows:

<The normal process of selection first is for you to solicit nominations from faculty in your department or program. Please also make clear that any faculty member can submit their own name. Next, since this service does require time and commitment, please discuss any nomination with the nominated faculty member(s) for their approval prior to submitting their names to the Elections Committee Chair of Faculty Senate.>

<If no one is nominated or volunteers, please reply to the Elections Committee Chair accordingly. Would you please aim to conclude this phase of the selection process by the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> week in April?>

<For the situation that the number of division nominees matches the number of Senators to be selected from your academic division, the nominee(s) will then be considered as the selected representative(s) of your division.>

< In the case of having more nominees than available Senate positions in your division to fill, the Senate Elections Committee will then oversee the election process.>

<The Faculty Senate sincerely appreciates your help in this important matter.>

(C) The Senate Elections Committee will then carry out any needed elections for new senators.

1) Normally the Senate Elections Committee chair will provide an election ballot by email to all full time faculty within the given division. This could be done by use of Survey Monkey.

2) Faculty are to be instructed to vote for the corresponding number(s) of new representatives from the provided list of nominees. The election will be conducted for 1 week, normally to be completed by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> week in April.

3) If the vote difference between 2 candidates for a single nomination is less than the total number of votes for all other candidates that received fewer votes, then a run-off election must be held. This election normally shall be concluded by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> week in April. With 2 possible nominees, a run-off election will be held only between candidates that received the second and third leading number of initial votes.

4) If there is a tie from the run-off election, then the Elections Committee will decide the nominee by a random selection process. This decision must be finalized by the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> week in April.

(D) If there are fewer nominees or volunteers for any open Senate position, that office is to be declared vacant until the next regularly scheduled spring election.

### **III. Special Elections**

(A) According to the Senate Bylaws (Article V, Section 1), “if a vacancy occurs on the Faculty Senate, a special election shall be called in the area unrepresented.” The selection procedure shall follow the process outlined above (Section II).

### **IV. The Announcement Procedure**

(A) At the conclusion of the election process, the Elections Committee chair shall make a college-wide congratulatory announcement of the newly chosen Faculty Senators. The announcement should include the academic division and department/program affiliation of the new Senators. The announcement shall be directed to **DL** – Academic Faculty Full Time and to **DL** – Administrators.

(B) Lastly, the newly elected Faculty Senators shall be invited by the President of the Faculty Senate to attend the May meeting of the Senate.

Accomplished

Updated Constitution and Bylaws

Created Online Guidelines

Implemented new faculty (COACHE) survey

Sent Merit Pay Memo to Board

Redesigned Mead Award

Submitted Report to Administration:  
"Increasing Summer Enrollment"

Designed Final Exam Schedule

Approved Rank & Tenure Proposal

Facilitated conversations between faculty and  
administration on a variety of critical issues.

Clarification of office hours in Faculty Handbook

Request sent to OED for an organizational chart  
and an employee directory

Elections handled by Senate

To be pursued

Acquire Promised Title IX Policy

Van Domelen proposal: Steve Smith

Summarize and evaluate COACHE Survey

Response from Board?

Changes to be incorporated in bylaws:

- Faculty/guest participation guidelines
- President designation: Employee of the Year Selection Committee
- Proposal to insure continuity in membership
- Elections Committee revision