

**Polk State College Faculty Senate Agenda**  
**Date: Wednesday, August 12**  
**TIME: 3:00 P.M.**  
**Meeting Held via Zoom**  
**Steering Committee Followed the Senate Meeting**

**OFFICERS:**

Bill Caldecutt, President  
Anthony Cornett, Vice President – Winter Haven  
Cindy Freitag, Vice President – Lakeland  
Rebecka Ramos, Secretary  
Lorrie Jones, Parliamentarian  
Greg Harris, Senator at Large  
Lee Thomas, Administrative Liaison

**Bill called the meeting to order at 3:00**

**Senators:** Aaron Morgan, Andrew Coombs, Johnny Stewart, Tina Feleccia, Keith Libert, Dawn Dyer, Misty Sparling, Amy McIntosh, Rafaela Ellis, Lorne Fairbairn, Alexandros Dimitriadis, Megan Cavanah, Danielle Delgiudice, Carol Stinson, Jess Jones, Dann Hazel

**Guests:** Dr. Falconetti, Val Baker, Larry Pakowski, Faye Bellamy, Jamie Haischer, LaTrice Moore, Niqui Young-Pringle-Brown, Christina Gesmundo, Dale Anderson, Jo Perez, Gregory Johnson, Jean Bennett, John Woodward, Kimberly Hess, Larry Pakowski, Larry Young, Makuu, Pam Jones, Penny Morris, Susan Moerschbacher, Tiffany Messerschmidt, Tristan Davison, LJ Russum

**Update from the President:** Dr. Falconetti provided an update on the COVID situation and its impact both financially and operationally. The state agencies have experienced a 6% holdback which equals a two million dollar cut to the College's operational budget. The DBOT approved a budget in June to plan for a negative 10% enrollment because of COVID. Because of the holdback and additional negative enrollment, the College is still working through budgetary issues. Dr. Falconetti mentioned that health insurance will be covered at 100% for this year. This is especially important because of the current health crisis. Dr. Falconetti expressed concerns about the coming year because the upcoming year could bring even more cuts to the Florida State College System. She will continue to advocate and work for faculty and students to ensure needs are met.

Dr. Falconetti also brought up enrollment issues. Through her communication with College colleagues, she has heard many questions and concerns about the pandemic and future

enrollment. When planning for Spring semester, in particular, there are some guiding principles the College is using to make decisions about how classes will be held in the Spring. The College has developed a score card to help gauge the impact of COVID on the College and the community to determine when the College should resume more face-to-face activities. The College will use data to make these decisions. These metrics include Polk cases of COVID and local hospital capacity. Dr. Falconetti's prediction is that there will be an increase in face-to-face classes in Spring. She encouraged faculty to continue to think outside the box to provide students with quality instruction in a safe environment.

Dr. Falconetti opened the floor to questions. Tina suggested using the time slots that professors had originally scheduled for classes should be maintained online for students. Alexandros mentioned that in Genesis notes, the math department has times attached and lectures will be recorded for students later. Niqui mentioned that SLS has done the same thing in Winter Haven to allow FTIC students live streamed classes. LaTrice mentioned that there are issues with doing only live sessions as many students could have families sharing one device, so she also advocates recording sessions. Bill reminded Senate that there are still funds available for students who need technology. Jamie mentioned that she also had lectures that were recorded for students. Dr. Thomas mentioned that there is a faculty development discussing these issues and more Friday.

Tina brought up the financial changes that have impacted faculty due to the enforcement of Procedure 1006. Specifically, Tina has lost a significant amount of income and has had to find second employment; however, adjuncts were not penalized any income. Dr. Falconetti stated that she is willing to have conversations with faculty about this issue and that the College is moving forward to make sure that College procedures are being followed. Recommended changes to procedures will be forthcoming from Senate and FHRC. The goal was not to penalize anyone, but to get to a place where the College is effectively following its procedures.

Jess suggested that TLCC for testing would be helpful for students who needed a quiet environment to test. Dr. Thomas is going to look into this and is happy to work through this to provide services to students. Dr. Falconetti encouraged those faculty with ideas or suggestions with dealing with COVID and the College to offer them. Amy asked if this use of testing could help some staff keep employment. Everything is being done to keep everyone employed, and the College is taking the current situation very seriously.

Lorrie thanked Dr. Falconetti for working with local hospitals to inform reopening of the school. Lorrie emphasized that this is not a one-size fits all issue and each community is facing it differently. Dr. Falconetti underscored the importance of the health of faculty, staff, and students as she works with the COVID response committee to make decisions.

**Approval of Minutes from May Meeting.** Amy moved to approve. Jess seconded. Minutes were approved.

**Approval of August Agenda.** Rule 3.08 was removed. Amy moved to approve amended agenda. Tina seconded. Amended agenda was approved.

**Reports:**

- President's Report: No report.
- Lakeland Vice President's Report: No report.
- Winter Haven Vice President's Report: No report.
- Administrative Liaison's Report: No report.

**Committee Reports and Updates:**

- New updates.

**Old Business:**

- Procedure 6085: *Investigations*. This was brought to Senate today by Val for the Federal language, which was approved. Rebecka reminded Senate of this procedure's history at Senate. Megan and several others were concerned about ambiguity with the steps. Lorrie moved to table until Jill was able to bring an update. Tina seconded. Procedure was tabled.

**New Business:**

- Title IX Updates: Val brought forward a block of Rules and Procedures (One new procedure, Procedure 6091, and several rules and procedures with updates: Rule 3.27, Procedure 6052, Rule 4.01, Procedure 5027, and Procedure 6085). These rules and procedures were changed because of coming changes to Title IX. Many of the procedures are lengthy, but this is because of the detail required by federal government. The information is what is required by federal regulations. Sexual harassment has been redefined, as reflected in the clean copies of all of these procedures and rules. Multiple definitions also needed to be included. Another key point that is new is that if someone brings forwards a Title IX issue, the College is required to have live hearings with trained advisors. Part of these changes are being brought because individuals felt that those who were accused had no rights and wanted due process. Now, both the supporting measures are provided for the complainant and the respondent. Niqui asked if all of the changes were all federal. Val said they were.

**Rules and Procedures:**

- Procedure 6085: *Investigations* Jess moved to approve. Lorrie seconded. Rules were approved.  
Procedure 6091: *Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct*: Misty moved to approve. Amy asked if all of the changes were all federal. Val said they were. Amy seconded.

- Rule 3.27: *Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Harassment*: Jess moved to approve. Lorrie seconded. Rules were approved.
- Procedure 6052: *Equal Access, Equal Opportunity, and Equity*: Jess moved to approve. Lorrie seconded. Rules were approved.
- Rule 4.01: *Student Code of Conduct*: Jess moved to approve. Lorrie seconded. Rules were approved.
- Procedure 5027: *Sexual Misconduct*: Jess moved to approve. Lorrie seconded. Rules were approved.
- Procedure 1024: *Faculty Schedule Assignment*: Bill sent this draft to Senate for review before the meeting today. The procedure was brought to Senate in Spring 2020 and it needed updating. A sub-committee was formed to work on a draft as a starting point for Senate to discuss. Bill mentioned that there was updating that needed to be made regarding technology and terminology. Megan asked about the compensation for an adjunct who loses a course and if a faculty member could also be compensated under Procedure 4. Bill recalled that full-time faculty were not addressed for compensation for a lost class because faculty had opportunities to replace classes that do not make due to enrollment. Megan suggested language be added that if a faculty member loses a course at the last minute and there is no replacement class, the faculty member should be compensated, as she has had to deal with this particular issue this semester. Further discussion ensued. Misty moved to approve. Bill suggested that this particular procedure should be returned to faculty as the faculty who brought it to Senate were from outside. The hope is for robust discussion to develop a procedure that works for everyone.

Greg and Larry confirmed that this draft of the procedure has gone to Faculty Human Resources, and it was approved. This particular compensation was intended for adjuncts who have no ability to recover losses when a course is taken at the last minute, despite the work and preparation done for the course. Cindy mentioned that this aspect procedure was created to compensate adjuncts who will have nothing, whereas faculty will still have their full load. Bill recalled that the SEIU discussions brought this to light as an issue. Greg reiterated that this was compensating the adjuncts. Megan emphasized that full-time faculty should also be compensated as adjuncts are in this proposed draft. Greg stated that the committee's idea at the time was that faculty are able to replace a class whereas the adjuncts did not have that opportunity. Megan stated that if that class for a faculty member cannot be replaced, that faculty member should be have compensation. Larry mentioned that an adjunct does not have the opportunity to take a course from a faculty member whereas faculty have extra protections built in to their position. Greg mentioned that this was also a move to be able to maintain an adjunct pool. Amy monitored the chat and brought up that there were people mentioning in the chat that Megan's point is a good one. Rebecka mentioned that a full-time person losing a class and not having it replaced was a reality in May; things have changed and now there is reality that full-time faculty are losing courses as well. Bill encouraged this discussion to continue. Lorrie agreed that the reality has changed, and full time faculty are being impacted by this and in light of current trends, this language may need to be addressed more fully.

Tina suggested that this procedure needs to be applied more equitably. Tina stated she lost classes, and her program director did not lose as much. Tina stated she has taught the same schedule for ten years, and she lost three classes whereas everyone could have lost one and had it be equitable. This procedure should be applied by an equal percentage so that everyone is impacted the same. Tina mentioned that previously, full-time faculty were the ones who wanted to be retained, not adjuncts. Tina also mentioned that many faculty have additional opportunities to earn more income through Department Coordinator and Assessment Coordinator positions, but Tina does not. Tina had been given extra classes because she had a program director, not a department coordinator. Point allocations for extra projects should be considered as a part of the maximum load. Greg mentioned that Bill reiterated that this is a draft and these changes are welcomed. Discussion ensued. Jess mentioned that the science department has different course numbers and this is not equitable to those who teach 3 credit courses. Discussion ensued. Aaron mentioned that there needs to be a discussion of what happens when one professor has overloads but another's does not. Anthony reminded that the language states "may," meaning that this will be a case by case basis. LaTrice mentioned that compensation for adjuncts will also be constricted by budget. People are facing losing jobs, and budgetary issues are important to consider. LaTrice had to give a class to an adjunct that she built, but as full-time faculty she was teaching other sections. Cindy agreed that this is an issue that could result in a slippery slope. Lorrie articulated the Nursing program's need for good adjuncts and her commitment to keep those adjuncts. Bill asked that senators send out the procedure to their departments. Senate fully expects more points of discussions.

4:34: Tina moved to extend. Greg seconded. Meeting was extended.

Bill mentioned that the subcommittee wanted to create consistency in the scheduling for Summer terms with the Fall and Spring. The new procedure asks for Summer to be treated in the same procedure as Fall and Spring. The proposed changes are more step-by-step than the previous versions. Bill mentioned that the proposal for 1006 increases the maximum to 96 points instead of 84, and that is reflected in this draft of 1024. Leftover classes will be available to faculty wishing to teach outside of their departments at the same step as adjuncts. Aaron asked for clarification. Bill recapped: full-time faculty would be given preference for their loads and overloads within their department up to 96 points (pending approval) and faculty who have not met their maximum load and wish to teach outside of their department in a credentialed area would be given preference at the same time as adjuncts. Christina mentioned that faculty requesting overload courses outside of their department should be given preference over adjuncts. Bill clarified that this would only apply to full-time faculty getting overloads (not courses to make contractual load) and would take the needs of the department into account. Lee mentioned that other institutions has become a difficult issue when it comes to adjuncts unionizing because they are not being represented as well as they want to be. Senate does a good job to make sure that adjunct issues are being addressed.

LaTrice asked how the staff are classified in this procedure. Bill confirmed that people who work for the College in other capacity are considered adjuncts when they teach beyond their roles. Bill highlighted the language bringing the dean into the situation to help with this kind of argument. Tina asked if seniority is considered at all and asserted that it should be as things in her department are being done inequitably. Cindy clarified that is not how the procedure is supposed to work, and mentioned that there was a conscious effort to help the adjuncts. Tina said that the person who was scheduling classes was taking care of themselves and not following procedure. Anthony mentioned that there is a grievance procedure for anyone who believes that a procedure is not being followed. Christina mentioned a more granular procedure that is adhered to by everyone is necessary. Anthony stated that a procedure cannot be made for every situation. Bill drew Senate's attention to the language in the next portion of the procedure that allows for a dean to make decisions when needed.

Tina brought up the concern of having classes reduced to comply with the 84 points in current procedure. Tina asked about the language that allowed for exceptions. Lorrie pointed out that the number of points now is 84 so to comply with SACS, full-time faculty's loads had to be reduced. Greg clarified that SACS was not looking at the specific numbers as much as the College following procedure. The concern is there are many faculty consistently teaching more than procedurally allowed. Cindy mentioned that a third of the full-time faculty were continuously teaching outside of policy. Greg added that the implementation of the compliance of 1006 was necessary for the College's accreditation. Dr. Thomas mentioned that the standard being discussed here is "faculty adequacy," which means having enough full-time faculty. If a faculty member is teaching double a full-time load, SACS sees that as the institutions lack of faculty. Tina mentioned that when JDA opened, she was the only fulltime faculty member there for almost eight years. She was given extra classes as incentive to teach at JDA until she was no longer needed.

Larry asked what the next step would be moving forward. Bill mentioned that part that the procedure needs to be worked out and agreed upon by Senate. If everyone can agree with 96 points, at least that language can get moved forward so that full-time faculty can have more points. Larry asked if the sub-committee needs to make a recommendation to FHRC and or does FHRC need to make a recommendation to the sub-committee. Greg indicated that the sub-committee would make a recommendation to FHRC. Niqui mentioned that faculty felt that the change was a drastic one, and the changes have been implemented in a way that was more of a smooth transition. Cindy clarified that the request came from faculty to form the subcommittee to work on this draft and then to present the draft to the full faculty. Bill reiterated that this was a draft, and it needs to be discussed and worked on. The feedback needs to be directed and streamlined. Lorrie suggested creating a feedback form. Tina mentioned that there should be a rush on the issue to get the approval before Spring schedule goes live. Anthony said that faculty need to prepare for a spring with the same cap unless these max loads are change. Jess mentioned that Senate should discuss the maximum points first, as it impacts spring, and then start working on some of these other issues in the procedure.

Lorrie stated that breaking down the procedures is a good idea. Christina agreed. Misty withdrew her motion. Tina moved to table 1024. Cindy seconded. Motion was tabled.

- Procedure 1006: *Faculty Workload – Academic Accounting System and Department Coordination*: Bill mentioned that one issue with this procedure was to separate the department coordinator duties to their own procedure. The subcommittee also removed specific dollar amounts and were converted to other measures. Finally, the instructional maximum was increased to 96 points. Andrew mentioned that there are confusing areas with the points, hours, and credits language in the course. These terms are difficult to stay consistent and clear because, for example, art professors have three credit hour courses that are four contact hours. Specifically, Andrew asked the committee to look at the terms and make sure that the appropriate term is being used. Andrew also mentioned that there are times when some classes have only fifteen meetings whereas another course could be seventeen meetings; is that ever factored in? Greg confirmed that would be an issue for the Calendar Committee. The reference to *Ceramics I and II* is dated. Andrew made reference to the stacked courses receiving additional compensation. Anthony mentioned that the sub-committee added that portion so that professors who do teach stacked classes would get some compensation for the additional work.

Amy asked about the 96 credits number, which does not work equitably for courses that are not 3 credit courses. Greg stated that there would be a sliding scale that would allow for the addition of those hours. Cindy offered her stance that a 96 point maximum should be a firm maximum. Greg added that the FYS professors will never be able to get all of their points because of their courses hours. Niqui echoed the concern. Discussion ensued. Several examples were brought forward to demonstrate that the procedural cap of 96 is inequitable across procedures. Dr. Thomas most institutions have a caveat of up to six point for these situations.

Tina suggested using percentages instead of dollar values in 1006 to compensate for DIS, which would equal \$85 per contact hour (5% of the overload pay). Makuu mentioned that the independent study does not sufficiently cover the time the student must stay in lab with the professors. Cindy agreed.

5:30: Greg made a motion to extend. Andrew seconded.

Makuu made the recommendation that credit hours be changed to contact hours for DIS compensation. Andrew mentioned that it is the same issue in his department and suggested changing the DIS reimbursement to contact hours instead of credit hours. Several examples were brought forward to support this change. Lorrie mentioned that DIS has become more popular when it was meant to be an emergent situation. Niqui mentioned that developmental education courses often do not make but students cannot proceed with their courses until the developmental education courses are taken, so DIS is used in that situation.

Tina mentioned that there needs to be an adjustment in terminology to reflect Vice President of Academic Affairs to be changed to respective deans. Andrew

mentioned that the word “may” needed to be removed from the definition of “overload points” in III, section A, number 10. Cindy brought up a concern about eliminating banked points. A faculty member believed that would reduce some faculty flexibility. Anthony asked if the College is able to continue with banked points. Tina made a motion to approve the change from 84 to 96 points in Procedure 1006 and table the rest of procedure for a full-faculty review. Greg seconded. Rafi mentioned that many faculty are anxious about the reduction in course points, so the voting and moving forward will help ease minds. Lorrie brought up that there needs to be a discussion about the rationale for the changes. Rafi agreed. Tina agreed, but echoed her concern about losing thousands of dollars with only 30 day notice, and the changes were not communicated to her. Lorrie remains hopeful that changes will be made that benefit the faculty and College. Andrew and Niqui expressed gratitude for continued employment in this time. Bill will have to return to being a dance instructor should he lose his employment. Motion was carried.

**New Business from the Floor:**

- **Not today.**

5:46 Greg moved to adjourn. Tina seconded.