

Polk State College Faculty Senate Agenda
Date: December 1, 2025
Time: 3:00 P.M.
Meeting Held via Zoom (recorded)
Steering Committee to Meet Following the Senate Meeting

Officers:

Bill Caldecutt, President (absent)
Anthony Cornett, Vice President Winter Haven (present)
Jess Jones, Vice President Lakeland (present)
Heather Childree, Secretary (present)
Greg Harris, Parliamentarian (present)

Others:

Chris Botelho, Senator at Large (present)
Amy Bratten, Administrative Liaison (present)

Attending Senators: Heather Childree, Kim Hess, Lee Childree, Misty Sparling, Anthony Cornett, Johnny Stewart, Laura Brimer, Greg Harris, Gregory Johnson, Pal Good, Michelle Bissessar, John Woodward, Jess Jones, Michael Derry, Chris Botelho, Gwyn Phillips, Dirk Valk, John Barberet, Andrew Coombs

Faculty Attendees: Kyle Seiverd, Andrea Hofeditz, Heena Park, Jacqueline Gray, Susie Moerschbacher, Kari Misa, LaTrice Moore, Pam Jones, Herb Nold, Jeff Barnum, Niqui Young-Pringle-Brown, David Hill, Jennifer Shaw, John Weimer

Presenting Guests and Others:

Presenting: Angela Garcia Falconetti

Non-Presenting: Tamara Sakagawa—VP and Chief of Staff, Beth Luckett—Dean, Yovan Reyes—Dean, Belkis Torres Capeles—Dean, Kim Thomas Manning—Dean, Bert Rivera Marchand—Dean, Cody Moyer—Director of Learning Technology

[The meeting began at 3:05 p.m.]

Dr. Falconetti reminded everyone of graduation on December 3. She said for this legislative session, her priority is to secure a \$7.5 million funding request to open the Davenport-Haines City Campus in Fall 2026. She said the Council of Presidents is pursuing a request for \$70 million which, if received, would be spread across the funding formula and impact all 28 colleges as recurring funds. Health insurance costs continue to rise primarily from individuals benefitting from family coverage, but there are no specific insurance funding requests to cover this increase. She stated that the Council's Chair and Vice Chair have encouraged the colleges to focus on the \$70 million, as these funds could be used to offset health insurance costs.

The PACE employee satisfaction survey be out in February. Dr. Clark has specific dates.

I. Approval of Minutes from November 2025 Meeting

Andrew Coombs motioned to approve the *Faculty Senate Minutes for November 2025*. Jess Jones seconded the motion. The motion carried.

II. Approval of December 2025 Agenda

Greg Harris motioned to approve the *Faculty Senate Agenda: December 1, 2025*. Dirk Valk seconded the motion. The motion carried.

III. Faculty Senate Officer and Administrative Liaison Reports

A. President's Report – (none—absent)

B. Lakeland Vice President's Report – Jess Jones (none)

C. Winter Haven Vice President's Report—Anthony Cornett

1. Anthony reported that PACE was selected for the *Faculty Satisfaction Survey*, as there were only two surveys needed by the College—not enough to justify use of Hanover (which costs more). The *Faculty Satisfaction Survey* will be in February.
2. Senators Lee Childree (Lakeland Collegiate), Dirk Valk (Science—LK), and Michael Derry (Social Sciences—LK) each agreed to serve another term. David Hill (Science—WH) is taking Anthony Cornett's seat as Senator. Kari Misa is taking over for Kim Hess (Math—LK). Andrea Hofeditz is taking over for Pal Good (Nursing—WH). Lakeland Social Sciences has 14 faculty members, which allows them to have 2 Senators. Half of the department are Education faculty members. After consulting with parliamentarians, the Senate Bylaws support a new Senator. The new Lakeland Education Senator is Niqui Young-Pringle-Brown. All Senators officially begin their terms in January.

D. Parliamentarian Report –Greg Harris

The Faculty Senate Officer Election is today.

E. Academic Liaison Report – Provost Amy Bratten (none)

IV. Committee Reports and Updates

Distance Learning Committee (DLC): Dirk Valk reported on last week's meeting.

1. **Accessibility Compliance:** The deadline is today, December 1. Currently, 80% of courses are in compliance; one in five course shells is not. Dirk reminded faculty to take a look before leaving for break. The Distance Learning staff members are ready to assist anyone having difficulty.
2. **Syllabus Compliance:** For 16-week courses, syllabi were due November 23. The College is at 86% compliance, with one of six syllabi missing. Twelve-week course syllabi are due December 22.
3. **Purge in Canvas:** For data security reasons, Canvas pages that are over five years old will be purged in January.
4. **Respondus Online Proctoring System:** The DLC has heard that there is dissatisfaction with the Respondus online proctoring system; a work group has been formed to look into the issues and make recommendations as appropriate.

[Discussion ensued]

Q: *Heather Childree: The purging in Canvas is for documents over five years old. Do we need to edit pages in Canvas to update their creation dates?*

- *Cody Moyer:* We're only purging live shells that are five years old or older. If a document is in a Development Shell, nothing will happen to it. We're only purging five-year-old course shells that have student data--anything beyond 2020. We'll be sending out an announcement with the specific dates. Anything you want to save in one of those 5+-year course shells should be saved to a Development Shell. Once a file is copied to a new live shell, it will remain in use.
- *Michael Derry:* A document created in 2017 but rolled over in 2024...
- *Cody Moyer:* The item will be maintained regardless of whether it is in a Development Shell or used in a live course in the last five years.

V. Old Business

A. Elections for Faculty Senate Officer Positions—**Greg Harris, Parliamentarian**

Greg explained a process that Misty Sparling [former Secretary] had used for the survey function through Zoom, but this was not functional for Heather Childree [current Secretary]. Kim Hess suggested that each person direct-message Greg Harris with the name of the person voted for if there is a run-off for a position.

1. Vice President for the Winter Haven Campus

Greg opened the floor for nominations. Anthony Cornett reminded everyone that a Senate officer must be on a Continuing Contract.

Kim Hess nominated Andrew Coombs; Misty Sparling seconded the nomination. Andrew declined the nomination.

Q: *Heather Childree: Can you self-nominate?*

Anthony: Yes, you can self-nominate. Andrew, Misty, Laura, Chris, Michelle, Pal, John, and Greg are the Winter Haven Senators.

Andrew Coombs nominated Laura Brimer.

Q: *Anthony: Laura, do you have Continuing Contract?*

Laura: No.

Q: *Misty: Does Chris Botelho have Continuing Contract?*

Chris: No.

Misty nominated Greg Harris. Jess Jones seconded the motion. Greg accepted the nomination.

Misty noted that the collegiate high school professors do not have Continuing Contract but are eligible to serve as an officer after five years on an Annual Contract.

With no other nominations, Greg Harris is the new Winter Haven Campus Vice President.

2. Vice President for the Lakeland Campus

Kim Hess nominated Niqui Young-Pringle-Brown. Anthony said that Niqui is not yet a Senator. Kim said that she's incoming in January. Andrew Coombs seconded the nomination. Niqui accepted the nomination.

Misty Sparling nominated Jess Jones, and he accepted the nomination.

Anthony directed the Senators to direct-message Greg Harris, Parliamentarian, regarding their votes.

Greg reported that there were 18 votes; two of the votes were abstentions. There were 10 votes for Jess, and 6 for Niqui.

Jess Jones is to continue leadership as the Lakeland Campus Vice President.

Kim Hess said that in the past only Lakeland Senators voted for the Lakeland Vice President position and only Winter Haven Senators voted for the Winter Haven Vice President position.

Greg said the Bylaws did not specify, and that it was the prerogative of the President how the vote would be taken.

3. Secretary Position

For the position of Secretary, Jess Jones nominated Heather Childree. Anthony Cornett seconded the nomination. Heather accepted the nomination. No other candidates were put forward.

Heather Childree is to continue leadership as the Senate Secretary.

4. Parliamentarian

For the position of Parliamentarian, Andrew Coombs nominated Michael Derry. Dirk Valk seconded the nomination. Michael accepted the nomination. No other candidates were put forward.

Michael Derry is the new Senate Parliamentarian.

5. Senator-at-Large Position

For the position of Senator-at-Large, Anthony stated that the Senator does not need a Continuing Contract.

- Laura Brimer nominated Misty Sparling. Misty accepted the nomination. Anthony seconded the nomination.
- Michael Derry nominated Chris Botelho. Chris accepted the nomination. Jess Jones seconded the nomination.
- Greg directed the Senators to send their votes through direct messaging in Zoom.

- Chris asked if the nominees get to vote; Greg confirmed that they do.
- Greg announced that it was 12 to 7 in favor of Chris.

Chris Botelho is to remain in the position of Senator-at-Large.

In accordance with parliamentary procedures, Greg Harris documented closure of the Senate elections. Michael Derry seconded, and all approved the motion.

B. Polk State Procedure 6012: *Faculty Evaluation*—Senate Subcommittee

Anthony Cornett said that this item was supposed to be under New Business in the agenda and will be discussed there.

C. Polk State Procedure 5024: *Presidential Fee Waivers*

Anthony Cornett said that this procedure was reviewed last month, and Michael Derry had asked about a sentence addition saying both full-time and part-time students are eligible for a Presidential Fee Waivers. This line was added, as the funding numbers are about full-time equivalents, which could be confusing to a student who might think that he or she needed to be enrolled full time to qualify for a waiver.

- *Michael Derry*: The procedure was approved contingent upon that change.
- *Anthony*: Yes. Because of that, we don't need to vote on it again.

D. Polk State Procedure 1006: *Faculty Workload – Academic Accounting System and Department Coordination*

Anthony Cornett sent this procedure out with the five attachments. He asked if there was any feedback from faculty.

- *Michael Derry*: The attachments refer to companies by name. We're on Canvas because the state has a deal with Canvas. We used to use D2L.
- *Anthony*: We need to edit the attachments to remove specific company names.
- *Michael*: We use QM [Quality Matters] at the moment; that could change. We're using *Simple Syllabus*; that could change.
- *Anthony*: Looking at Attachment 1, where it says the “participating faculty member agrees to utilize Polk State College’s Canvas Learning Management System, LMS,” you could just delete “Canvas” and just put the “participating faculty member agrees to utilize the College’s LMS.”
- *Michael*: Instead of saying “Canvas Commons,” use “LMS Commons.” Instead of saying “Quality Matters certified,” it could say that faculty have online “Quality Certification.”
- *Anthony*: There’s Quality [certification] and then there’s Quality Matters [certification]. [*Note: There are two forms of “quality” course certification-- an internal and external certification process. Both allow for course advertisement in the Florida Shines initiative.*]
- *Kim Hess*: Do we need to have Cody chime in? I feel like we do need to use “Quality Matters.”
- *Dirk Valk*: I think the term “*highest quality*” could adequately replace “Quality Matters.”

- *Cody Moyer*: [Quality Matters] is in Procedure 1006, so by putting it in 6012 the two procedures are aligned because that's the standard by which the State of Florida does its quality assessment for courses, and QM is a nationally recognized entity. There aren't a lot of options. There's the Online Learning Consortium. We are heavily invested in Quality Matters, so it would not be financially smart for us to move to a different entity unless there were some kind of state mandate.
- *Michael*: Because the State of Florida tends to change things just for the sake of changing them, by not using company names [here], when the state dictates a change, we won't have to correct all of these procedures and attachments because, for example, we're using Canvas instead of D2L because the State of Florida mandated it. In 5 years, we're going to be moving from SACS to the Higher Learning Commission because the State of Florida mandated that. More generic terminology means we won't have to change all of these attachments and procedures.
- *Cody*: That makes perfect sense. Just one point of clarification, the State did not mandate Canvas. Faculty selected Canvas, and Florida negotiated a lower contract price for institutions to use it, but it is not state mandated. In terms of language about Canvas Commons, there are specific features that we mentioned in there that other LMSs may not have. We could come up with something generic to replace that language to, say, a common repository, or something to that effect.

Anthony asked if there were other changes.

- *Michael*: Article 1, Attachment 1 said that joint development compensation is shared "equally", in Article 2, Section E, Subsection 6 it will be shared "equitably." Attachment 2 says "equally." These words have different definitions, so the same terms should be used.
- *Anthony*: We can use "equal," so the language remains universal.
- *Michael*: In Attachment 3, the instructor contact information, office hours, course expectations, grading policies, ADA accommodations, institutional policies, support resources, and even the full course schedule are already included within *Simple Syllabus*, but it's listed separately in the [Online] Rubric. Does this imply that we have to develop a different section within the course detailing this information, or is what's on *Simple Syllabus* acceptable?
- *Cody*: It would be looking at the syllabus to make sure that the content there is represented appropriately.
- *Michael*: So if it's in the syllabus, we've got it covered.
- *Anthony*: Yes.
- *Jaqueline Grey*: The [Online] Rubric in the attachment doesn't state where to look for that information. I don't want whoever's reviewing the course to have to hunt for the information, so maybe it can say to "look in the syllabus."
- *Cody*: The reason we don't specify is because people put information in different places. It is required in the *Simple Syllabus* sections, but we don't want to mention *Simple Syllabus* per Michael's point.
- *Jaqueline*: How does the [reviewer] know where to look?
- *Cody*: They do know to check the shell itself.

- *Michael*: Attachment 5 is *Guidelines for Students in the Online Environment*. This should be attached to Rule 4.01 and not Procedure 1006 because Procedure 1006 deals with faculty workload and compensation and not student behavior.
- *Anthony*: We can't attach it to a rule because that has to go to the District Board of Trustees. There was talk about attaching it to Procedure 1001, but the reason it was left here is because if you're a faculty member, this would be a tool for the faculty member to keep in mind about student responsibilities. We could move it to 1001.
- *Michael*: Students aren't going to look at procedures. We need to attach it to rules for student contact. I didn't find anything for classroom or online behavior.
- *Anthony*: The *Netiquette Guidelines*.
- *Michael*: I didn't find any of those in procedures. It's only in Rule 4.01. That's why I think it needs to be attached there or we need to develop a 5000-level Procedure so we have a clear spot where this is published and students know about it. Students wouldn't look at faculty procedures. We need to make it easy for students to access.
- *Anthony*: That's why it's in 1006. The faculty member can give it to the students. It's up to the Senate; we can move it to Procedure 1001: *Communicating Course Information to Students*.
- *Michael*: We could keep the Attachment and attach it to both. It needs to be easily visible to students in case there is a discipline incident or challenge.
- *Cody*: We also have information about *Student Guidelines for the Online Environment* in the College Catalog. Students have that as a reference.
- *Anthony*: Let's make our lives easier and attach it to both since 1001 is due for review.

Anthony asked if there was anything else.

- *Michael*: Procedure 1006, Article 3, Section C, Subsection 1, Paragraph C does not have the terms *academic dean* and *provost*, but those are in the attachment.
- *Anthony*: It's in Procedure 1006. That got fixed because it didn't say that before.

Greg Harris motioned to approve Procedure 1006 and its attachments with the addendum that "Canvas" is to be removed and referred to as "the LMS." Dirk Valk seconded the motion. The motion carried.

VI. New Business --Polk State Procedure 6012: *Faculty Evaluation*--Senate Subcommittee

Anthony Cornett said that a number of people have read the updates to Procedure 6012, and he's leery of sending the procedure to faculty because there are things in the procedure that faculty will be angry about. He asked to create a subcommittee of five or six Senators to look over the changes. He'd like the subcommittee to meet in January and have this procedure done and voted on by April or May.

Michael Derry moved to form the subcommittee; Andrew Coombs seconded the motion.

Anthony continued that the method of approval of Continuing Contracts might be problematic. It used to be peer voting. At other institutions one has to basically do a

dissertation. With the peer voting removed there's no voting on who receives a Continuing Contract. It would be up to the individual Administrator. There needs to be a defined method for obtaining Continuing Contract. It was removed because multiple people have said things in that *Peer Compatibility Survey* that were ignored by Administration.

We also need clarity regarding the section about faculty self-assessment. Some faculty will have heartache for not having the *Faculty Goals Forms*. There is also a comment that says we need to check the SACS guidelines to make sure it doesn't say that *Faculty Goals Forms* have to be there. We might have to insert some language. I'd like the subcommittee to look over the document and make suggestions for some form of evaluation for Continuing Contract.

Q: *Johnny Stewart: Do we know if the new accrediting body will require something different?*

- *Anthony:* I heard from an administrator that the new accrediting body is more stringent. We probably need to gear this toward both SACS and HLC.
- *Jess Jones:* Peer Compatibility Surveys are done across the board in institutions. Taking faculty completely out of this is a precedent we should not set. We need some sort of peer accountability, and we need some sort of self-assessment. There needs to be clear guidelines so people coming into the College don't worry about not offending the wrong person.
- *John Barberet:* This is a long tradition. As a collegiate institution we should be able to interact with colleagues and have a say in who is going to join us and participate.
- *Anthony:* I'd like Andrew and Laura on the subcommittee, as they were on the original committee, and two or three more people, especially those who have been evaluated at other institutions, such as Jess. What do other institutions do? What is considered standard practice? If anyone else wants to join, send me an email. We'll start in January.

VII. New Business from the Floor

[Note: Commentary from the floor spanned two main topics which were interspersed. Comments are reordered by topic to assist with reading, but the input remains in sequence by the order it was spoken.]

A. SPI Surveys

Gregory Johnson asked if Student Perception of Instruction Surveys could be extended. He asked if there is a rule for the timing, as it closes before the end of the semester. In his program, having the SPI as part of a reflection process would be helpful.

- *Kim Hess:* To Gregory's point, I was there when David Sutton changed the dates for SPIs. I want students who've completed my course to evaluate the course; however, with Canvas, as soon as a student takes a test, the grade is known. If the SPI survey ends before the last week, students give better [more accurate] feedback based on the course and not on whether the faculty member is willing to fudge grades.
- *Gregory Johnson:* On the timing of the SPIs, that's quite helpful feedback. Perhaps a compromise might be in order. Instead of going to the end of the semester when final grades could influence the outcomes, perhaps we go back a little bit. Maybe a

two-month period after the middle of the semester or extend the timing by a week. I found the timing short, so we get just a sample from those who really love the class or hate your guts.

- *Andrew*: The concern on SPIs—it's before the Withdrawal Deadline [it must be sent afterward]. I wonder if we could have students fill them out in person [for in-person courses]. I leave [the room]; “Here’s where you leave the survey.” Is there a way to make it happen in the classroom so it’s done in the window and we get more feedback?
- *Jess*: I’m a fan of the scantrons. The amount of feedback we got was a lot more.

B. Invoking DWF and Pass Rates as a New Aspect of the Evaluative Process

- *John Barberet*: I heard that our ratio of pass-fail is going to become part of our evaluations [for our jobs]. I’m not sure this is such a good way to evaluate professors. I’m concerned that we would use this, especially in Science classes. Is this going to be part of our evaluation?
- *Amy Bratten*: The pass-fail rate is something that is a moving target. There should not be one specific percentage that anyone is looking for to deem a professor or course successful. It is one piece of one metric of Procedure 6012. It’s more about if you have a College average of a Drop-Fail-Withdraw rate. If the faculty member runs their DFW rate, can they show that the content of the course is more difficult than the average course, but also has that professor also provided all the resources to the students for them to be successful? There are a lot of pieces of data that are used. Here’s where this class falls into the average of the College; here’s what I’ve done to help my students. It has more to do with pedagogy and andragogy and what faculty have done. It’s misleading to say that pass-fail rates will determine our jobs.
- *Barberet*: It’s also misleading to say that our tutoring program isn’t good. I mean, that’s sort of what you’re saying, right? Our tutoring program has been established to help these students, and what the professor can’t really control is the tutoring, right?
- *Amy*: What I’m saying is, can you show that you have provided the resources to the students, and it was just that the students didn’t go?
- *Barberet*: Can we separate the criteria from Sciences and the Humanities? Because in the Sciences somebody will end up being qualified when the person is not qualified. The second point is that this will lead to grade inflation. Every faculty member right now is thinking, “Dang, they’re going to evaluate me based on how many people I pass and how many people I fail?”
- *Amy*: It’s not as simple as saying: “If I meet the metric I’ll be compensated or fired,” which is why in the email I sent out last week, that it’s not a percentage you’re striving for. It’s a conversation with your content area. If it’s a course that’s deemed more difficult, then your goal is going to be different from someone in the Education Program. There won’t be one specific measure that will come out of my office because of that, John. I do not want to encourage grade inflation. We’re looking at the difficulty and providing all of the resources so that students have every opportunity to succeed.

- *Jess Jones*: The department determines the rigor, but who's going to make the final decision? Because if the department feels a certain way based off the rigor, but Administration gets squeamish about pass-fail rates....you see where I'm going here?
- *Amy*: It's not as simple as yes or no. It's complicated. It's differentiated. It should be based on industry standard for that content area.
- *Barberet*: My advice to new faculty is to talk to the dean and ask exactly what the criteria is: How many people they should pass and how many they should fail.
- *Jess*: Twenty years ago at USF, we had common exams, and we had five instructors. One had a degree in Chemical Education so that person knew the pedagogy. Another professor literally sat at the podium and read the book to the students. The highest grades were from the person at the podium reading from the textbook. It depends on the students and on the class. I can point them [in the right direction], but I can't make the students do [what is needed to be successful]. I offered a student the chance to make up a missed quiz. The student declined. I can't force the person to do the work.
- *Amy*: That exact scenario is exactly why I said it is differentiated based on the scenario, based on the students you have, based on the content. And there's no way for me to nail down one specific measure to tell you this is what you need to hit. It has to be that conversation with the person who's doing the evaluation of performance and the person who's done the observation in the classroom and meeting in the middle somewhere, having the conversation, and it's not going to be an Administration-versus-Faculty situation. It's going to be based on the fact that there have been intentional conversations to ensure that the faculty member is just showing that they are providing as many opportunities for success as possible. So, this is not a conversation that's going to be a one-hour-long conversation, one-and-done, right? This is a very philosophical type of conversation that has to do with teaching strategies, knowing your audience, knowing your content, and being able to explain that to the dean and having the dean understand it, which is one of the reasons why we have deans that oversee areas as opposed to campuses, right? So, they can be a little bit more focused in that knowledge.
- *Barberet*: My dean is focused on 8 different areas—so I don't see how he can "focus." And the person that we're actually really talking about here got a very good evaluation and then suddenly got a very bad one—like, overnight—from what I can tell. I'm dubious. I agree with Jess. This is a bad idea to link faculty evaluations to pass-fail rates.

[Anthony Cornett motioned to extend the meeting. Jess Jones seconded the motion. The motion carried at 4:31 p.m.]

- *Jess*: There's nothing written out to give guidance, so this appears arbitrary depending upon whom you are working with. There's not any clear-cut idea. It's too holistic. We need guidance. We need resources. Faculty want to be better teachers. We didn't have professional development funds for years. Science pedagogy is very specific in my field. We're taught to be scientists, not teachers.

We're trying to provide good instruction [with standards] so that the Nursing students do not kill us later on.

- *Laura*: For my ENC 1101 [*College Composition I*] and ENC 1102 [*College Composition II*] courses there are department-level standards for how the final paper is averaged into the grade. Students are doing great until the end when they don't submit their final paper--or use AI [to plagiarize]. It would not be an accurate reflection of their participation in the course, my teaching, or the resources if students can change or alter their SPI afterward because they plagiarized their paper [and were caught]. About use of DFW, I know I'm going to have more [failures] due to the issue with AI plagiarism: My concern is maintaining high academic integrity standards [if DFW rates are used in the evaluation]. I can talk about how I tried to eliminate the use of AI if that's going to be a factor in my evaluations. I understand showing all of the times I've reached out to students. But to Jess's point it's rather vague and open to interpretation. I don't have any recourse for a student who doubles down on saying they're not using AI.
- *Dirk Valk*: If my DWF is abnormally high, you will ask what's going on, and I will defend myself with what I've done to support students, [but] I don't know why we're invoking DWF rates. Any time there's a question about my performance, that could come from student criticism, a comparison of pass rates in [students'] university classes that lead off from mine, in a change in my students' mean GPA. DWF rates are a clumsy and unsubtle metric to use, and one of the downfalls is that it can be an impetus for grade inflation, a punishment for teaching a difficult course, or for having a soft crop of students. I stand ready to defend my practices. I do not see a specific reason to invoke DWF for bringing you [Administration] to me. DWF is a red herring and is drawing attention away from what I interpret as the impetus for serving students well. I think we're all proud of our ability to do that. Do you need to be looking at my DWF to do that? I don't think so.

VII. Adjournment

Misty Sparling motioned to adjourn. Andrew Coombs seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting ended at 4:44 p.m.