

Polk State College Faculty Senate Agenda
Date: February 10, 2025
Time: 3:00 P.M.
Meeting Held via Zoom (recorded)
Steering Committee to Meet Following the Senate Meeting

Officers:

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

Others:

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

Attending Senators: Misty Sparling, Laura Brimer, Lee Childree, Kim Hess, Gwyn Phillips, Andrew Coombs, Johnny Stewart, Michael Derry, John Woodward, Dirk Valk, Gregory Johnson, and John Barberet.

Faculty Attendees: Salma Nawlo-Wehrmeyer, Heena Park, Jamie Haischer, Melissa Shapiro, Tiffany Messerschmidt, Francisco Rodrigues, Pam Jones, Jacqueline Gray, Susie Moerschbacher, Matina Wagner, Carolyn Orr, Latrice Moore, Jennifer Shaw, Penny Morris, Fatin Morris Guirguis, Niqui Young-Pringle-Brown, Ed Smith, Nerissa Felder, Holly Scoggins, Alfredo Gonzalez, and Herb Nold, and Alison (last name not displayed).

Presenting Guests and Others:

Presenting: Angela Falconetti, President; Cody Moyer, Director of Learning Technology; and Britt Gamble--Evergreen Solutions

Non-Presenting: Reggie Webb, Senior Vice President of Student Services and Campus Operations; Tamara Sakagawa, Vice President of Communications and Public Affairs; Kim Manning, Dean of Academic Affairs; Bert Rivera Marchand, Dean of Academic Affairs; Yovan Reyes, Dean of Early College and Student Engagement; Beth Lockett, Dean of Health Sciences; and Belkis Capeles, Dean of Workforce Education

I. Approval of Minutes: January 2025 Meeting

Misty Sparling made a motion to approve the *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes: January 13, 2025*; Greg Harris seconded. The motion carried.

II. Approval of February Agenda

Greg Harris motioned to approve the *Faculty Senate Agenda: February 10, 2025* with a change for the late addition of Britt Gamble (Evergreen Solutions) to be added to hear faculty feedback and answer questions on the Compensation Study during the scheduled discussion.

The motion was seconded by Misty Sparling and carried.

- A. **President's Update:** Dr. Falconetti provided a brief overview of renovations and gave a link for ongoing construction updates (<https://www.polk.edu/about/construction->

[projects-polk-state/](#)). She discussed her meeting of the Council of Presidents. Polk State received a \$30,000 donation from Legoland Resorts. Coffee with the President is scheduled for later in the week.

- B. SPI Update (Cody Moyer): Procedure 6012 indicates the *Student Perception of Instruction Survey* (SPI) opens the day after the withdrawal deadline, closing before final exams. Previous SPIs were done through *Passport*. Fall SPIs were conducted using *Qualtrics* and were collected for 12-week, 16-week, and Fastrack-2 courses. The interface didn't work as expected. The deans have the results, and a faculty member should email if results were not received. The survey questions are the same—there were no modifications, just a different modality.

For the spring semester SPIs will use *Course Eval HQ* via Canvas. The results will be automatically emailed to professors two weeks after grades are posted. All courses will automatically be evaluated unless the professor opts out. At least 60% of a full-time instructor's classes must be evaluated. Fastrack-1 SPIs have been configured; the other sessions are in process. A suggestion was made to send a reminder message to students halfway or three-quarters of the way through the semester, or to make the SPI a module or assignment within the course. (Link to Cody's Presentation: https://www.canva.com/design/DAGeu7MsIpl/eTx1rl-30z6s8mhDE3tA8g/view?utm_content=DAGeu7MsIpl&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=uniquelinks&utm_id=hdf05f292ae)

III. Faculty Senate Officer and Administrative Liaison Reports

A. Faculty Senate President's Report (Bill Caldecutt)

1. Salary Study: Evergreen held an online webinar (1/31) that resulted in a request to gather input from the committee members. The Faculty Senate was given the task of gathering feedback via Senators from faculty in their departments to share at this meeting. Later in this meeting, this feedback can be provided to Britt Gamble.
2. Polk State Procedure 6073: Procedure on Rules and Procedures: Mary Clark has stated that both Procedure 6073 and the *Faculty Senate Constitution* are being reviewed. On 1/14, concerns were stated about the meetings being shut to other observers. Administration sent an inquiry to the College's attorney to review the request to open these meetings due to the *Sunshine Law*. The attorney stated that because the meeting is a "fact-finding group," it does not follow the *Sunshine Law*. This characterization indicates that the committee can talk about a procedure but cannot make recommendations for changes. But, while this committee may not require *Sunshine Law* openness, is it in line with the College's values and history to refuse observers?
The committee's homework was to research the definition of *shared governance*.
3. Reduction of Faculty Overloads and Stipends: Bill continues to talk to faculty who've lost overloads, with courses given to adjuncts without explanation. Some faculty are now considering quitting due to this impending policy. The *Evergreen Faculty Survey* showed that most faculty require overloads for financial survival. The Senate has asked Administration for an explanation for why this has happened and why there is a desire to remove faculty stipends and overloads; there have been no updates in response to these questions.
4. Cancellation of Classes: Classes were abruptly closed for low enrollment at the start of the semester. There has been no update from Administration regarding whether the College will continue to close low enrollment classes in this way. Full-time faculty are indicating that they may choose not to teach potential low-enrollment courses, such as majors courses and upper-level courses, for fear of losing the class

and being negatively financially impacted. It is too “risky” under these circumstances.

5. Definition of Salary Steps: Administration has not provided any updates regarding whether the definition of “a step” on the *Faculty Salary Schedule* will be restored to the previously (approved) language that existed before it was altered by an unidentified person.
6. Procedure 6012: Faculty Evaluations: The committee met, but a second meeting was put on hold to get feedback from Senate. This will be addressed further later in today’s meeting.
7. Mold in LTB: There was discussion at the January President’s Staff meeting regarding ongoing testing of the Lakeland Technology Building. Toxic black mold was found growing in various locations in LTB. The concern is that the monitoring should be more frequent [to help keep people healthy] than the annual testing that Administration has communicated to faculty. The mold was found as recently as December 2024 and had recurred several times after cleaning, bleaching, HEPA filtering, and other strategies. For safety, faculty would like more frequent testing of the rooms that had toxic mold. Administration said they would ‘explore the cost to do the screening sooner.’ No update has been provided by Administration regarding more frequent testing.
8. Senate Objectives List: The next President’s Staff meeting is tomorrow; Bill has been asked to present the Senate’s list of concerns (*Faculty Senate Objectives*). This is an old document that has been receiving additions from Senate for years. The President scheduled a “kickoff” meeting with Bill, Jess Jones, and Anthony afterward for further discussion. There are two objectives that faculty have submitted for addition to the list. This will be discussed later in today’s meeting.

B. Lakeland Vice President Report (Jess Jones)

Jess Jones has concerns about the Evergreen report. He says,

As a member of the Faculty Resource group involved with the DBOT mandated salary study with the Evergreen group, we were asked to provide feedback regarding concerns associated with the “Assessment of Current Conditions” and the “Market Summary.” My primary concerns, as listed below, were shared with the group and included in the resource group feedback. I am sharing this information for the sake of transparency and to establish a record of concern.

Issues with exhibits 2F, 2G, 2H, and 2I of Chapter 3 – Assessment of Current Conditions

The data presented in exhibits 2F, 2G, 2H, and 2I should not be included in the final report as its inclusion implies there is a relevancy in the data presented. The inclusion of the data would mislead a reader to assume a narrative that faculty salaries exceed what would be predicted based on years of service to the college and are thus overpaid. The information in the exhibits present two pieces of information, actual salaries of faculty based on years of service at the college deemed “tenure” and projected salaries of faculty based on tenure at the college. Projected salary was determined by setting all faculty to **step 0** on the date of hire and then add a step to their salary for each year of tenure at the college. Under this methodology, all faculty hired who are in their 10th year of tenure would be or should be paid at **step 9**. This method is not an accurate representation of how faculty enter the step system at Polk State College. Faculty, when hired, can be entered into the system, based on years of experience, at any point between

steps 0 and 10. If a faculty member were to enter the step system at **step 10** (not unusual) and receive a step for each year of service, they would be at **step 19**.

*Given the type of comparison displayed in exhibits 2F, 2G, 2H, and 2I, the faculty member entering at step 10 would be paid greater than their “projected salary” by **more than 10%**. **The inclusion of this data is damaging to any real discussion of salary stagnation as its inclusion implies that the information is useful and relevant, and conclusions about faculty progression within the step system can be accurately made from this data analysis.** These types of conclusions **cannot be made** as the faculty member entering at step 10 did so in agreement with the College and only received a singular step for each year of tenure, **they are not outperforming their “projected salary,”** they would simply be at the salary they should be given a step-system that results in the rewarding of a step for each year of tenure. A proper analysis for determining if faculty are progressing properly through the step system would have a “projected salary” where each faculty member would have their starting step adjusted to the real step they entered at, and then given an additional step for each year of tenure.*

Issues with exhibits 4C and 4D from Chapter 4 – Market Summary

The data presented in exhibits 4C and 4D should not be included in the final report as its inclusion implies there is a relevancy in the data presented. The inclusion of the data would mislead a reader to assume a narrative that faculty at all degree levels and all percentiles of earning are vastly outperforming their peers. The data included in 4C and 4D summarizes mean salaries of faculty within a degree grouping, with a comparison (% diff) being made between Polk State College faculty at the average salary of their peers at other institutions. A comparison of average salaries can be useful, if care is taken in controlling variables. If Polk State faculty and peer faculty each had the same number of years of tenure, then an average salary comparison would give a fair analysis of competitiveness of salary. If Polk State faculty and peer faculty each had the same range of salaries (same minimum and maximum salaries), then a comparison of averages **could** provide information regarding either the efficiency of progress through the step system **or** the relative tenure of faculty at the College (veteran versus new to the profession). Neither of these types of analyses were performed.

*Given the type of comparison displayed in Exhibits 4C and 4D, faculty at various percentiles of earning when compared to their peers are making as much as 34% more than their institutional peers. **The inclusion of this data is damaging to any real discussion of salary competitiveness within the market as its inclusion implies that the information is useful and relevant, and conclusions about faculty salary competitiveness can be accurately made from this data analysis.** These types of conclusions **cannot be made** as variables such as salary range and years of tenure were not controlled, as discussed above. Given the data in exhibit 4F (average ranges) and exhibit 2D (quartile analysis and time with the organization), this “out performance of average salaries” is most likely due to faculty at Polk State College having a higher average tenure at the College than faculty at our peer institutions.*

Issues with exhibits 4B from Chapter 4 – Market Summary

The cost-of-living indices listed in exhibit 4B and slide 11 of the Resource Group presentation, do not “pass the eye test” nor agree with other external cost of living index sources (and the composite data needed for its creation) in regard to the Lakeland/Winter Haven regions cost of

living when compared to its peer institutions. This potentially erroneous multiplier is used throughout the market analysis bringing Polk State salaries more into line with market values. ***This usage of a potentially erroneous value will lead to underestimations of what a real market salary is within the work region.***

Though it is understandable that salary ranges must be normalized for potential differences in cost of living, normalization with inaccurately low values will predict that a salary is satisfactory for a certain “style of living” that does not reflect the actual economics within the living area. In addition, ***the Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER) (the creator of this index) themselves state:***

“The Cost of Living Index simply isn’t that precise. Therefore, it’s not valid to calculate the ratio of two area indexes and conclude that the price differential between those two areas is exactly the arithmetic result. Because the index numbers are approximations, the differences are also approximations. Small differences between areas may not represent significant—or even actual—differences in living costs. Larger differences do permit an inference of substantial real differences”

According to slide 11 of the presentation, “Polk State” has a COL (cost-of-living index) of 95.1. It is not clear if this is in reference to Polk County or the Lakeland/Winter Haven metro region. Initial meetings with Evergreen announced that COL would be for Winter Haven or Winter Haven/ Lakeland. At the most recent meeting, it was stated that the listed COL was for Polk County (or the “service area”). According to the COLI (Cost of Living Index Manual) that discusses methodologies for the COL creation, these values are meant for urban areas, regions of a certain population density, or a minimum county population of 50,000 with a city of 35,000.

For reference, this COL of 95.1 for Polk State is the second lowest of all listed institutions in Florida (third lowest of all compared). This ranking applies that faculty at Polk State are experiencing the second lowest living expenses in the sampling regions. This ranking does not pass the eye test and is not supported by other rankings of cost of living that are readily available. The following is a listing of ***some*** of the colleges (and their home campus city) that are deemed “more expensive” than Polk State based on COL: Tyler Junior College (Tyler, TX), Chipola College (Marianna, FL), North Florida College (Madison, FL), Florida Gateway College (Lake City, FL), South Florida State College (Avon Park, FL). Neighboring institutions in higher cost of living regions were included to provide additional context. The following table includes cost-of-living index values obtained from bestplaces.net, and the relative cost of living ranking (out of 6,050 ranked metropolitan regions) according to the Economic Research Institute.

College	City	COL	Relative Ranking (out of 6,050)
Polk State College	Lakeland	91.6	3,473
	Winter Haven	91.6	3,758
Tyler	Tyler, TX	85.2	4,115
Chipola	Marianna	77.1	5,700
North Florida	Madison	78.5	Not Available
South Florida State	Avon Park	83	Not Available

Florida Gateway	Lake City	85.5	4,560
Hillsborough ^a	Tampa	104.2	1,435
Valencia ^b	Orlando	106	1,360

^aHillsborough had a COL value of 105.0 in Chapter 4

^bValencia had a COL value of 105.8 in Chapter 4

C. Winter Haven Vice President Report (Anthony Cornett)

1. *Safety Training Series*: February 13 from 10-11 A.M. in WST 126; *Active Assailant Response Training*: February 28 in LTB 1125
2. *Increasing Mental Toughness Workshop* (Felipe and Bert): February 12 from 1:30-2:30 p.m.

D. Parliamentarian Report (Gregg Harris)

Three people have volunteered to be on the Senate committee to review the Senate documents. The work should begin near the end of this semester, after the plate is cleared with regard to Senate objectives and previous projects and concerns.

E. Academic Liaison Report (Provost Bratten)

[*Note: Amy asked for the Senate to reorder the Agenda so that Britt Gamble could speak earlier. A motion to reorder the Agenda to place the “Compensation Study Discussion” above “Report”s was made by Jess Jones and seconded by Andrew Coombs. The motion carried.*]

1. Extended Time for Evergreen Study Input: Kim Manning had originally provided only a few days for input. The deadline has been extended to Thursday, February 20.
2. Strategic Plan: The *Academic Affairs and Workforce Education Master Plan* (AAWE) is posted to PIE. It was developed by the Deans and Directors in Academic Affairs. Deans are to gather faculty input. A meeting will be held in March to pull together all comments and suggestions for changes. Senators are asked to review the plan, send it to their departmental constituents, and provide feedback to the deans.
3. Air Quality and Annual Testing: The Facilities Department is working on a schedule to test all College buildings; issues can be reported via the *ProPlan* platform.
 - *Faculty raised questions about the methodology being used for safety and testing.*
 - *Amy said she would forward these questions to the appropriate person.*
4. Coffee with the President: February 12 and 13.

VI. New Business: Evergreen Compensation Study Feedback

[*Note: A complete record of all questions received from faculty in preparation for this meeting is copied below, along with a summary of all questions and comments covered during this meeting.*]

[*Note: Greg Harris made a motion to extend meeting that was seconded by Jess Jones at 4:23 P.M. The motion passed.*]

IV. Committee Reports and Updates: None

V. Old Business

A. HR Questions and Answers

To follow-up on the email sent with HR answers to questions, please email Bill if you need anything clarified.

B. *Senate Objectives List*: Update

The list of concerns is on the President's Staff Agenda for tomorrow's meeting. Two items have been requested to be added:

- Faculty Salary Schedule: The *Faculty Salary Schedule* is constructed as a step-based schedule and it includes, at the bottom, a definition of what a "step" is. This definition was changed without attribution. Dr. Falconetti previously agreed to restore this language in early 2024 ("A step is normally equivalent to one year of service" versus "A step is approximately equivalent to one year of experience"). Faculty are formally asking for the original definition and language to be restored.
- Shared Governance (DBOT rule 2.24): Many faculty have indicated that there has been a shift away from the College's historical approach and culture of collaborative policy-making from the beginning of developments or changes. The Faculty Senate is directed by governing documents to be a 'full partner' with Administration in creating, implementing, and changing policies and procedures, using a consensus model. Senate is not simply an advisory body, and "should be there from the beginning." Faculty are asking for a return to use of DBOT Rule 2.24: *Senate Constitution*. This is a request to renew the interpretation of the *Constitution* as it was written--that the Senate/faculty are partners with the Administration-- and that this includes all steps along the way.

Jess Jones motioned to add these two items to *Faculty Senate Objectives List*; Greg Harris seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. **New Business: Review of Procedure 6012: Teaching Faculty Evaluation Procedure**

There has been one meeting of this committee. A question arose at that meeting regarding whether or not the committee is inclusive of Faculty Senate. There was also a request in that meeting for Faculty Senate to be involved from the beginning in whatever work is done.

The issues regarding faculty involvement and Senate partnership may be partially addressed, despite the "spilled milk" of the group having not been formed in collaboration with Senate, by adding more Faculty Senate members at this point and by agreeing to real-time and authentic communication with Senate throughout the remainder of the process. The current total number of committee members is 9, and 5 are faculty. The committee is hoping two Senators can be added by Friday at 1:30 P.M. [if possible] because the next meeting is this Friday. If anyone is interested in serving, please email Bill.

VII. **New Business from the Floor**

A. Room Reservations: Misty Sparling informed the Senate that Collegiate faculty have reserved rooms a year in advance, then told within a month of the event that they are being bumped. This makes event planning and room reservation pointless and frustrating.

Amy Bratten asked for examples and said she would email VP Webb about this.

B. Constant Changes in Academic Affairs: Kim Hess said that the Math Department is frustrated with constant changes in Academic Affairs, especially the sudden relocation of the Academic Dean's Office without prior communication, which has created a sense of faculty disconnection. There are logistical issues, such as unclear procedures for mail delivery and supply management, as well as frequent turnover among administrative assistants, which affects operations. Safety concerns have also arisen

due to the unlocked front door and lack of security for areas with sensitive materials like tests. The suggestion was made to add a locked door to the mail area. Math faculty are concerned about the ongoing instability in staffing and the potential replacement of the effective Department Coordinator model with a Department Chair version. There was a suggestion to have an Instructional Designer assist Dean Rivera Marchand and Manning in handling online faculty evaluations. There is also much frustration with the dysfunction of the Banner system.

- *Amy Bratten responded that there have been a lot of changes--some due to her decisions. There's been a lack of change management, and she recognizes this. The deans have even said that Amy needs to slow down the changes. The idea of switching away from the Department Coordinator model is not set in stone. Dean Rivera Marchand's office was moved to make the position forward-facing to the community. She admits the move was not done well.*
- *Bert responded that his office is shorthanded, but trying to be more visible. They hope to address the staffing issue soon.*

C. College Operations and the Academic Affairs and Workforce Education Master Plan:

Gregory Johnson said that the *Academic Affairs and Workforce Education Master Plan* directly impacts departments, students, and the efficient functioning of the College and instruction. Something this major, given the enormous number of changes in the College, caught him by surprise as there was no inclusion of faculty. He wants to be part of the discussion, instead of being told 'what's going to happen.' Faculty must be involved from the beginning. Getting the document at this point is too late. There should have had meetings and discussions with faculty with authentic collaboration.

A Program Director needs data, and he can't get the data he needs from the College. Why can't he go into a portal and click on a table that says how many students are enrolled in each program, etc.? Data shouldn't be this hard to get. Can we get this on the Administration's agenda to be discussed so that program directors and people who run departments can make decisions based on the data? If it's licenses, get the licenses--or give the raw data so individuals don't have to jump through hoops.

D. Academic Affairs Changes and the Academic Affairs and Workforce Education Master Plan: Niqui Young-Pringle-Brown asked how consolidating Academic Affairs administrators into a single area is good for students. There is no representation at either of the front desks. The students just wander around because they don't know where to go. This is also harming faculty morale. How is this good?

We're trying to get data, and there is no one available to us to get data from. It's really important for us to make program decisions. The College has become administratively heavy. Removing the Department Coordinator model and adding a Department Chair [another administrator] is adding even more Administration. As a solution [to having roaming students], can we have several administrative assistants rotate at the front desks, so students have a person to obtain help from?

E. Full-Time Faculty Overloads Given to Adjuncts: Jacqueline Gray asked to clarify if full-time overloads were being given to adjuncts, as she thought full-time faculty had priority. Also, she asked what the plan is for the vacant space where Academic Affairs was located.

- *Bill said that Polk State College Procedure 1024 gives priority in scheduling to full-time faculty. During the pandemic a Senate subcommittee worked to review and clarify the procedure to ensure it was used properly, but Administration did not allow the reviewed procedure to move forward--it stalled with Administration in DCG after gaining the Senate's approval. He's hearing that the practice of giving overloads to adjuncts is not being applied universally [some examples have been discussed at the Senate].*
- *Amy Bratten said she would like a list of examples.*

VIII. Adjournment

Jess Jones made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Greg Harris and all voted in the affirmative. The Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Questions and Comments Received from Faculty to the Senate President after Feb 5 (when the video of the Jan 31 Evergreen webinar was released).

Faculty Member #1:

This is in response to the request for input on the Evergreen report before they submit their recommendations. I want to express my support for all of the concerns you summarized in your email that have been raised by other faculty members. I would like to highlight a few and add to that list.

I think this has been addressed in some of the communications that we've seen from other sources, but (as you mentioned in your email summary) the study does not appear to consider the fact that cumulative inflation since 2022 has been over 16%, nor does it consider that from 2019 to 2024, cumulative inflation has exceeded 24% (according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Consumer Price Index (CPI) data). While small salary increases have been implemented, they have not matched the rising cost of living, meaning faculty purchasing power has steadily declined.

It's also my understanding that Polk ranks among the highest in Florida in operational costs, which seems relevant to consideration of faculty pay. Faculty salaries are being scrutinized, but I haven't seen anything that indicates there is a fair distribution of pay or pay raises across Administration and faculty (and other positions at the school for that matter). How do administrative expansion and pay increases compare to faculty pay? As a matter of fairness and balance, it would be useful to see how Polk's administrative salary growth compares to faculty salary trends. Given that Polk ranks among the highest in operational costs in the state, understanding where those funds are allocated would provide a more complete picture of compensation distribution. Faculty compensation should be analyzed in the full context of Polk's spending priorities.

As you noted in your email summary, faculty pay is determined by contact hours, courseload, and responsibilities, not by a fixed number of months. Additionally, the step schedule was originally intended to provide predictable salary growth based on experience, but it has not been consistently applied. This has led to years where we received no step increases, significantly impacting our long-term earnings and financial planning. Any analysis of faculty pay should address how step schedule administration—or the lack thereof—has affected our compensation over time. Adjusting Polk salaries based on contract length creates a misleading comparison that does not reflect how faculty are paid.

In addition to those concerns, there is the issue of using all of Polk County to determine the cost of living, but that seems to have been pretty well covered already, based on your summary.

Finally, there's the question of how Polk faculty salaries compare to other institutions. The study concludes that we are well paid compared to faculty at other colleges, but many of us do not find that conclusion reflective of our experiences. The comparison institutions should be selected fairly and transparently, not based on who responded to an Evergreen survey (I think that's what I heard in the presentation). If Polk's salaries are truly competitive, faculty should be able to see how those numbers were determined and how they align with institutions of similar size, scope, and truly relevant regional cost of living.

I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to this discussion and fully support the concerns already raised by faculty. The study's conclusions do not fully reflect faculty compensation realities, and any recommendations based on incomplete or flawed assumptions risk leading to unfair outcomes. I hope these additional concerns will be taken into account before final recommendations are made to the Board.

Faculty Member #2

As faculty members with extensive experience in both higher education and economic analysis, we have thoroughly reviewed Evergreen Solutions' salary study, the methodologies outlined in the COLI manual, and the January 31st faculty meeting presentation. This study is not just flawed—it misrepresents faculty salaries and fails to provide an accurate assessment of compensation concerns.

Deliberate Exclusion of Experts

During the faculty meeting, Britt Gamble mentioned that her methods had been praised by economists. While she said this, there were economists in attendance. But those economists, who were of a different opinion, were kept on “mute”.

The COLI Methodology Is Deeply Flawed and Misleading

Evergreen's use of a county-wide cost of living index (COLI) fails to reflect the reality of our actual living expenses. Polk County is vast, spanning from dense urban areas like Lakeland and Winter Haven to sparsely populated rural regions. Using an average across the entire county artificially depresses the cost-of-living calculation, severely underestimating the financial burden faced by faculty who live in the urban centers where they actually work.

The COLI manual itself states that:

“Cost of living indices should reflect the areas where employees reside rather than broad regional averages that dilute economic realities.” (COLI Manual, Section 3.2)

Evergreen's approach blatantly ignores this standard, distorting the comparison. By failing to weight COL accurately toward urbanized areas where housing, transportation, and everyday expenses are significantly higher, you have artificially deflated the perceived salary shortfall.

Misrepresentation of Faculty Salary Progression

The first slides in the January 31st meeting presentation compare current faculty salaries to a “projected” salary based on a step system. This is misleading.

Nobody is ever hired at Step 0 or Step 1. Ever.

Hiring at Polk State College begins much higher in the step system, meaning these “projections” are completely disconnected from actual faculty compensation patterns. The faculty repeatedly pointed this out in the meeting, yet the flawed comparison remains central to the study’s conclusions.

This significantly distorts the salary progression analysis and creates a false impression that faculty are fairly compensated relative to an unrealistic baseline. Any valid salary study must account for actual hiring practices, not theoretical step placements that never occur.

Failure to Address Annual Step Progression Disputes

One of the most critical salary issues at Polk State College has been the annual step increase for service. Faculty are supposed to receive a 1.6% per year step increase, as outlined in the salary schedule, which states:

“A step is normally equivalent to a year of service to the college.”

However, administration secretly altered this language to read:

“A step is approximately equivalent to a year of experience.”

This change has been used to justify the administration’s claim that steps are not automatic but contingent on budget availability, despite the clear historical understanding that they represent an annual progression for faculty service. This has been an ongoing dispute, and Evergreen was specifically given this information by faculty but has failed to address it in the study. The absence of a clear analysis on this fundamental issue means that the study fails to resolve one of the most contentious aspects of faculty compensation at Polk State College.

Contract Length Comparisons Are Misleading

Evergreen’s analysis attempted to convert contract lengths between institutions, specifically converting 10-month contracts to 9-month contracts and vice versa. This is a deeply flawed approach that misrepresents actual workload and compensation structures.

Many institutions listed as having “10-month” contracts have similar numbers of service days and courses taught as Polk State College, which spans 164 days over 16 weeks, covering 9 months in actual work time but extending over 10 calendar months.

For comparison:

- Valencia College: 15 weeks (8-month contract)
- Central Florida State College: 16 weeks (9- or 12-month contracts)
- Hillsborough Community College: 16 weeks (12-month contract)
- Lake-Sumter College: 16 weeks (9- or 12-month contract, 167 days)
- Seminole State College: 16 weeks (9-month contract labeled as “10-month”)
- Broward State College: 163-day contract (fall and spring)
- Brevard College: 165-day contract
- Palm Beach State College: 168-day “10-month” contract (includes 8 non-instructional paid days)

- Pensacola State College: 164-day contract
- St. John's River College: 9-, 10-, and 12-month contracts (varies by discipline)

This data demonstrates that months as a measurement of contract length is a misleading metric. The actual number of service days and instructional workload should be the basis for comparison. By failing to use service days as the metric, Evergreen's study distorts the analysis of how faculty workloads compare across institutions.

Inclusion of Stipends as a Distraction

The study included various stipends, such as those for faculty serving in governance roles and department coordinator positions. However, these stipends were not part of base salary calculations. Their inclusion in the report appears to serve no analytical purpose beyond shifting the focus away from structural salary concerns.

Stipends for additional duties are standard across higher education and are:

- Temporary and tied to specific administrative or leadership responsibilities
- Not part of base faculty salaries
- Irrelevant to broad faculty compensation comparisons

Their mention in the study obscures the real issue: faculty salaries remain stagnant and uncompetitive. Any legitimate salary analysis should focus on base compensation and its adequacy relative to inflation and peer institutions.

Failure to Account for Inflation and Real Compensation Erosion

The study also ignores inflation trends when comparing faculty salaries over time. Over the past five years, inflation has significantly outpaced any salary increases, meaning that faculty purchasing power has steadily declined.

The COLI manual explicitly states:

"Periodic adjustments for inflation should be incorporated into any longitudinal salary comparison to ensure accurate assessment of compensation trends." (COLI Manual, Section 4.1)

Evergreen's study fails to do this, making historical salary data comparisons meaningless. By ignoring inflation's impact, the study overlooks a critical factor that affects faculty retention and overall financial well-being.

Conclusion: Significant Methodological Issues Must Be Addressed

The cumulative effect of these issues calls the validity of the study into question. The use of misleading cost-of-living calculations, unrealistic step projections, failure to address step progression disputes, misleading contract length conversions, and the inclusion of irrelevant stipends fails to provide an accurate and meaningful assessment of faculty compensation.

A rigorous, transparent, and fact-based salary study should:

- Use cost-of-living data that reflects the areas where faculty actually reside and work
- Accurately model salary progression based on real hiring practices
- Directly address the long-standing dispute over step progression and whether steps are automatic

- Use service days as the standard for contract length comparisons rather than misleading “months”
- Exclude temporary stipends from base salary discussions
- Account for inflation to measure real salary trends over time

These corrections are essential to ensure that the final study provides a reliable foundation for addressing faculty compensation concerns.

Faculty Member #3:

My comments:

1. However much we paid that person to present the findings was too much. She was condescending, rude, and was offended when people challenged her interpretation. She also referred to us as a university.
2. The interpretation is misleading in multiple ways. Jess mentioned that if you are hired at step 10 and have been there for 10 years you should be on step 20. But the data ignores your starting 10 and leaves you on step 10 instead of 20. So you're not underpaid - you're on step 10!
3. Why are they not accounting for compound interest? If I missed a step 10 years ago, giving it to my now is not the same as giving it to me 10 years ago. Times change and interest goes up.
4. The cost of living calculator, which most of the data was based on, is very misleading. I live in Lakeland, one of the fastest growing cities in the country. Everything, in particular housing, is more expensive. Cost of living is not the same throughout Polk county.
5. Whether you call it department chair or department coordinator, most places have a faculty member that is the point person for the faculty in the department. It is misleading to say DC is not common – while the term may be unique to Polk, the job is common to most colleges.

Faculty Member #4:

Questions for Clarification:

1. **Salary Step Comparisons**
 - Why did Evergreen assume all faculty were hired at Step 0 when many were granted higher steps based on prior experience? How would the data change if initial step placements were included?
2. **Cost of Living Adjustments**
 - Did the study consider the cost of living in areas where faculty reside (e.g., Lakeland, Tampa, Orlando)? If not, why was the county-wide average used instead?
3. **Contract Length Adjustments**
 - Why were faculty salaries adjusted based on months worked when faculty contracts are based on contract hours or workload? How does this affect the overall findings?
4. **Comparison with Gallagher Study**
 - How does Evergreen justify its findings in light of the 2022 Gallagher study that indicated faculty salaries were 30% below market? What factors account for the drastic shift in conclusions?
5. **Inflation Consideration**
 - Did the study consider inflation when determining salary competitiveness? If not, how does it account for the significant rise in living costs since 2022?

Faculty Member #5

I am writing to express my concerns about the methodology and resulting conclusions presented in the Evergreen salary study. The analysis appears to contain several fundamental flaws that call into question the accuracy of its findings. Please consider the following itemized feedback:

1. **Flawed "Projected Salary" Calculation:** The comparison of current faculty salaries to a "projected salary" based solely on years of service at Polk State, while ignoring initial placement on the salary schedule based on prior experience, is fundamentally flawed. Assuming all faculty are hired at Step 0 is demonstrably false and creates a skewed comparison. I say this because I joined the full-time faculty in 2023, but I had 16 years of teaching experience and four years of adjunct experience. I did not enter as year 0. This methodology inflates the perceived value of Polk State salaries by comparing current salaries (which reflect both years of service *and* initial placement) to a hypothetical salary that ignores prior experience. This is not an apples-to-apples comparison and leads to misleading conclusions. A proper analysis must account for the actual step at which faculty were hired.
2. **Inappropriate Cost of Living Calculation:** Averaging the cost of living across the entirety of Polk County, including sparsely populated rural areas, inherently distorts the reality faced by the majority of faculty. The vastness of the county and the low cost of living in remote areas artificially inflate the perceived value of Polk State salaries. The study fails to adequately account for the higher cost of living in areas closer to campuses and the recent reports that Polk County is one of the fastest growing because of its proximity to the two big cities. A more granular cost of living analysis, focusing on the areas where faculty reside, is essential for accurate comparisons.
3. **Lack of Focus on Salary Step Schedule Administration:** The study's apparent lack of focus on the Faculty Salary Step Schedule and its proper administration is a significant oversight, especially considering this was a primary objective outlined by the Board of Trustees. The report should thoroughly analyze how the step schedule is currently being used, identify any inconsistencies or issues, and provide recommendations for improvement.
4. **Questionable Adjustment for Contract Months:** Adjusting faculty contracts based on the number of months is perplexing and seems to inflate Polk State faculty salaries compared to other institutions. Faculty contracts are typically based on contact hours, course load, or workdays, not months. This adjustment requires further clarification and justification. It is unclear how this metric accurately reflects faculty compensation or allows for meaningful comparisons. I also wonder if additional workloads are being removed from the salary analysis. Are Summer classes, overloads, DIS assignments, and any other extra duties that warrant extra pay being accounted for during the base salaries? While this question may seem to answer itself with the word "base" being used, it becomes less clear when looking at the methodology applied to the years of service.
5. **Disregard for Prior Study and Inflation:** The study's conclusions appear to contradict the findings of the 2022 Gallagher Salary Study, which indicated significant underpayment of faculty. It seems highly unlikely that minor salary increases in the intervening years, which have not even kept pace with inflation, would have resulted in Polk State faculty now being overpaid. This discrepancy requires a more thorough explanation and raises serious questions about the validity of the current study's findings. If there were different methodologies applied in the previous survey, a comparison of the two could be provided to show how the conclusions are so vastly different.

Because of these significant methodological flaws, I would like to urge the administration to reject the current findings and commission a new, more rigorous salary study that addresses these concerns. A fair and accurate assessment of faculty compensation is crucial for attracting and retaining qualified educators at Polk State College.

Faculty Member #6:

COLI Methodology Misrepresents Local Economic Conditions:

Evergreen's approach utilizes a county-wide cost of living index to determine faculty salary comparisons. This methodology is inappropriate for several reasons:

- Polk County is not a uniform economic entity—it contains both urban and rural areas with vastly different costs of living.
- Faculty in Lakeland and Winter Haven face significantly higher housing, transportation, and daily expenses than those in the more rural parts of the county.
- The COLI Manual explicitly states that cost-of-living indices should reflect the areas where employees reside, not broad regional averages that dilute economic realities.

COLI Manual Reference:

“Cost of living indices should reflect the areas where employees reside rather than broad regional averages that dilute economic realities.” (COLI Manual, Section 3.2)

Evergreen's failure to account for these differences has artificially deflated the cost-of-living adjustments, leading to an underestimation of salary needs.

Flawed Application of COLI Data in Faculty Salary Comparisons

The study's comparison of Polk State faculty salaries to peer institutions does not properly adjust for cost-of-living variations. The COLI Manual states:

“An accurate comparison requires adjusting for local economic conditions, including housing, transportation, and regional inflationary trends.” (COLI Manual, Section 4.5)

Evergreen's approach fails to fully adjust for regional inflationary pressures that have disproportionately impacted Central Florida since 2022. Instead, it relies on outdated COLI figures that do not reflect recent cost increases, particularly in housing and insurance costs.

Failure to Address Inflation's Impact on COLI Adjustments

The COLI Manual explicitly recommends adjusting for inflation trends when conducting longitudinal salary comparisons. However, Evergreen's study neglects the fact that inflation in Central Florida has significantly outpaced national averages in recent years.

COLI Manual Reference:

“Periodic adjustments for inflation should be incorporated into any longitudinal salary comparison to ensure accurate assessment of compensation trends.” (COLI Manual, Section 4.1)

Ignoring inflation trends artificially inflates the perceived competitiveness of Polk State faculty salaries by using cost-of-living adjustments that do not reflect current economic conditions.

Conclusion: Evergreen's Application of COLI is Inaccurate and Misleading

The application of the COLI methodology in Evergreen's salary study fails to meet the best practices outlined in the COLI Manual in multiple ways:

- Uses an overly broad county-wide average instead of adjusting for localized cost differences.
- Does not incorporate regional inflation trends, leading to outdated cost-of-living calculations.
- Misrepresents faculty purchasing power by failing to account for rapid increases in local housing and living expenses.

A valid COLI-based salary analysis must reflect real economic conditions, not statistical averages that obscure financial realities. The faculty request that Evergreen revisit its methodology and apply COLI data in a manner consistent with best practices outlined in the COLI Manual.

Faculty Member #7:

Bias

"We should get used to the fact that we are going to be underpaid." (Brett) Evergreen has shown they are biased before conducting any analysis.

Comps

There are two geographical points that arise.

Faculty are spread out over central Florida, and teaching opportunities not only span all of Central Florida but also via online, across the United States. There is no such thing as a comparable institution based on size and other key characteristics.

A principle of biology course is identical at every state institution in Florida and in many contexts similar to that in colleges and universities across America. Consequently, national salary averages assume relevance.

Data Reporting

Published data by the State of Florida lags by one to two years. Furthermore, it excludes labor contracts from labor unions. In one instance it was found that reported data from Pasco-Hernando did not match the terms of their labor agreement. Kudos to Prof Derry.

Editors Note: This is in reference to data we have seen but not published by Evergreen as they are 'sampling' selected colleges. I prefer looking at state and national averages.

Index Construction

There are several problems in how Evergreen constructs their cost-of-living index. Prof Derry will expand on this explanation.

Inflation

While this overlaps some of the points made above, it is important to understand how the erosion of purchasing power has caused financial anxieties in our families. No one works to become broke. It also erodes our competitiveness in hiring for faculty. This, so far, has not been addressed formally in Evergreen's published notes. Although verbally their attitude has been quite clear.

Faculty Member #8:

One more issue not being talked about is summer pay. I have a friend who works for Daytona State College and I asked him about the summer pay structure there, and he said this:

The summer term is split into two six-week terms. Faculty may select to work A or B. They are paid a base rate for teaching two classes and may teach an additional two classes at an overload rate.

There are tiered rates based on level (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, and senior professor). The tiers are only a few hundred dollars apart. I believe they range from around \$7600-8400. Again, that is for 2 classes for 6 weeks.

If you teach another two classes, that's about \$12,000-\$13,000. This is above the regular pay. Faculty receive their regular monthly salary plus the additional dollars.

As you can see Bill, Polk is not even in the same ballpark with Daytona State when it comes to summer class compensation.

Faculty Member #9:

As for the step system, I do not know this to be a fact, but I was hired at step 10 without requesting it, (and not knowing what it was) and with only 1 year of teaching experience. So, is it right to assume that most new hires are automatically offered step 10 as their starting pay level?

If I remember right the evergreen assumption was that new hires start at step 1. That makes a big difference in pay ranges.

Faculty Member #10:

1. The compression study showed that people like me PHD and 23 years service are 10 percent below market

Hopefully the recommendations will be made to remedy this asap because of its impact on pension especially this has been going on for many years.

2. In terms of duty the 9 months and 10 month I believe are the same in terms of teaching work load, office hours, and admin duties--10 month contracts do not include teaching summer

Faculty Member #11:

I am VERY, VERY concerned about them indicating—through whatever inconsistent measures used—that we are being shown as at market in some capacities.

Also, I would like some confirmation from administration about the application of steps moving forward and, possibly, what estimate they have for raises each year. I am holding out that we receive a minimum 10% increase this year, but hopefully it is a raise somewhat significant and that we can trust administration to implement both raises and steps moving forward. They've spent a significant amount of dedicated salary for faculty and staff on these two studies and the findings seem to contradict each other! In short, my salary as a faculty member does not keep up with inflation and this is an issue I believe administration should rectify.

Faculty Member #12:

Following up on the below. The question of additional qualifications that might warrant classification increases (Alpha, Gamma, etc.) has been posed, but I am not sure if it has been answered.

Classification increases should be considered for things like:

- In the arts, the terminal degree is the MFA. So, it makes sense to consider them being paid similarly as other academic PhDs.
- Many qualifications exist that indicate a professional has made significant progress in their expertise. If a professor has taken a certain number of graduate classes toward a PhD (but not yet received the degree, they are moved up to the next classification. But there is currently no similar classification increase for so many other similar, if not even more rigorous, steps that show a significant milestone. Just 2 examples would be a person who is a Certified Public Accountant, of professional licensure such as Professional Engineer.

If possible, please include these in the meeting conversation and pose these questions to the consulting firm.

Summary of Faculty Senate Meeting with Evergreen Solutions (Feb 10, 2025)

Christopher Botelho

Question: How does the current Evergreen study conclude that faculty are now "above market" when a previous compensation study (Gallagher Report) found them 30% behind? Faculty have only received about a 10% raise since then.

Response: Gamble acknowledged the difference but argued that the Gallagher study relied solely on secondary data (Coupa) and lacked cost-of-living adjustments, contract length adjustments, and real-time salary updates. She claimed Evergreen's study used primary data from current peers, which accounted for salary changes.

Dr. Gregory K. Johnson

Question: Why do Polk State salaries seem lower than Valencia College salaries? What features

allow Valencia to pay more?

Response: Valencia has a larger budget due to legislative allocation, enrollment, and student success funding. They also have different contract structures, including "8-month annually appointed" faculty and "10-month tenured faculty," who work approximately 31 more days per year than Polk's 9-month faculty.

Question: How were salaries adjusted for comparison?

Response: Salaries were adjusted by dividing total salary by contract days and multiplying by Polk's contract length.

Fatin Morris Guirguis

Question: Why does contract length matter if faculty teach the same number of courses? At Polk, contracts are based on course load, not duty days. How did Evergreen factor this in?

Response: Gamble argued that duty days matter because institutions use them to calculate compensation. She stated that Valencia's 10-month faculty are required to work 31 more days than Polk's.

Anthony Cornett

Question: If Polk faculty work summers to make up for low salaries, should this be factored into the salary comparison? When including summer teaching, Polk salaries remain lower than Valencia's 10-month contracts.

Response: Gamble stated that summer teaching is overload and voluntary, unlike Valencia's required summer teaching for some contracts.

Michael Derry

Question: Why does the study fail to address inflation? Faculty perception is that their salaries have not kept up with rising costs.

Response: Gamble said inflation is indirectly accounted for because Evergreen used current-year salary data.

Question: The COLI index used by Evergreen is designed for dual-income professional families in the top 20% of earners. How is this appropriate for Polk State faculty?

Response: Gamble defended the index, saying it is widely used by organizations like the Department of Labor and National Education Association. She requested an alternative methodology if faculty objected.

Suggestion: The Federal Reserve's Regional Price Parity Index is a better alternative.

Response: Gamble agreed to look into it but did not commit to using it.

Andrew Coombs

Question: Many faculty live in areas with much higher costs of living (Orlando, Tampa). Shouldn't the study acknowledge that qualified candidates must be recruited from high-cost areas?

Response: Gamble said cost-of-living adjustments are always based on the institution's location, not where employees live.

Jennifer Shaw

Question: Houston schools were used as salary comparisons, yet Houston's cost of living is much higher than Polk County's. How is this justified?

Response: Gamble stated that Houston and Polk County have similar cost-of-living levels based on the COLI index.

Question: If the COLI index is designed for dual-income households in the top income bracket, how can it accurately represent Polk faculty, many of whom are single-income earners?

Response: Gamble did not directly address this, beyond defending the use of the COLI methodology.

Niqui Young Pringle Brown & Dirk

Question: The study does not address the step system, which was the main issue faculty expected it to cover. Why?

Response: No clear answer given.

Summary of Concerns

1. Faulty cost-of-living adjustments: The COLI index used is designed for high-income professionals, not middle-class educators. The COLI manual states that indices should reflect where employees actually live, which was not followed. The Federal Reserve's Regional Price Parity Index would be a more accurate measure.
2. Flawed salary comparisons: Evergreen adjusted salaries by contract months instead of actual workload and duties.
3. Inflation was ignored: The study failed to account for how faculty purchasing power has eroded over time. The COLI manual explicitly states inflation adjustments are necessary, yet Evergreen did not apply them.
4. Step system excluded: This was the most contentious faculty compensation issue, and Evergreen did not analyze it.
5. Misleading use of peer institutions: Texas colleges were included, but their cost-of-living levels do not match Polk County. After the meeting, faculty confirmed that new construction in Tyler, Texas is much less expensive compared to Polk County.

Item	Notes	Goal(s)	Progress/Status	Update
1	<p>Publication of Senate Minutes on the College Website and Emails for Transparency to Members of the DBOT; Compliance with Procedure 6056 (est. 2024)</p>	<p><u>APRIL 2024:</u> The FS President contacted the VP of OCPA; she has added a link to the College website (via the Faculty Senate's page) that connects to the Senate PIE folder. This allows current <u>employees</u> to access Senate documents via the College website; however, adjunct faculty who are not teaching during a particular term and other community stakeholders cannot access the minutes (or reports, objectives, or other documents). This is not the transparency required. The Senate is formally asking for the password protection be removed or the documents to be otherwise restored to the College website in compliance with the College's governing documents.</p>	<p><u>April 2024:</u> Dr. Falconetti requested that she be responsible for sending the Senate minutes to the DBOT members, and she said she will copy the Senate on her emails.</p> <p><u>May 2024:</u> The Senate documents are still password-protected despite discussion and multiple requests.</p> <p><u>October 2024:</u> Senate minutes are being regularly transmitted to Trustees and they are being posted publicly to polk.edu.</p>	<p><u>May 7, 2024:</u> The FS President contacted OCPA to renew the request that password protection be removed to allow the documents to be accessed. There has been no response as of 5/10/2024.</p> <p><u>May 14, 2024:</u> Administration agreed to share Senate minutes with Trustees via email. They will not be sent by Senate, but by Christine Lee. The Senate President will be copied on the emails.</p> <p><u>August 2024:</u> Minutes are now posted publicly again on polk.edu.</p> <p><u>January 2025:</u> This concern has been resolved.</p>
2	<p>Rule and Procedure Review Process, Senate Participation, and Shared Governance (est. 2023)</p>	<p><u>AY 2022-23:</u> President's Staff did not meet to conduct official business between Sept. 2022 and Sept. 2023. When meetings resumed in Fall 2023, a new process was adopted, without discussion or consensus by which Rules and Procedures are approved between meetings via email. The members of Staff respond by clicking a button to "approve" or "reject," and Staff receive notification of whether the document has been approved or not (i.e., no role-call vote, debate, or discussion). Thus, consensus is neither possible nor sought with this method. Documents have historically been sent to Senate in a "clean" edited state that is ready for review, with a carefully curated revision that uses Tracked Changes. At this point, it</p>	<p><u>AY 2023-24:</u> President's Staff (PS) reconvened meetings and restarted the process of reviewing Rules and Procedures. The Senate President raised objections with several members of PS (and with the President) regarding the process of review, issues with shared governance, and voting. As items are being sent to the Faculty Senate (FS) as rough drafts with errors, then edited after the Senate votes on them, this is creating a very problematic situation. Editing can introduce changes. The FS President is required to compare and contrast documents to determine what changes have been made after the Senate's vote; he must then determine if these are acceptable to vote during PS by first <u>finding them</u> and then evaluating all additional changes. Voting is done via email (without discussion to reach consensus over any nuances,) as had been the previous practice.</p>	<p><u>May 2024:</u> The Senate President requested more information about the Rule and Procedure Review Process and Timeline and was told this would be discussed in the June 2024 President's Staff meeting.</p> <p><u>October 2024:</u> President's Staff was informed early in the Fall semester that, because most Rules and Procedures have not been reviewed within five years, it would be impossible to review them all now in time for the upcoming SACS review. Admin contacted SACS to request advice and Polk received permission to</p>

		<p>Thus, the heart of shared governance at Polk State has always been consensus among members of President's Staff and with the President.</p>	<p>has become standard for Senate to receive documents as a "rough draft" with many errors, reducing the efficiency of Senate meetings and wasting participants' time.</p> <p>Additionally, several executive administrators have made statements promoting the idea that Senate "<i>only looks at documents to give input</i>" or that "<i>bringing documents to Senate is just a professional courtesy.</i>" That is not shared governance.</p> <p>This system leaves Senate to approve rough documents without the ability to make an informed assessment of what the final changes will look like. Documents are routinely changed extensively after Senate approval. In some cases, documents are changed after President's Staff (PS) approval and before publication. Faculty Senate asks that the review process be restored to its former state: with final, proof-read documents (with Tracked Changes carefully curated) brought to the Senate for review, input, and approval --or further revision, as necessary. This same version should then go to the PS for approval. In the event that there are substantive changes during PS, the document should step back to the Senate to be re-reviewed and approved to ensure consensus. This provides harmony among partners; makes the workload lighter, meetings shorter, and process less frustrating; it also supports the collaborative and respectful essence of shared governance.</p>	<p>UPDATE April of 2024: The College President assured the FS President that she has asked PS to suspend all review and approval of Rules and Procedures pending a review of the process; she also stated that email voting was going to cease. [NOTE: The FS President was informed that the five-year scheduled cycle for review of all Rules and Procedures has been dormant since before COVID and items now need to be processed quickly to be ready for SACS. The FS President indicated that items need to be edited prior to Senate review and that the volume of documents required to be reviewed per Senate meeting must be considered. He has requested a timeline/schedule be created for discussion (April 2024).]</p>	<p>start a new review cycle, reviewing the entire set of documents over the next five years. A schedule has been created and review should begin no later than January 2025.</p> <p>Nov/Dec 2025: Admin has established a schedule for the review of all Rules and Procedures over the next five years. None have yet been presented to Senate or President's Staff. There is a workgroup to review Procedure 6073 (Procedure on Rules and Procedures). The outcome of this workgroup could potentially impact the way Senate participates in the process. Updates will be posted as information becomes available.</p>
3	Full-Time Faculty Pay (est. 2017)	<p>Faculty pay has fallen below market; the salary schedule should be revised to reflect the passage of time since the Mercer Study (completed in 2011) and years of inflation. The salary schedule has only been increased 3.4% in the 10 years since the Mercer Study--if divided over the many years without an increase, this equates to a 0.34% increase per year. This means that faculty have lost</p>	<p>The <i>F/T Faculty Salary Schedule</i> should be raised to a level that is appropriate and aligned with market benchmarks. Going forward, salary steps for F/T Faculty should be built into the annual budget (as agreed upon with Administration in 2012), and base-pay increases to the salary schedule should be applied regularly to remain competitive and indexed to inflation. Salary steps should be tied</p>	<p>AY 2022: The FS President made a second official request for a salary study to VP Bottorff. Gallagher started review in (2022. Position descriptions were solicited (spring 2022) to inform the process. (Nov. 2022: Study completed.)</p> <p>UPDATE SPRING 2023: Faculty asked for the original copy of the Gallagher Report; this was not provided (an edited version was provided almost a year after the study was completed). In spring 2023, a</p>	<p>UPDATE MAY 2024: The faculty salary schedule was increased 3.4% in 2021 and 6.8% in 2023. In 2021, 2022, and 2023, five salary steps that had been previously held back were implemented. The President told faculty at a Q&A that the 2024 step will only be implemented if the budget</p>

		<p>standard of living against inflation each year for a decade. A salary study was requested in 2020. Additionally, the yearly step via the system used for step-scheduled employees has been missed over several years, leaving faculty behind peers with the same years of experience at other institutions (in terms of earnings and step level).</p> <p>UPDATE 2022: In the approximately 10 years since the last salary study, F/T Faculty have fallen significantly behind in base pay and salary steps. This has been an issue for faculty pay and standard of living, and also for attracting and hiring new faculty members.</p> <p>UPDATE--POST-GALLAGER SALARY STUDY: Gallagher determined that Faculty were 30% below market value (i.e., requiring an adjustment of 42% to the base pay listed in the salary schedule to achieve market median). Some other employee groups who are not on a step system were found to be at or above market. An across-the-board increase was provided, whereby administration used 2 missed steps for years of service to fulfill 3.2% of the "across the board increase," and a 6.8% increase was made to the base salary schedule. This difference in application of the "increase" further spreads the inequity to market values between those who are on a step system and those who are not. This is especially true as non-step system employees are commonly "releveled" or shifted within a pay level, and faculty are not eligible for these opportunities.</p>	<p>directly to the number of years of satisfactory service, and not confused with adjustment to faculty pay (raises).</p> <p>UPDATE 2024: While it is difficult to determine without another salary study, subject-matter experts estimate that even after the 2023 increase, faculty salaries are still approximately 30% below market value. This is independent of inflation. This makes sense given that the salary schedule was only adjusted by 6.8% (or a total increase of 10.2% in 12 years, incl. the 2021 increase). Departments continue to have significant issues attracting quality applicants, and individuals are leaving the College or working second jobs. The goal is to raise ALL groups to market median and correct the practices that are leading to recurring inequities that require a study.</p>	<p>workgroup met, and proposals were made based on the partial/incomplete Gallagher data released.</p> <p>The Budget Council met directly before DBOT but did not deliberate, as the compensation decision had already been made by Administration. Compensation changes were announced at the DBOT meeting directly following the Budget Council meeting.</p> <p>SUMMER 2023: To complete the Compensation portion of the Gallagher Study, the following changes were made 2011-2023: The Faculty salary schedule was increased 6.8% in 2023 (post-Gallagher). When added with the 3.4% from 2021, this is a total of 10.2% increase to the salary schedule over <u>12 years</u> (avg. +0.85% per year).</p> <p>Additionally, in 2023, two previously withheld steps for years of service were reinstated (with the Gallagher increase). Per hiring agreement, those on a step-system are supposed to receive an annual step (In 2021, 2022, and 2023, five salary steps that had been <u>previously held back</u> were implemented.)</p> <p>UPDATE: REQUEST FOR DATA, YEARLY STEP, and EQUALITY IN EARNING POTENTIAL (Summer 2023-present): It is unclear if the step that is scheduled for 2023 or 2024 will be implemented.</p> <p>The list of questions sent to Administration and HR remain mostly unanswered. In Fall 2023, the FS President requested salary information for all employee groups to demonstrate, with data, that steps do not "cost the College money" for those on a step system (a well-supported mathematical reality supported by multiple Polk faculty experts and various scholarly publications) - rather, the system of using "step-equivalents" is creating inequity in earning potential among employee groups. This conclusion was parallel for the Mercer and Gallagher studies. Between 2011-15, HR had readily provided the FS President with this public information, which allows for data analysis to ensure that employee groups (step and non-step employees) are treated equitably to maintain the gains from The Mercer Study. This information was requested (but not provided) in the fall of</p>	<p>allows. The Gallagher report showed that faculty were 30% below market benchmarks when the study was conducted with 2020-21 data, meaning that <i>Faculty salaries would have needed to be raised approximately 42% to reach the benchmark.</i></p> <p>Thus, faculty have failed to advance in terms of their standard of living and have fallen significantly behind. They are behind in terms of our own step schedule, relative to other employee groups, relative to other colleges, relative to the market, and relative to inflation. Adjusted for inflation, faculty on Step 15 in 2024 (15 yrs. of service) are making the same salary as a newly hired faculty member on Step 0 (zero yrs. of experience or service) in 2008. If the individual was hired at Step 5, the salary is 21 years behind. This means that faculty are spending their entire career at Polk State with the same standard of living and buying power as an individual who just entered the profession. The Senate remains supportive of additional increases to faculty salary; additionally, faculty are concerned about the step to non-step employee inequities, the frequency with which faculty are placed on the incorrect step on the faculty pay scale, and the lack of substantive faculty input/involvement in budgeting. If a step is not implemented in 2024, many will be one or two steps too low on the current pay scale. Additionally, as 5</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				<p>2023 from both the Provost and VP of HR. The request was repeated in May 2024.</p> <p>June 2024: DBOT approved one salary step for faculty and a base salary increase of 1.6%. They also called for another salary study for the purpose of establishing an agreement on how faculty salary steps should be implemented. The study would include a third-party and the process would be a collaboration between faculty and Administration.</p> <p>A work group was formed by Administration and a third-party (Evergreen) was hired by Administration. Administration formed and defined a work group and selected all members but two.</p> <p>October 2024: Evergreen conducted a survey of full-time faculty. We await the results and next steps.</p> <p>December 2024: The survey results were presented to faculty during a webinar. For faculty on continuing contract, 67% are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with base salary. Also, 72% are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the administration of our STEP system of annual salary progression. And 74% say overloads often required to supplement base pay and are critical for financial stability. Overwhelmingly, respondents say the College needs to raise base pay and align faculty pay with years of service.</p>	<p>steps were used to fulfill the Gallagher-study, faculty have lost an additional 8% in comparison to employees who not on a step system (they received "step equivalents" which are presumed to act like raises to the base salary for those employee groups).</p> <p>UPDATE Fall 2024: A new salary study has been created (Evergreen). Per DBOT directive, this was supposed to be done in full collaboration with the Senate. The workgroup, vendor, and vendor work proposal were derived entirely by Administration without allowing faculty participation. Dean Manning was made Chair of the team. The workgroup made a faculty survey which was distributed to faculty via an incorrect list sent from HR. Results were shared in November. The next steps are unclear, but it looks like a report with recommendations will be sent to Dr. Falconetti by Evergreen.</p>
4	Adjunct Pay (est. 2017)	Adjunct pay has been consistently low compared to comparable institutions, causing hardship in attracting, hiring, and retaining adjunct faculty members.	Adjunct pay should be raised to a level that is competitive for the market, with regular increases that compensate for inflation and/or cost-of-living changes.	<p>AY 2021-22: There has been progress made in several increments. There was a raise in the fall of 2021 and again after the Gallagher. The Senate has been continuing to advocate for increases. The Compensation portion of the Gallagher Salary Study is completed (Nov. 2022).</p> <p>UPDATE SUMMMER 2023: Dr. Falconetti's announcement regarding employee payment changes in the fall of 2022 (see above) included a \$1 per hour increase to adjunct pay (and overload compensation). This is a continuation of the plan that was put in place in 2019 (to implement regular increases until adjunct pay is raised to market value). In 2023, after the Gallagher Study, an additional raise of 8% (\$3 per hour) was approved.</p>	<p>AY 2023-24: Faculty Senate remains supportive of additional increase to adjunct pay. Budget Council has not met this year, so there have been no updates/discussion related to this objective.</p> <p>June 2024: DBOT approved a \$1/hour increase for adjunct faculty.</p> <p>December 2024: When the DBOT approved the Evergreen salary study in June 2024, adjunct faculty salaries were excluded, but</p>

					Administration said a separate study would be conducted. There have been no updates about this yet; however, low adjunct/ overload pay were featured in the Evergreen Survey results.
5	<p>Procedure 1006: Faculty Workload--- F/T Faculty Point Restrictions and Other Issues (est. 2020)</p>	<p>AY 2020-21: Per faculty request, a sub-committee was formed to review Procedure 1024: Faculty Scheduling, but it soon became apparent that Procedure 1006: Faculty Workload needed work also. Much of this document's wording was outdated or vague. For example, the document still refers to use of PAL (Desire2Learn), and the College has been using Canvas since 2017. During the summer of 2020, a sub-committee drafted a cleaned-up version of Procedure 1006 with a few significant suggested changes, including an increased instructional point limit for F/T Faculty to reflect 2003-2019 practices. At the time, this change was intended to align the procedure more closely with traditional practices prior to COVID. This was presented to Administration in the fall of 2020.</p> <p>AY 2021-22: The Senate gathered and presented data showing that other FCS schools commonly allow three additional courses as an overload, just as had been common at Polk State until 2020. Finding qualified adjuncts to teach courses and fill classes is becoming increasingly difficult per Dept. Coordinators.</p>	<p>The goal is to gain approval from faculty and administration to implement recommended changes, including an increased limit (approx. 3 classes total, or the addition of 1 class) on the instructional point load to alleviate issues with covering classes and the need for Polk State faculty to 'merry-go-round across the state,' taking on adjusting positions at other institutions while the College's DCs struggle to find new adjuncts to cover unstaffed classes at Polk State (see below). The suggested limit is based on the prior number of overloads that were common for faculty prior to COVID and the amount permitted at several FCS sister schools.</p>	<p>UPDATE AY 2020-21: In the fall of 2020, the Senate unanimously approved the sub-committee's draft (increase to 96pts, or 1 extra class above the published policy); this was submitted to administration for consideration. Administration formed a college-wide group for review of the suggested changes. The proposal to increase the limit on F/T Faculty instructional points was rejected (2020-21).</p> <p>UPDATE May 2022: After speaking with the President by phone, the FS President asked the Senate to revise, prepare, and vote on a second draft that just adjusted the F/T faculty point load to pre-COVID practices. The Senate voted to request a change that would allow faculty to teach 90 points, plus 'half the point value of the smallest scheduled class,' without VP approval. For almost all F/T faculty, this would effectively allow a schedule up to 96 points, while also incorporating flexibility within departments where classes are not calculated in 12-point increments. The FS President sent this proposal to members of Administration; it was rejected. He was told there are two colleges in Florida that allow faculty to teach 96 points, and they are both up for re-accreditation and are likely to be reprimanded for the policy. The Senate provided data showing many other colleges allowed this policy and were told that this would be looked into. No further information was provided.</p> <p>UPDATE AY 2022: The Senate re-visited the procedure to seek approval of just the "clean-up" and editorial changes, clarifying the procedure and making it more usable.</p>	<p>UPDATE Spring 2023-24: The Faculty Senate has asked Administration several times for a partner to revise this policy and procedure. The item was submitted to President's Staff; it was never published or finalized by Administration. Given the lack of forward movement, Senate voted in November 2023 to rescind support for all recommended changes. In the fall of 2023, Assoc. Provost Sutton volunteered to assist, but he no longer works for the College. No other initiation to partner with faculty for this revision has been made. The Senate awaits Administrative action to initiate needed changes/corrections to this document. The 2017 version is currently in use.</p> <p>May 2024: There are currently no updates for this objective. The FS President has requested an Administrative partner to work on this document several times.</p> <p>Note: The current and approved Procedure 1006 does not include any restriction for F/T Faculty</p>

				<p>This was sent to Administration and was prepared for publication (without the point-limit adjustment, which continues to receive interest from faculty). This was never finalized or published.</p> <p>UPDATE 2022-23: There has not been a consistent VP or Academics or Provost to work with to make changes for several years.</p>	<p><i>during the summer term. There is an "unwritten" limit of 63 points (approx. 5 classes) that was established by President's Staff during the most recent SACS reaccreditation cycle. This is a mathematically proportional load based on the maximum of 84 points during a 16-week term. There is an annual limit for adjunct faculty of 96 points per academic year.</i></p> <p>Oct. 2024: no updates; no administrative partner tapped.</p> <p>Dec. 2024: Senate learned in November that Administration is conducting a study of faculty workload, with the purpose of exploring the idea of restricting faculty overloads and/or additional duties associated with stipends. Faculty were not involved in these decisions. <i>The Senate was told this is due to pressure from SACSCOC and the Department of Labor. The Senate requested documentation of this 'pressure' and has not received a response.</i> Faculty members are already beginning to report issues with overload points being given to adjunct faculty, outside of the procedure which allows faculty to have first selection of courses.</p>
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6	Department Coordinator (DC) and Assessment Coordinator (AC) Procedure(s) (est. 2021)	AY 2021-22: During the summer, a Senate sub-committee actively worked to review and draft suggested revisions to the Department Coordinator (DC) Procedure (i.e., as previously defined inside <i>Procedure 1006: Faculty Workload</i>). Along with this, the subcommittee was working to draft a new <i>Assessment Coordinator (AC) Procedure</i> "from scratch." Work for these goals was diverted for a period when the new Program Review process appeared from the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning, as this expansive and as-yet undefined duty was suggested as a new <u>DC responsibility</u> by this Office, but was not in the DC's defined responsibilities. It would also a new duty for any AC.	The goal is to complete a new draft procedure (i.e., new number and title) that covers the roles of DC, AC, and Program Review Leader. The new procedure will more clearly define the DC role to prevent spread in duties, and also to firmly establish the Program Review Leader as a separate position that can be taken by any department volunteer, not just the DC. The new procedure will be open for input from all F/T Faculty and will receive a Senate vote. Afterward, the procedure will be forwarded to Admin. for consideration at President's Staff.	Spring 2022: Via Senate negotiation, a delineation of responsibilities among the Program Leader, DC, and AC was agreed upon. The subcommittee is ready to resume work, which will include drafting the section to define the new role of the Program Review Leader as separate from either the AC or DC role, and to provide metrics for compensation for the role. The subcommittee planned to reconvene to complete its tasks in the summer of 2022. UPDATE SUMMER 2022: The group that had been working on these procedures was scheduled to resume work on the DC, AC, and Program Review documents; this action item was delayed due to the departure of the VP of Academics, J. Alexander. This item was expected to resume in fall 2022 with a newly assigned Administrative partner. UPDATE 2022-23: No Administrative partner has been assigned.	Update Jan 2024: This item was tabled when Senate voted in Nov 2023 to rescind approval of changes to 1006; these procedures must be revised together and in concert with Procedure 1024: <i>Faculty Scheduling</i> . These revisions require a partner within Administration (see Procedure 1006). October 2024: There are no updates at this time. Administration has still not assigned a partner to work with the Senate.
7	Procedure 1024: Faculty Scheduling (est. 2020)	AY 2020-21: The Senate sub-committee that worked on <i>Procedure 1006: Faculty Workload</i> also reviewed <i>Procedure 1024: Faculty Scheduling</i> , which outlines the process for assigning courses to faculty (FT and adjunct). The product of this work was tabled when the pandemic began, and Procedure 1006 became the more urgent priority. These two procedures should be revised together, as these documents affect overall scheduling of adjunct and full-time faculty.	The goal is to more concretely outline the decision-making processes involved in scheduling courses. When there is agreement to move forward with all recommended changes, the procedure will be forwarded to Administration via President's Staff for consideration.	AY 2020-21: A Senate subcommittee convened to work on this document, provide proposed changes, and clarify the language. The Faculty Senate has completed an initial review of the sub-committee's draft. Faculty in each department submitted questions and/or recommendations to their Senate representatives. Input was presented at the May 2022 meeting and discussion is ongoing. The subcommittee finalized recommended changes to the DC portion of Procedure 1006 and produced a draft of a new AC procedure. Senate approved the DC portion, and it was sent forward to DCG. UPDATE 2021-23: The second proposal was tabled by DCG and remained dormant between DCG and President's Staff. Update Nov 2023: Senate voted in Nov 2023 to rescind approval for all recommended changes as Admin has still not responded.	AY 2023-24: The Senate is still ready to revise this document in conjunction with Procedure 1006, making scheduling more accessible for Dept. Coordinators, adjuncts, and F/T faculty. The Senate President has requested a partner from Administration several times. October 2024: There are no updates at this time. Administration has still not nominated a partner to work with the Senate (see also Objective 5).
8	Procedure 6073: Procedure on Rules and Procedures (est. 2019)	During the SACSCOC review (2019), faculty determined that this procedure had been modified (approx. 2015) without being put through the Faculty Senate. The changes added a new step in the governance process in which all proposed changes to Rules and Procedures must first be voted on by the District/Campus Group (DCG) prior to moving to the President's	A review is necessary, due to some items in the Procedure 6073 that do not reflect current or past practices; significant changes were made to this procedure in the summer of 2015, when the Senate was not in session. Therefore, the Senate did not have an opportunity to partner to make these changes. In the fall of 2021, members of administration were charged with providing written	2020-22: The DCG does not have an official membership or constitution. It has tabled several Senate items. The Senate has asked for Administration to review and revise Procedure 6073 with the Senate, so it aligns with DBOT Rule 2.24 and to prevent overreach. UPDATE AY 2023-24: Information items such as changes to Rules and Procedures are presented at DCG, and the votes taken during meetings serve to record that	UPDATE Spring 2024: This procedure remains very incorrect, and it contradicts DBOT Rule 2.24 (<i>Senate Constitution</i>). The Senate shares full partnership with Admin in the development and implementation of Rules and Procedures and policies. Procedure 6073 is

		<p>Staff. The DCG is not an official College Committee. During the period of College history where each campus had a provost, the DCG began as an informational ad hoc discussion group to maintain communication and prevent institutional silos. The DCG does not have an official procedure, bylaws, or DBOT directive (like the Senate), and it is not listed as an official Standing Committee (<i>Procedure 6002: Committee System</i>). It does not have an established list of voting members or a constitution. Work needs to be done to clarify the scope, role, function, and membership of the group. Procedure 6073 currently conflicts with the processes and policies set forth in DBOT Rule 2.24 which governs the Faculty Senate.</p>	<p>clarification of DCG's structure and role.</p>	<p>information has passed through the committee as a completed discussion. The review of <i>Procedure 6073: Procedure on Rules and Procedures</i> was in progress by administration, but some of the individuals involved have moved on to other institutions. The Faculty Senate President plans to revisit this item with administration. Unfortunately, simultaneous with this change, several members of President's Staff began referring to review and votes taken at the Senate as merely a "professional courtesy." This is not consistent with DBOT 2.24 which places the Senate in full partnership with Administration in College governance.</p>	<p>fatally flawed and remains a serious problem. The Senate is awaiting Admin partnership to initiate review and repair of this document.</p> <p>May 2024: Admin has still not provided a partner.</p> <p>Update November 2024: Mary Clark (without faculty or Senate input) formed a workgroup to address this Senate Objective; she selected all members. Of the 7 members, 4 are Admin or faculty without current or previous Senate membership (i.e., without historical reference for how Rules and Procedures are reviewed within the shared governance model). Mary stated that the group will review Procedure 6073 <u>and</u> DBOT Rule 2.24 (<i>The Faculty Senate Constitution</i>). The FS President informed Dr. Clark that this Senate objective is not concerned with the content of the <i>Senate Constitution</i>, that changes to the <i>Senate Constitution</i> initiated by Administration would be unorthodox and unprecedented. There are very specific steps for amending the <i>Faculty Senate Constitution</i>, and these steps are unique to the document (i.e., Admin is not meant to be part of this process—the document is an agreement between the DBOT and faculty).</p> <p>December 2024: The workgroup had a meeting November 19. The group was asked to review the <i>Senate Constitution</i> along</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

					with Procedure 6073. A Senate VP attended to observe but did not participate. A second meeting is scheduled for January 10; faculty have been informed by Mary Clark that the meeting will be closed--people who are not members of the Admin-appointed workgroup will not be permitted to attend.
9	Rules and Procedures-Drift in Policies Due to Detachment of Supporting Documents, Guidelines, and Handbooks (est. 2018)	<p><u>AY 2021-2022:</u> Rules and Procedures often have related forms, guidelines, handouts, documents, and handbooks that provide more detail regarding how processes are carried out. These materials have traditionally existed as attachments to a numbered item within the College's governing documents. The attachments clarify actions, establish a sequence of steps, or provide area- or role-specific directions. Upon periodic or scheduled review of a Rule or Procedure, historically, the attachments would also be reviewed, and any changes would be passed through the process of participative governance. Several years ago, some important attachments to procedures were inexplicably decoupled. Because this was only noticed recently, there has been a drift in some policies. The procedure/rule has been reviewed within the governance process, but its attachment(s) have been updated as needed outside the governance structure.</p> <p><u>UPDATE:</u> Faculty continue to find issues where manuals or other detached supporting items conflict with College Rules and Procedures, including Procedure 5026 Academic Dishonesty Procedure; Screening Committee Procedure and Manual; College Policies and Collegiate Handbooks; Faculty Handbook and Procedure 1006 (fixed); and others.</p>	The Senate asked VP of Academics Julie Alexander take the lead in reconnecting and reviewing attachments to the governing documents and processes affected, and for ensuring alignment in all materials/processes. This task will likely take a significant time investment. As items are reviewed and reattached, these need to be brought to the Senate and through the governance process, closing the loop on the drift in policies. This should address some of the 'unofficial evolution' in policies that have been found in screening committees, the procedure on Academic Dishonesty (Procedure 5026), Faculty Evaluations, and a few other areas noted by faculty members.	<p><u>2022:</u> VP Julie Alexander agreed to begin work on this process in the spring/summer of 2022.</p> <p><u>UPDATE 2023-24:</u> The Senate brought this issue up with the new Provost, Dr. Bratten, and Dr. Falconetti, and hopefully work will commence in the near future.</p> <p><u>UPDATE Spring 2024:</u> During the Spring semester of 2024, multiple issues have arisen due to the use of handbooks or guidelines in leu of Rules or Procedures. For example, multiple concerns have been raised over changes to the way screening committees operate, and these changes have not been subject to the standard review process or shared governance. Also, Collegiate faculty have received new handbooks that impose various policies that are not reflected in Polk State Rules or Procedures.</p>	<p><u>UPDATE May 2024:</u> The Senate President has discussed this issue with Dr. Falconetti several times. During three recent meetings, the issues of eroded shared governance have been discussed at length. The situation regarding detached attachments and handbooks being revised outside the governance process has also been discussed with the Provost. During the Spring semester of 2024, multiple issues have arisen due to the use of handbooks or guidelines in leu of Rules or Procedures. For example, multiple concerns have been raised over changes to the way screening committees operate, and these changes have not been subject to the standard review process or shared governance. Also, Collegiate faculty have received new handbooks that will impose various policies that are not reflected in Polk State Rules or Procedures, and they were not allowed to participate in the process of creating these documents despite asking for this opportunity several times.</p> <p><u>Fall 2024:</u> The Collegiate Faculty Handbooks have</p>

					<p>been removed (see objective 10)</p> <p>A 5-year review schedule for SACSCOC has been proposed to begin in Nov/Dec 2024 (no materials have come to the Senate yet). Hopefully items will be reattached during this review.</p> <p>There are no other updates at this time.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

10	Collegiate Faculty Handbook (est. 2023)	<p>The creation of a new employee handbook was initiated in Spring of 2023. Faculty in the Collegiate programs asked to be included in the creation of this document at this time and were denied. The Faculty Senate asked that these faculty be involved and was told that they would be shown the document "after it returned from the lawyer" (summer 2023). The Faculty Senate has asked each month for the past year and have been denied access to the document or involvement.</p>	<p>Before these employee handbooks go into use by the Collegiate programs (and to the Senate for final review), the Senate asks that consensus be reached between Collegiate faculty and administration regarding all questions and concerns they have with the documents. The concerns are significant and serious. For example, the documents state that faculty can be terminated without cause and the documents require a faculty signature upon receipt. There are collegiate faculty with continuing contract, so this is a clear violation of Polk State Rules and Procedures. There are many other problems with the documents.</p>	<p>Update April-May 2024: After a year, Administration released the manuals in rough draft to the Collegiate faculty in April of 2024 and collected feedback. There are still many concerns and the majority of Collegiate Faculty do not support or endorse the documents. The document was contains many issues including conflict with the College's Rules and Procedures and plagiarism, despite having been reviewed by the College's lawyer. Before Collegiate consensus had been reached or the documents were revised, Administration asked the Faculty Senate to move these 3 documents (150 pages) through the review process within 3 days of the May 2024 meeting. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee declined the request to place these items on the agenda. Even if the items had been in perfect condition, there was not enough time to review 150 pages and ask other faculty for approval to provide to their representatives, per Senate practices.</p>	<p>May 2024: Administration is seeking to implement the documents in August of 2024. The Senate President has explained to Administration that approval of Senate is necessary per DBOT Rule 2.24; placement on the agenda cannot occur until August 2024 at the earliest, but the faculty would need time to review 150 pages and to obtain the support of all faculty areas at the College, which is the role of the Senators. This will require time due to the length of the documents. Further, there must be consensus with the Collegiate Faculty, as the Senate cannot be asked to overrule one of its areas of faculty representation.</p> <p>August 2024: Senate asked Admin for an update and we were informed that the Collegiate Handbook would no longer be used. The Collegiate programs will follow Polk State's Rules and Procedures.</p> <p>January 2025: This concern has been resolved.</p>
11	Faculty Salary Steps (est. 2017; refer to Item 3)	<p>Full-time faculty are paid according to four "lanes" that correspond to degree (i.e., alpha, beta, gamma, delta) and 30 annual steps per lane. Thus, each faculty member has a salary listed on the Salary Schedule depending on the faculty member's degree and the number of years of satisfactory service since being hired. The application of an annual step is budget-neutral when averaged over a few years, due to faculty retiring at or near step 30, and all new faculty entering at step 10 or lower.</p> <p>NOTE: In addition to the change in</p>	<p>Annual steps should be implemented automatically for faculty who have completed a year of satisfactory service, just as faculty are moved to a different lane when a higher degree is earned. When the College applies a raise, it should be done without regard to steps. Raises produce a change in the salary schedule and are different. Raises combat inflation and increase the pay for new hires. Steps do not impact pay for new hires. There are numerous other important differences. The Senate President met twice with the</p>	<p>AY 2023-24 and prior: The Senate President has thoroughly and repeatedly explained the rationale for the Senate's ongoing request to formally differentiate steps and raises, and has requested an end to the interchangeable way these two items are applied. "Step equivalents" (simultaneous raises given to pro-tech and admin to match faculty steps) are also inappropriate and generate inequities between Faculty/Career (step-based) and Pro-tech/Admin (non-step-based) employee groups. <u>A "step equivalent" produces a new standard pay level for many positions and this constitutes an effective raise that is not reflected in the</u></p>	<p>Fall 2023: The Senate President requested data to compile a report in support of this objective--this was requested of the Provost and VP of HR. It was not provided.</p> <p>UPDATE May 2024: The Faculty Senate President requested data to support this objective on May 3 during a meeting with the President, Provost, VP of OCPA, and the VP of Human Resources. He</p>

		<p><i>the way that steps have been recently applied, the attachment for the faculty evaluation tool has also been recently altered without Faculty Senate review or input. The alteration included removal of the boxes to check the statement that the 'faculty member is recommended for a step increase for satisfactory service.' Many faculty have copies of the prior version of the evaluation for comparison.</i></p> <p><i>Note: The faculty salary schedule has always stated "Each step is normally equivalent to 1 year of service.", but the most recent schedule now states, "Each step is approximately equivalent to 1 year of experience." The appearance is that there has been a deliberate attempt to erase the historical link between steps and years of service during employment.</i></p>	<p>President to discuss this in May 2024, and once with three additional VPs.</p>	<p><u>salary schedule. Note that there is no written progression plan for pro-tech or admin, which is required by DBOT Rule 3.16.</u> It also aids in attracting and retaining non-step employees by effectively raising each position's designated salary. For faculty, steps do not change salaries via the salary schedule, so they do not help attract new quality instructors. They are an agreed upon part of a step-system-based position and are not attached to performance or inflation, as a raise is. <u>Non-step employee's "step equivalents" should instead be applied as raises to the base salary for ALL employees, including those who receive steps and change the salary schedule for all (rather than just for some, via a "hidden mechanism").</u></p> <p><u>June 2024:</u> See Objective 3. A new salary study was called for by DBOT, specifically to have a third-party determine how faculty salary steps should be implemented. This new study was designed by Administration and a work group was formed and is led by Administration. The third-party was hired by Administration. A survey was sent to faculty in September 2024.</p> <p><u>Nov/Dec 2024:</u> The survey results were shared during a webinar in November. Evergreen said recommendations would be delivered to the College President.</p>	<p>requested public information that he has easily received from HR in many prior years: an up-to-date copy of a data set consisting of all employees, dates of hire, starting salary, current salary, starting pay range, and current pay range. There were objections raised; this request is pending further discussion among Admin. Additionally, the FS President has reviewed the data and numbers that track faculty salaries and the effects of a step versus the impact of "step-equivalents" over the past two decades with Dr. Falconetti (April 2024 and May 2024). He further discussed this information with three other members of President's Staff.</p> <p><u>Nov/Dec 2024:</u> In the President's Staff (PS) Nov. 2024 meeting, Dr. Falconetti asked for the language that needed to be replaced within the salary schedule. This was provided. In the Dec. 2024 PS meeting, Administration argued to not replace this language.</p> <p>In the Evergreen Survey, faculty cited the need for proper Step progression, as well as the impact of improper use of the Step System by the College, as factors resulting in low pay.</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

12	<p>Academic Integrity (est. 2023-24)</p>	<p>Over the course of the past two years, many faculty have attended Senate meetings to express concern and frustration with significantly increased academic dishonesty issues and the lack of resources available to faculty to help ensure and preserve the value of a Polk State education and diploma. Many faculty find Honorlock to be ineffective and incredibly time consuming to use; there has been significant interest in exploring other more effective options, including in-person testing (and local centers available via consortia), other applications, TLCC testing, and in-house testing-review assistance.</p> <p>The Honorlock contract was extended in May 2023, but many faculty were not supportive of this decision. Enhanced reviewing and proctoring support were added to this package, which has provided a significant improvement for some instructors; however, it has not been a complete solution due to the broad scope of the problem. The College plans to give up the enhanced review feature in favor of a cheaper option in the upcoming year.</p> <p>Additionally, <i>Polk State College Procedure 5026: Academic Dishonesty</i> was revised without following all steps in the process, and this led to unintended consequences where there are now several forms of the process (detached attachments and other aspects) that are causing the procedure to be very problematic in its usage. Processing and preventing cheating have become a time sink. The Senate has asked an administrative partner to work toward revising the procedure and correcting these issues.</p>	<p>Faculty Senate has been supportive of faculty involvement in the exploration of proctoring options and decisions.</p> <p>The Senate has sought an administrative partner to assist. David Sutton (former Assoc. Vice President) volunteered to assist but is no longer with the College.</p>	<p>A workgroup was formed in May 2023 to make recommendations for proctoring options. This group was led by Kim Hess and Lori Jones. Recommendations have been presented to Faculty Senate.</p> <p>The Senate remains eager to partner for a revision of <i>Procedure 6056</i>, as it no longer reflects current practices.</p>	<p>Faculty Senate will meet on Monday, May 13 and Cody will deliver a presentation on the subject.</p> <p><u>November 2024:</u> Access to Honorlock will end in December. A new proctoring system (Respondus and ProctorU) will be launched instead. There was a training session offered in October.</p> <p>A review of Procedure 5026 is still needed, but no Administrative partner has been provided and not updates given.</p> <p>Faculty remain uncomfortable about the loss of Honorlock in favor of other vendors and are deeply concerned about the lack of in-person proctoring option in the TLCCs.</p>
----	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13	TLCC Testing Support (est. 2022-24)	Prior to COVID, the TLCC provided in-person, proctored testing for online students. There was a robust system and effective staffing. It was understood that online classes were a good option for students, but academic integrity could not always be ensured without in-person testing. During COVID, in-person testing was severely (nearly completely) suspended, and it has not returned. Faculty currently have the use of Honorlock, but many faculty find that it does not ensure academic integrity. For some high-stakes testing, it has been found to be very problematic. There is significant concern and many faculty have expressed that there is currently no viable option to ensure academic integrity for an online class.	This topic has been discussed at nearly every Senate meeting for the past two years. Faculty have been asking Administration for support since in-person classes first resumed post-COVID. The Senate has been told several times that the TLCC does not have the physical space or the resources to provide in-person testing, though testing volume was considerably higher pre-COVID with the same staff numbers. Faculty are asking for a concerted effort to provide a mechanism that allows for online classes to test in person. Faculty members currently do not even have a mechanism to allow for on-campus proctoring, as online classes aren't assigned to a room.	The faculty have involved Administration on many conversations but have not seen any improvement in this situation since it was first brought up (when in-person classes first resumed post-COVID). The issues with academic integrity are being seen in all departments--from Humanities to the Allied Health Programs.	Update May 2024: Representatives from the TLCC will present to Senate on Monday, May 13). Update October 2024: Senate has made several requests for increased testing support in the TLCC for online and hybrid courses (resources available pre-Covid). This used to be the way online courses tested and is in our documents. These requests have been denied based on the rationale that online courses are more common now and the TLCC lacks the necessary resources. December 2024: New online testing applications and tools will be used now (see also Objective 12), and faculty remain concerned that there is insufficient support for in-person proctoring in the TLCC, high-quality remote proctoring options for faculty tests, and high-quality proctoring options that are affordable for students.
14	Evaluation of Administrators; Compliance with Polk State Procedure 6009 (est. 2024)	Historically, per Procedure 6009: <i>Administrator's Performance Evaluation</i> , faculty have been asked annually to evaluate the administrator(s) they report to (e.g., dean, associate dean, VP, Provost). Faculty on both campuses have reported that this has not been done in at least two years.	The Faculty Senate asks that Procedure 6009 be followed effective immediately.		October 2024: No updates at this time. December 2024: No updates at this time. Evaluations for Administrators are inconsistent or not used.
15	Salary "Releveling" of Professional/Technical and Administrative Employees (est. July 2023)	The DBOT meets monthly and, as part of the "consent agenda" frequently approves salary "releveling" of specific employees in the Professional/Technical and Administrative categories. This is done without discussion or explanation, and it results in employees moving from one pay	Faculty members have asked Faculty Senate for information about releveling. Specifically, they have asked what impact releveling has on the salary of employees. The FS President reported this multiple times at Senate meetings, and it is included among the questions that were submitted to HR (per Dr. Falconetti's	The FS President spoke by phone with Dr. Bratten and Stacy Carry in the spring of 2024 to discuss the request from faculty for transparency related to position releveling. He was told that this information can't necessarily be provided. A discussion ensued about the fact that salary information in Florida is publicly available and so this request should not present a problem. But no	October 2024: Administration has not provided any information about Staff position releveling. Given the lack of information, Senate made calculations based on information in DBOT meeting packets from the

		range to another. In nearly all cases, the employee moves up one or more pay ranges.	request: questions attached below) in July 2023. Senate asked what the financial impact of releveling is. Senate has asked for transparency in all aspects of salary and budgeting, including position releveling.	information has been provided to date. In addition, many or most of the question submitted by Senate related to the Compensation Study have not yet been addressed (see questions below). Update May 2024: The Senate President renewed the request for the same data set that he has received from HR many times over many previous years. Objections were raised. The data has not yet been provided.	past two years. The overall change in recurring spending associated with position releveling is estimated to be roughly \$900,000 per year over the two years. We will continue to report these estimates going forward. December 2024: Dr. Falconetti commented at the Dec 5 President's Staff that there is "misinformation" about releveling, and that releveling is "budget neutral". Faculty would still like to have detailed information (on a regular basis) about the budgetary impact of releveling as it occurs often for many positions (sometimes monthly). Faculty do not benefit from these increases.
16	Transparency and Shared Governance for Collegiate Faculty Salary (est. 2024)	Historically, Collegiate faculty used the same pay scale as all full-time faculty at Polk State. This was changed years ago, and since that time, faculty in the three collegiate programs have had no meaningful input or participation in the process of administering salaries or raises.	We request that Collegiate faculty be afforded full access to the process of determining salaries. The budgeting process for Collegiate faculty salaries should be open and transparent, and faculty should have a meaningful and authentic partnership with Administration (i.e., shared governance).		
17	Current Organizational Chart	Faculty do not have access to an up-to-date organizational chart. The chart that is currently posted in PIE is a 2023 Organization Chart draft (it lists David Sutton as Associate Provost, it shows the Lakeland Dean position vacant, the Winter Haven Dean position vacant, the Associate VP of Student Services is shown as vacant, and many new Associate VP, Dean, and VP positions have been added.	Faculty/staff need a current Org Chart that is regularly updated to reflect the correct structure and staffing. We are asking that the Org Chart be updated whenever personnel changes occur in Administration. Additionally, as the College's Rules and Procedures are so out of date and processes rely on position titles to direct who can/how to resolve concerns or complete operational tasks, there is currently no way to tell how to complete some operations without guessing or calling around, creating inefficiencies.		

18	Faculty Access to Complete Class Schedule	Faculty do not currently have a satisfactory way to search the course schedule for a given semester and see all courses including sections assigned to adjunct faculty or sections that are on hold. Given that faculty are increasingly having difficulty making or maintaining a schedule, they need to have an effective means to see all available sections at any given time.	Faculty would like to have better access to the course schedule.		
19	PIE Organization, Usability, and Accessibility	Faculty have expressed concern over PIE. The overall structure is not user-friendly for faculty searching for documents. Often, documents are buried deep within a many-layer file structure, and there are often multiple versions of the file. There is an overall feeling that a file, once found, may not be the correct file or the correct version. A mechanism is needed that allows for easy browsing and searching. Also, there is concern that many of the files kept on PIE should be accessible by the public, not just employees. For example, adjunct faculty cannot access important files when they are not actively under contract for a given term. Transparency should also be a top priority.	To have a better mechanism introduced that will allow faculty to easily access vital information with accuracy and confidence.		
20	Faculty Salary Schedule	This item is in support of item #11. The Faculty Salary Schedule defines a step system based on years of service and degree level , distinct from other salary increases tied to funding availability, cost of living, or discretionary adjustments. Historically, the step schedule has stated: “A step is normally equivalent to one year of service.” This clearly differentiated steps from raises and established them as a structured progression in faculty compensation. Recently, this language was changed—without explanation—to “A step is approximately equivalent to one year of experience.” At the same time,	In the absence of any clear explanation from administration for the change in the definition of salary steps—and given the critical role this definition plays in the administration of faculty salaries —we request that the original language be restored . The step system was designed to provide predictable and structured salary progression based on years of service , and altering its definition has introduced unnecessary ambiguity. Over the past several years, this issue has been the subject of multiple discussions with administration . Dr. Falconetti met with the Faculty Senate President and both Vice Presidents to address concerns, and		

		<p>administration has begun treating steps as discretionary, dependent on available funding, and referring to them as raises. This approach undermines the purpose of the step system, making it indistinguishable from other salary adjustments.</p> <p>A step adjustment does not modify the salary schedule or increase competitiveness for new hires—it simply places faculty in their appropriate position within the existing structure. If steps are not granted annually, the step system becomes meaningless, functioning no differently from any other type of raise. Faculty Senate objects to this shift and reaffirms that steps should be recognized as an established progression based on service, not a discretionary salary adjustment.</p>	<p>there was agreement at that time that the language would be restored. However, despite this commitment, the change has not been made. During President’s Staff in December 2024, some members of the administration expressed opposition to reverting to the original definition, and the altered language remains in place.</p> <p>We formally request that the administration honor its prior commitment and restore the original language: “A step is normally equivalent to one year of service.” Additionally, we ask that steps be granted according to the schedule and the original definition, ensuring that the step system functions as intended rather than as a discretionary salary adjustment.</p>		
21	Shared Governance	<p>DBOT Rule 2.24 and the Faculty Senate Constitution state that the Senate and administration shall confer on all matters related to educational policies and governance and that the Senate is a full partner in the initiation and development of rules, policies, and procedures. Historically, faculty and administration have collaborated from the outset of any policy review or development process.</p> <p>However, there has been a fundamental shift. Administration has unilaterally initiated reviews of the Faculty Senate Constitution, the faculty evaluation procedure, and the Rule on Rules and Procedures—without Senate consultation. The two recent salary studies were also developed and implemented without Senate partnership. Faculty Senate has been reduced to a reactionary role, responding to decisions already made, rather than serving as an</p>	<p>The Faculty Senate urges the administration to reconsider its recent approach to faculty governance and return to the long-standing model of authentic, collaborative partnership as defined in DBOT Rule 2.24. Shared governance is not simply including Senate representatives at some stage of a process—it is a full and active partnership in shaping policies and procedures that impact faculty.</p> <p>For years, this model has fostered productive and harmonious collaboration between faculty and administration. However, the recent unilateral initiation of major review processes without Senate involvement represents a significant departure from this principle. We call on the administration to reaffirm its commitment to true shared governance by engaging the Faculty Senate as a full partner from the very start of all governance-related discussions and decisions.</p>		

		<p>active partner in governance as intended.</p> <p>Despite repeated objections, administration has stated that this practice will continue. The Faculty Senate does not exist as an advisory body; it is a governing partner. We object to this exclusion and reaffirm our role in shaping the policies and procedures that impact faculty and the College.</p>			
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Compensation Questions (Sent to Administration and HR by request on XXXXXX)

- 1) Polk State had \$7.5M available last year and, after implementing two salary steps, employees were told that a minimum of \$5.5M was left unspent for allocation toward additional compensation adjustments.
 - Has any of the \$5.5M been spent or re-allocated? Is it all still designated for compensation?
 - Is there a limit to how much recurring money can be "carrier over" or how long it can be held?
 - Was the entire \$2M of the total \$7.5M spent during the 2022-23 Academic Year allocated toward the college-wide step increases?
 - Faculty did not receive an increase to base salary in 2022 (two previously held-back salary steps were implemented, but there was no change to the salary schedule for faculty). Did other employee groups receive a 3.2% increase to their base pay, or did they receive two "step-equivalents"?
 - Does the College have \$11M available to spend this year (i.e., \$5.5M from last year + \$5.5M from this year)? If so, what will the \$11M be spent on?
 - Can recurring money be spent on non-recurring expenses?
 - Will the Classification Phase affect faculty, or will it only affect staff?
- 2) Why will this year's increase begin earlier for the Admin, Career, and Pro-Tech employee groups than it will for the Faculty group if all of us are paid over a 12-month period (and most of the faculty still work over the full 12-month period) despite the difference in contracts?
 - Historically, raises to base salaries have often been implemented and backdated to an earlier date. Given that the \$7.5M appropriation was for the purpose of compensation adjustment, why was this not done with this year's increase?
- 3) Between 2010-23, faculty received a total increase of 6.9% to the base salary (3.5% in 2012 and 3.4% in 2021). The additional 6.8% this year yields a total increase to base salary of 13.7% over 13 years. The recent increase brings the total base salary change to an average of just over one percent per year over 13 years. The published cumulative inflation rate for the same duration is 39.9%. This means faculty base salary, including starting salary for new hires, has effectively declined 26.2%, or approximately 2% per year. Is there a plan to address this decline, and also to prevent future decline, to faculty earning potential?
- 4) The Compensation and Classification Workgroup (CCW) was told that Polk State's faculty salary was 30% below market benchmarks as of 2021(?) data. Faculty are currently receiving a total increase of 6.8% to base salary (steps do not affect base salary). Is all work on the Compensation Phase complete, or will the College take further steps to address the remaining deficit and the inflation that has occurred since the study began?
- 5) Gallagher data presented to the CCW indicated that some employee groups are further below market benchmarks than others (e.g., the faculty are 30% below market).
 - Given this inequity, won't the across-the-board increase only perpetuate this inequity rather than correct it?

- Is there a plan to address the remaining inequity between employee groups in the next phase?
- 6) The steps that are being implemented as part of the compensation package represent steps that were held back from faculty during previous years.
- Salary steps have previously been based on years of experience, as they are at other institutions. Has this changed?
 - The steps that are being implemented were missed during previous years, so isn't implementing them now a "classification" correction?
 - Should annual steps be implemented automatically?
 - Steps are less, on average, than annual inflation rates, and increases to base salary are very rare, which means faculty tend to continually fall behind inflation. Should the College consider a way to adjust the step value to address inflation?
 - Why is the restoration of a missed step within this compensation package being referred to as a "raise" in the same sense as a raise to base salaries?
 - How does implementing a step (or steps) increase the College's competitiveness for hiring new faculty if this does not impact the salary schedule itself or the monetary value offered to the individual being hired?
 - Salary steps are statistically self-funding over time. Faculty retire from high steps and new faculty are hired at low steps. But it is routinely stated that implementing a step "costs" a certain amount of money. Is the money saved from retirements put back into the ledger to implement steps? If not, what is done with the money that is routinely recovered when a faculty member retires (i.e., from within the step system), and a new faculty member is hired at a much lower step?
 - Whenever the decision is made to skip the implementation of an annual faculty salary step, shouldn't this decision be made in collaboration with the faculty?
 - Employees were told that last year's increase (two steps) cost \$2M of the \$7.5M available. Currently, data presented showed that full-time employee salaries total approximately \$30M, which means it should cost a maximum of \$1M to implement two steps (and step-equivalents). Why did two steps + step equivalents in 2022 cost \$2M?
- 7) Faculty members were told they now rank as the third-highest paid in the state.
- Was this evaluation made via comparison of base salaries alone (i.e., not based on base salary + overloads + other duties)?
 - Faculty were told that this ranking was calculated using Table 6.6T of the *DOE Fact Book*. On analysis, these data seem to be an account of the amount each college spends each year on faculty pay, rather than a direct comparison of salary schedules. Overall spending on faculty pay is impacted by changes to the salary schedule (e.g., raises), but it is also significantly impacted by the *proportion of faculty with higher-degree attainment*, the *proportion of faculty with more years of experience*, and other factors. It does not seem like these data can be used to make a statistically valid comparison and conclusion that Polk State's faculty are ranked third. Can this assessment be more fully explained?
 - Could the College conduct an "apples-to-apples" comparison of faculty pay at each state college, showing how Polk State's salaries at each step compare to other College's salaries using their salary schedules? (Even if other institutions don't use a "step" system, there are minimum and maximum salaries for each faculty classification.)
 - Other colleges have announced recent pay increases. How do these increases compare to Polk State? Were these recent increases factored into the analysis when ranking Polk as third in the State?
 - What is the State-wide rank for the Pro-tech and Career employee groups based on comparison of the salary schedules at other institutions?
- 8) Within the Compensation and Classification Workgroup, Budget Council, and other groups, there was no consideration/discussion of an across-the-board raise of less than 10%. (It was explicitly stated that there was \$5.5M available for compensation adjustments). There was also no mention the implementation of previously missed steps in the Compensation Adjustment Phase (steps are an aspect of classification and the implemented steps were already "owed"). How were these decisions made?
- 9) In a recent email to employees, there was mention of a Total Rewards Package for all employees that included 19 paid non-duty days for winter and spring break. Currently, faculty do not get these 19 paid days during winter and spring break--was this an error in the current compensation structure or did this not refer to faculty?

- 10) The Gallagher Study was completed in late 2022. Members of the CCW were told several times they could have a copy of the "original document that was sent by Gallagher," if requested, but it has still not been provided.
- Why has there been a delay in releasing the original document that was sent?
 - There was mention of "edits" being made. What changes are being made to this original document?
 - Has Gallagher done any other salary studies for two-year colleges?
 - What was the cost of the Gallagher Study?
- 11) Are there plans to evaluate and adjust faculty salaries in the Collegiate programs? If so, will faculty be included in the decision-making process?
- 12) For each employee group (i.e., Faculty, Career, Pro-tech, and Administration), how much money was spent during the previous three years to finance re-leveling, promotions, or reclassifications?