Polk State College Faculty Senate Minutes
Date: May 6, 2024
TIME: 3:00 pm
Meeting Held via Zoom
(Steering Committee Meets Following the Senate Meeting.)
**Link to supporting documents/reports without PIE access on last page.

OFFICERS:
Bill Caldecutt: President
Anthony Cornett: Vice President – Winter Haven Campus
Jess Jones: Vice President – Lakeland Campus
Misty Sparling: Secretary
Greg Harris: Parliamentarian
Chris Bothelo: Senator at Large
Amy Bratten: Administrative Liaison

Attending Senators: Dirk Valk, Gwyn Phillips, Johnny Stewart, Anthony Cornett, Greg Harris, Kim Hess, Jess Jones, Misty Sparling, Kara Larson, Heather Childree, John Woodward, Aaron Morgan (substituting for John Barbaret), Lee Childree (substituting for Dawn Dyer), and Michael Derry

Faculty Attendees: Susie Moerschbacher, Gregory Johnson, Jacqueline Gray, Christopher Johnson, Laura Brimer, Cary Gardel, KT Moran, Lynsay McCaulley, Christy McCullough, and Bulmuo Maakuu

Presenting Guests and Others: Cody Moyer, Director of Learning Technology and Online Education (presenting); Tamara Sakagawa, Vice President of the Office of Communications and Public Affairs (non-presenting); Courtlann Thomas, Director of TLCC and Learning Resources Lakeland (presenting); Chris Fullerton, Director of TLCC and Learning Resources Winter Haven (presenting); Patrice Bryant-Thigpen, Principal of Chain of Lakes Collegiate High School (non-presenting); Rick Jeffries, Principal of Lakeland Collegiate High School (non-presenting); Meesha Downing-Townsend, Principal of Lakeland Gateway to College High School (non-presenting); Kim Deronda, TLCC Testing and Tutoring Manager, Lakeland (presenting); and Tina Hanson, TLCC Testing Services Specialist (presenting)

I. **Approval of Minutes: April 2024 Meeting**
   The *Faculty Senate April 2024 Meeting Minutes* were reviewed. Greg Harris made a motion to approve; this was seconded by Jess Jones. The Minutes were approved unanimously.
II. **Agenda Approval: *May 6, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda***
   A motion was made to approve the *May 6, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda.* Misty mentioned a correction she had been directed to, and this had been changed so that the version on PIE (Polk Informational Essentials-cloud) was correct. Greg Harris motioned to approve, and Anthony Cornett seconded. The agenda was accepted unanimously.
III. **Faculty Senate Officer and Liaison Reports**
   A. Faculty Senate President's Report: Bill Caldecutt
      - The *Faculty Senate President's Report* reviews the updated copy of the spreadsheet of ongoing *Faculty Senate Objectives* (i.e., rolling list of issues and concerns). This

document is posted in PIE and inserted at the end of the Faculty Senate Minutes.
https://polkstatecollege.sharepoint.com/:w:/s/departments/aa/fs/EXTZhK_nPKtIoC
u6fHEdbIwBi8TCez2mg3twRpwXCC8arQ

- Faculty discussion ensued during Bill's presentation of the spreadsheet update:
  a. **Salary**:
     - Anthony Cornett shared that he is behind two salary schedule steps currently. Discussion ensued.
     - Aaron Morgan expressed that faculty are supposed to receive steps every year [based on a step-system-based contract].
     - Anthony discussed some of the history of lost steps, explaining that within the *Faculty Evaluation Tool* [*Polk State Procedure 6012: Teaching Faculty Evaluation System*--Attachment 3] there used to be a section at the bottom of the form with a check box that stated, "***recommended for a step increase***" if the faculty member "***meets or exceeds expectations***." The form was altered at some point without any faculty input and without explanation--this statement and the check box were entirely remove. April Robinson (former Dean of Academics--WH), used the older version of the form to evaluate faculty until 2020.
     - Bill also explained that the *Polk State Faculty Salary Schedule* has historically said "***A step is normally equal to one year of service***". Two years ago, it was changed (without faculty input or explanation) to say:" ***A step is approximately equal to a year of service.***" It **now** says, "***A step is approximately equal to a year of experience.***" These sorts of changes, taken together, have been interpreted by some as quiet move to re-define salary steps and to decouple them from years of service. Administration has not provided an explanation for these changes.
  b. **Polk State Procedure 1006: *Faculty Workload and Academic Accounting System and Departmental Coordination*:**
     Aaron Morgan explained that there has been no communication about the newly required *Program Review Report* by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning [e.g., how it is to be done and who is responsible, and how that person is to be compensated]. Polk State Procedure 1006 states that the Academic Deans are supposed to do the Program Review, not the Department Coordinators (DCs), but this duty has been pushed to DCs. It is not in their contracted duties.
  c. **Polk State Procedure 6073: *Procedure on Rules and Procedures***
     - Jess Jones stated that, though this procedure conflicts with DBOT (District Board of Trustees) Rule 2.24 *Faculty Senate Constitution*, a DBOT Rule always supersedes a college procedure.
     - Aaron Morgan expressed that it kind of seems like the College is ignoring the DBOT Rule or violating it; he asked about the consequences for this.
     - Jennifer Shaw stated that part of the problem is that faculty are being told that informing them [the Senate] of the changes that are being made to the governing procedures is just a "professional courtesy," and that faculty are not being allowed any real involvement.
     - Bill responded that the faculty [via the Senate] are supposed to be a "***full partner***" with the Administration in the governance of the College. DBOT

Rule 2.24: *Faculty Senate Constitution* is meant to guarantee that full partnership.

- Aaron asked if Bill was being outvoted at President's Staff meetings.
- Bill stated that the President's Staff did not meet with Bill for over a year. Once it began to meet again, a new system of voting began which could lead to Administration outvoting him; this is due to online voting without meeting discussions and consensus-building.
- Bill was asked if President's Staff had met consistently.
- Bill reported that he had looked through his files and the minutes of meetings, and there was no President's Staff business conducted between September 2022 and September 2023. Bill explained that President's Staff has historically operated with <u>consensus as the standard</u>. This is because faculty are equal partners with administration by Board Rule, but are represented on the President's Staff by only <u>one person</u>; hence, a numerical vote is, by definition, contradictory to shared governance and the spirit of the DBOT Rule.
  - He reported that he has raised the concerns related to voting to several administrators on the President's Staff.
  - Bill stated that in a recent meeting with Dr. Falconetti, she said she would halt the review of Rules and Procedures until the process being used could be evaluated.

d. **<u>Rules and Procedures Review and Attachment drift:</u>**
  - Jess Jones asked if there had been any updates regarding procedure reviews or screening committee issues [changes made to the process outside the governance procedures; changes to the Manual; new policies without faculty involvement; lack of transparency and integrity of committees].
  - Bill explained that though he has not heard anything specific, the College is bracing for a storm of Rules and Procedures that need to be reviewed because this process has been dormant for several years. Rules and Procedures are scheduled into a 5-year cycle of review, but it has been much longer for some (12+ years). During the April President's Staff meeting, Mary Clark explained that this delay was due to COVID.

e. **<u>Collegiate Employee Handbooks</u>**
  - Many Collegiate faculty members in attendance expressed universal dislike for the newly developed handbooks. They expressed that they are Polk State College faculty, and thus are covered by Rules and Procedures like all other faculty. Specific examples of handbook issues were discussed where Collegiate faculty are specifically mentioned and described in Rules and Procedures. Collegiate faculty were not included in writing the documents despite repeated requests for inclusion.
  - Bill explained that there have been other attempts at different times to insert a separation between Collegiate faculty from other College departmental faculty. They were recently re-titled from "professor" to "teacher" by Administration without warning or explanation, and this was subsequently reversed only when it was noticed by the Senate. This change was in violation of DBOT Rule 3.04: *Faculty Titles*.
  - Individuals expressed concern that the Collegiate handbooks were 150 pages to review. Bill stated that in order for the handbooks to be received and

reviewed by the Senate, they will need to be finished with the drafting stage and in a final form; they will also need support from Collegiate faculty.

- Amy said the Collegiate faculty will work on the documents during the summer retreat and will be returned to Senate in August.
- Lee Childree asked for clarification of the timeline because they had been told the documents would be in use by August.
- Amy said they would need to wait until Senate approval.

f. **Posting of Senate Minutes on Web Site**

Bill explained that the minutes must be posted to the College web site (according to Senate Bylaws). They were moved to PIE by OCPA years ago and need to be returned. There have been multiple requests to fix this and a link has been added to the PIE page, but it is password-protected and thus does not satisfy the requirement. For example, adjunct faculty cannot view minutes if they are not currently teaching a class. Johnny said that it is possible to change the "permissions" of the folder such that anyone can view the documents. Senate asks that this be accomplished.

g. **Additions from the Floor to List of Senate Objectives**

i. **Academic Integrity Issues**

- Jenifer Shaw asked that Academic Integrity be addressed. Polk State Procedure 5026: *Academic Dishonesty* and DBOT Rule 4.01: *Student Code of Conduct* needs to be reviewed and revised [the procedure has been conflicting and problematic for several years; faculty need an Administrative partner to collaborate].
- Aaron Morgan explained that the reason for the previous Senate Parliamentarian's resignation was due pressure from Administration to remove issues related to academic integrity from the Senate agenda.

ii. **Increased Proctored Testing Resources/Support through the TLCC**

- Aaron explained that faculty were having difficulty using the College's TLCC to schedule in-person testing services where this service was needed for integrity, especially when other options did not work for the course or subject. Discussion ensued.

iii. Bill stated he would add the two new topics to the Senate Objectives list and indicated others could be added for the next Academic Year.

iv. He asked the Senate to vote to adopt the updated list with the understanding that representatives would approve the basic objectives framework and topics, and then they would have an opportunity to review the detailed content. This content would be in use in the upcoming year if they voted that there were no concerns with the content that was presented during the meeting. Kara Larson motioned to accept the Senate Objectives with the additions and changes; Chris Bothelo seconded. The item passed unanimously.

B. Lakeland Campus Vice President's Report: Jess Jones (none)
C. Winter Haven Campus Vice President's Report: Anthony Cornett
   Thursday, May 9 at 11:00 am, the Study Abroad Information Session will be on Zoom for anyone interested.
D. Parliamentarian's Report: None

Greg Harris Motioned to extend the meeting at 4:25; Anthony Cornett seconded. The meeting was extended.

E. **<u>Administrative Liaison's Report:</u> Amy Bratten**

The *Administrative Liaison's Report* is available in PIE.
https://polkstatecollege.sharepoint.com/:b:/s/departments/aa/fs/Eebb5TqNByZHkuAwfj6sWqwBkqAcBtpra4YbJPFTG-yGTQ

1. <u>Graduation:</u> Amy thanked those attending and said she planned to talk with the Registrar to see if graduations could be scheduled so they no longer directly conflict with faculty classes and finals.

2. <u>Passport and Faculty Password Issues during grades submission:</u> Amy said that Dr. Clark indicated a problem that if a computer is away from campus for over 45 days, then it will disconnect from the network and not update. For this reason, all instructors should visit the campus with their computers within the 45-day timeframe to keep everything running smoothly. Amy reminded everyone that grades impact financial aid eligibility, dual enrollment, and class rank for high schools.

   - Kara Laron expressed concern, as there are many dual-enrollment adjuncts who are stationed at high schools and are never on campus. Amy responded that she would look into the need for more support for dual enrollment teachers.
   - Jess Jones added that he experienced similar problems with adjuncts more broadly.
   - Jacqueline Gray added that sometimes changing the password in Outlook can allow for successful login on Passport and Canvas.
   - Johnny Stewart added that when making a password, faculty need to be made aware that using periods and exclamation points are okay, but they cannot use other characters, because it will cause problems in Genesis.

3. <u>Simple Syllabus:</u> There is a training tomorrow for some who are piloting the platform over the summer. The goal was to go live in the Fall of 2024 so it would be utilized 45 days before the Spring 2025 Semester, per the statute.

4. <u>The DBOT Budget Workshop:</u> This was moved to June, because the Governor has not signed funding yet. Discussion ensued.

   - Aaron Morgan brought forward a question he had asked to Dr. Bratten and Dr. Falconetti during Professional Development Day's Faculty Q & A Session. He reiterated that he had asked if the President's Staff had met within the past few years, and he asked that-- if they had--was the Faculty Senate President included in those meetings. Aaron said he and the faculty were told that President's Staff had met.

     After this answer was provided at the session, Aaron said he looked up information pertaining to those meetings on the President's Corner and expressed concern that there were no agendas or minutes available for a 16-month period. He also explained that there were two sets of meeting minutes that were recently added *after* his question at PDD. They each contain only one topic (an update) and did not appear to be normal meeting minutes for business. He expressed concern that the meetings should contain official business; they cannot be official if they are just phone meetings or do not have an agenda or meeting minutes available to review. There were also no minutes approved for the topic discussions

(i.e., the recently added items). And there are no other President's Staff Meeting Minutes in PIE for any other single-topic updates during other months or years--only the two that very recently appeared after the Professional Development Faculty Q & A Session in which his question was asked.

- Aaron also added information about his department and the problems they are having with testing. He has asked for help via multiple emails and never received a response. His department does not use Honorlock. He spoke to the TLCC and was told that they test for three areas, but none of these testing areas are for Polk State College students. It was recommended that the department re-design their courses instead of use the Testing Center. He explained that his department no longer wishes to use online testing as the faculty have no confidence in the online proctoring systems. Amy explained that Faculty Senate is supposed to hear from both the TLCC and Cody Moyer later today. *
  [*Note: These presentations were postponed until the May 13 meeting due to time constraints.]
- Jennifer Shaw asked if *Simple Syllabus* will be linking to *Banner*, and if so, are Faculty going to be trained on *Simple Syllabus*?
- Amy responded that it would be linking to *Banner*. They pushed back the *Simple Syllabus* training to the Fall of 2024, since the Banner training will take place in August after the Convocation event.
- Jennifer expressed frustration that professors are being asked to attend *Banner* training after Convocation and faculty meetings, as that takes up even more time that professors are supposed to have for planning and setting up multiple courses, including media and course tools. This leaves only one day to get everything ready, and it generally takes several days to set up courses for a full semester. [There are usually only 1-2 days between when one semester's grades are due, and the next semester begins.]
- Amy responded that she can only address *Simple Syllabus*, because *Banner* has had delays that are beyond her control.
- Bill reiterated that the afternoon of Convocation is typically for the faculty meeting, and this should wrap up by noon, as that has been the consensus agreement from the Calendar Committee [after the shift to 2 faculty workdays in the fall]. He explained that professors should not be asked to use their weekends to set up their courses due to extra trainings being administered during that time.
- Others stated that the College needed to be respectful of professors' time to prepare.
- Amy said she would investigate this.

5. The Collegiate Faculty Handbook: The Handbook is not going to be available for review until August. Administration provided these documents to Bill on Wednesday (May 1) night in admittedly very rough form. [Bill then forwarded some basic preliminary feedback from the Collegiate faculty to Dr. Bratten, as the faculty expressed strong opposition to the document, its contents, tone, and lack of professionalism. They also strongly objected that it had been created

without including any input or inclusion for over a year --despite requests to be involved.]

- Anthony asked why we need three different handbooks [150 pages].
- Amy responded that we have three different collegiate high schools that serve three different populations.
- He responded that, instead, Polk State College rules and procedures should be referenced.
- Amy said the reason that did not happen was to differentiate K-12 from the College. She wants to make sure we are compliant with the *Jessica Lunsford Act* and the *Marjorie Stoneman Douglas Act.* She also wants to make sure that collegiate faculty are available for students. Discussion ensued.
- Faculty expressed the following concerns about the Collegiate Manuals:
  - o Collegiate faculty are also Polk State College Faculty, and they are governed by Polk State's Rules and Procedures. While there are no objections to the previously mentioned Acts being adhered to, there are other issues with the Handbooks. Specifics of the bell schedule, the calendar, and the list of current faculty should not be included in the Handbook since it would have to be re-written every year and then approved by the Faculty Senate again if those items are included. There are redundancies with Polk State's Procedures and direct violations of them as well.
  - o The Handbooks provide specific directives that are written in a way that made the collegiate faculty feel like they are not professionals. The feel of the handbook is to make us separate from the Polk State College Rules and Procedures. For instance, there is a portion that requires a signature at the end that states that we can be fired for any reason at any time. That is not applicable to those of us on continuing contract and should be removed. Amy responded that it has been removed.
  - o Lynsay McCaulley said the handbook does not respect that faculty work numerous hours after school; it attempts to dictate non-working hours.
  - o The contents felt punitive where it should have been informative.
  - o Amy apologized for that by saying some statements should not have been in the document; she added that the faculty are now allowed to have input.
  - o History was provided explaining that the handbooks were created without any input from faculty despite faculty members asking frequently for that opportunity. Administration completed the document but still would not show it to faculty; instead, it was sent to lawyers. It was withheld for over a year for different reasons then given to faculty last week, where they were told it needed to be adopted immediately for the fall semester.
  - o Dr. Bratten stated that it went to lawyers to help facilitate. Dr. Clark [her predecessor with the project] sent it out rough, and Dr. Bratten stated that she was sorry for that.

- o Bill explained that faculty expect shared governance, and this means that all parties are at the table to formulate documents from the inception. Receiving something that has already been to the lawyers is not what faculty are used to. The Polk State College Rules and Procedures include notes, forms, processes, and directives about the Collegiate Faculty throughout. A Handbook seems redundant, and it has been interpreted by some people as a way to remove the Collegiate Faculty from the College's governance process. A Handbook is fine, but the source material cannot contradict Rules and Procedures--it should reference them.
- o Christy McCullough indicated that the Handbook was marketed for all employees of the Collegiate High Schools, but it has specific mention of *Faculty* throughout --even when less than half the employees are "faculty." [Not all employee categories use the same processes or contracts.]
- o Many Collegiate Faculty expressed that a major reason for coming to work at Polk State College was because they appreciated being treated as professionals (in contrast to teaching for the district). The Handbook's tone and content does not convey "professional" treatment.
    - ♦ Specific restrictions should be removed, for instance, "lesson plans need to be submitted every Friday" which are not even required by the collective bargaining agreement with the Polk County School District.
    - ♦ The threat of not being covered by insurance should also be removed.
    - ♦ This Handbook implies that Collegiate Faculty are lazy in their approach when, in reality, they are always available for their students. There are after school clubs, supervised activities, and ample opportunity for tutoring. The item is insulting.
- o There is an acknowledgement that there may be items that are specific to Grade 10-12 that should be addressed, *if* these are not covered by Polk State College Procedures (e.g., Collegiate students must wear their college IDs at all times while in the buildings, and the classroom doors must remain locked). There are no objections to these details. These could be entered into College Procedure if needed under a section for Collegiate faculty.
- Lee Childree and other Collegiate Faculty discovered that large portions of the handbooks had been plagiarized and could easily have been just replaced by five Polk State College Procedures rather than another school's rules and processes. Faculty expressed dismay that there were plagiarized portions given that Polk State is a higher-education institute setting an example; plus, these documents had already gone through the College's lawyers. The cut-and-paste portions should have been caught.
- Bill added that the College's lawyers should have caught the portion that stated that a department (not the DBOT or President) *could fire a Continuing Contract Faculty member with or without cause.*

- Collegiate Faculty asked: Will they receive the updated handbook with all their requested changes? If so, when?
- Amy responded that the collegiate faculty will be given another opportunity to have input at the summer retreat; it will be given to the Faculty Senate for review next.

      6. President Falconetti, V.P. of HR Stacy Carey, Amy, and Bill all met regarding faculty compensation. Amy appreciated the history Bill shared on how compensation has been addressed previously. Stacy is now working on putting together a report on compensation and compression for the President's Staff meeting in May.

IV.   **Committee Updates: None, due to time constraints.**
V.   **Old Business: None, due to time constraints.**
VI.   **New Business: None, due to time constraints.**
VII.   **Business from the Floor: None. due to time constraints.**
VIII.   **Adjournment**

Jess Jones motioned to adjourn the meeting at 4:55 pm, but to allow for another May meeting the following week [May 13 at 3:00 pm] to afford substantial time for respectful review and discussion of the presentations from the valued guests who did not have an opportunity to present: Cody Moyer, Chris Fullerton, and Courtlann Thomas. Dirk Valk seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The meeting adjourned.

Supporting documents are accessible to those without access to PIE via this Dropbox link: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/slv3cbgip9rxwj1849t07/ALdpevV3fgemheuMobQaDvo?rlkey=3fn7a9hr9zw2j4br4xwaqpsk6&st=03jlrbsl&dl=0

Item	Notes	Goal(s)	Progress/Status	Update
1 — Publication of Senate Minutes on the College Website and Emails for Transparency to Members of the DBOT; Compliance with Procedure 6056 (est. 2024)	The Faculty Senate bylaws (Procedure 6056) states: *"Copies of the approved minutes shall be e-mailed to each member of the District Board of Trustees and posted to the Polk State College website. The approved minutes shall also be electronically archived."* The Senate documents were historically posted to the College website but were moved to PIE (password-protected Cloud) by the Office of Communications and Public Affairs (OCPA) several years ago. Also, during a transition between Senate secretaries, the practice of mailing minutes to DBOT members was inadvertently suspended. Faculty members recently requested that the Senate restore transparency of the minutes (with officer reports and supporting documents) to the College website and resume mailing the minutes directly to members of the DBOT in compliance with College Procedure 6056.	**APRIL 2024:** 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.	**April 2024**: 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. **May 2024**: The Senate documents are still password-protected despite discussion and multiple requests.	**May 7, 2024:** 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.
2 — Rule and Procedure Review Process, Senate Participation, and	According to DBOT Rule 2.24: *Senate Constitution: "The Senate shall be primarily interested in and involved with the initiation, review, monitoring, and evaluation of rules, policies, and procedures affecting*	**AY 2022-23:** 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	**AY 2023-24:** President's Staff reconvened meetings and restarted the process of reviewing Rules and Procedures. The Senate President raised objections with several members of President's Staff (and with the President) regarding the process of review,	**May 2024:** The Senate President requested more information about the Rule and Procedure Review Process and Timeline and

| Shared Governance (est. 2023) | *faculty…"* and

"The Senate shall enjoy a full partnership with the College administration in the initiation and development of rules, policies, and procedures…" The Faculty Senate is the "official voice of the faculty".

Historically (for 20 years at least), President's Staff has operated with consensus as the goal and the gold standard for decision-making. The Senate President has always been only one of 8-13 members, so direct democracy would be utterly contradictory for shared governance. Thus, the heart of shared governance at Polk State has always been consensus among members of President's Staff and with the President. | 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 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.

Additionally, several executive administrators have made statements promoting the idea that Senate "**only looks at documents to give input**" or that "***bringing documents to Senate is just a professional courtesy***." That is not shared governance.

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 approval and before publication. Faculty Senate | issues with shared governance, and voting. As items are being sent to the Senate 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 President's Staff 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.

UPDATE April of 2024: The College President assured the FS President that she has asked President's Staff 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).] | was told this would be discussed in the June 2024 President's Staff meeting. |

In the event that there are substantive changes during President's Staff, 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.

| 3 | Full-Time Faculty Pay (est. 2017) | 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 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 | The *F/T Faculty Salary Schedule* 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 directly to the number of years of satisfactory service, and not confused with adjustment to faculty pay (raises).

UPDATE 2024: While it is difficult to determine without another salary study, subject-matter experts estimate that even after the 2023 | **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.)
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 workgroup met, and proposals were made based on the partial/incomplete Gallagher data released.
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 | **UPDATE AS OF 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 allows. The Gallagher report showed that faculty were 30% below market benchmarks when the study was conducted with 2020-21 data, meaning that *Faculty salaries would have needed* |

experience at other institutions (in terms of earnings and step level).

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.

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.

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.

meeting directly following the Budget Council meeting.

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 12 years (avg. +0.85% per year).

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 previously held back were implemented.)

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.

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

to be raised approximately 42% to reach the benchmark.

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

| | | | | 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 2023 from both the Provost and VP of HR. The request was repeated in May 2024. | 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 steps were used to fulfill the Gallagher-study, faculty have lost an additional **8%** in comparison to employees who <u>not</u> on a step system (they received "step equivalents" which are presumed to act like raises to the base salary for those employee groups - data pending to confirm*). This system further reduces the ability to attract faculty applicants and continues the repeated need for salary studies, where step-based employees (Career and Faculty) are always found to be the most behind market. ***Note: Faculty are currently awaiting the delivery of the public data from Administration (see item 11 and 12).*** |

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.	**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). **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.	**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.
5	Procedure 1006: Faculty Workload---F/T Faculty Point Restrictions and Other Issues (est. 2020)	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.	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.	**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). **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	**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.

		This was presented to Administration in the fall of 2020. **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.		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. **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. 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. **UPDATE 2022-23:** There has not been a consistent VP of Academics or Provost to work with to make changes for several years.	The Senate awaits Administrative action to initiate needed changes/corrections to this document. The 2017 version is currently in use. **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. *Note: The current and approved Procedure 1006 does not include any restriction for F/T Faculty 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.*

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 *Procedure 1006: Faculty Workload*). Along with this, the subcommittee was working to draft a new *Assessment Coordinator (AC) Procedure* "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 be 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, Julie Alexander. This item was expected to resume in fall 2022 with a newly assigned Administrative partner for the work group. **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: *Faculty Scheduling.* These revisions require a partner within Administration (see Procedure 1006).
7	Procedure 1024: Faculty Scheduling (est. 2020)	**AY 2020-21:** The Senate sub-committee that worked on *Procedure 1006: Faculty Workload* also reviewed *Procedure 1024: Faculty Scheduling*, 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.	**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.

				Update Nov 2023: Senate voted in Nov 2023 to rescind approval for all recommended changes.	
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 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 (*Procedure 6002: Committee System*). It does not	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 clarification of DCG's structure and role.	**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 information has passed through the committee as a completed discussion. The review of *Procedure 6073: Procedure on Rules and Procedures* 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	**UPDATE Spring 2024:** this procedure remains very incorrect, and it contradicts DBOT Rule 2.24 (Senate Constitution). The Senate shares full partnership with Admin in the development and implementation of Rules and Procedures and policies. Procedure 6073 is fatally flawed and remains a serious problem. The Senate is awaiting Administrative action and partnership to initiate review and repair of this document. **UPDATE May 2024:** Administration has not yet discussed making changes to this procedure.

		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.		2.24 which places the Senate in full partnership with Administration in College governance.	
9	Rules and Procedures-- Drift in Policies Due to Detachment of Supporting Documents, Guidelines, and Handbooks (est. 2018)	**AY 2021-2022:** 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. **UPDATE**: Faculty continue to find issues where manuals or other detached supporting items conflict	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.	**2022:** VP Julie Alexander agreed to begin work on this process in the spring/summer of 2022. **UPDATE 2023-24:** The Senate brought this issue up with the new Provost, Dr. Bratten, and Dr. Falconetti, and hopefully work will commence in the near future. **UPDATE Spring 2024:** 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.	**UPDATE May 2024:** 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 hanbooks 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

| | | with College Rules and Procedures, including Procedure 5026 Academic Dishonesty Procedure; Screening Committee Procedure and Manual; College Polices and Collegiate Handbooks; Faculty Handbook and Procedure 1006 (fixed); and others. | | | 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. |

10	Collegiate Faculty Handbook (est. 2023)	The creation of a new employee handbook was initiated in Spring of 2022. 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.	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.	**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 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.	**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.
11	Faculty Salary Steps (est. 2017; refer to Item 1)	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.	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	**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. _**A "step equivalent" produces a new standard pay level for many positions and this constitutes**_	**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. **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

		NOTE: In addition to the change in 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. *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." and it adds a new sentence, "New faculty may start no higher than Step 10 to give credit for previous experience." The appearance is that there has been a deliberate attempt to erase the historical link between steps and years of service during employment.*	President met twice with the President to discuss this in May 2024, and once with three additional VPs.	***an effective raise that is not reflected in the salary schedule. Note that there is no written progression plan for pro-tech or admin, which is required by DBOT Rule 3.16.*** 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>	Human Resources. He 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.
12	Academic Integrity (est. 2023-24)	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	Faculty Senate has been supportive of faculty involvement in the exploration of proctoring options and decisions. 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.	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. The Senate remains eager to partner for a revision of *Procedure 6056*, as it no longer reflects current practices.	Faculty Senate will meet on Monday, May 13 and Cody will deliver a presentation on the subject.

		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. 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. Additionally, *Polk State College Procedure 5026: Academic Dishonesty* 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.			

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)
14	Evaluation of Administrators; Compliance with Polk State Procedure 6009 (est. 2024)	Historically, per Procedure 6009: *Administrator's Performance Evaluation,* 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.		

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 range to another. In nearly all cases, the employee moves up one or more pay ranges.	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 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.	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 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.	
16	Screening Committees (2019--formally added 2023)	Polk State Procedure 6068: *Screening Committee* once had an attachment (Screening Committee Guidelines) that detailed how exactly screening committees operated with detailed steps, processes, and parameters. This document was therefore subject to open review through the shared governance model. But the attachment (entire manual) was removed several years ago without explanation or faculty input. The document is now subject to modification without faculty involvement, and it has changed significantly. Additionally, the process has been amended by emails and messages sent at different periods--these have also not been indicated in the procedure.	The Senate has asked several times over several years for the attachment to be returned to the procedure, so that shared governance can once again function. Additionally, the Senate has asked for a review of the process in order to reinforce the role of screening committee members and to ensure the value of their expert input.	To date, no action has been taken by Administration in response to concerns from the faculty or the Senate. The issues related to the detachment of processes and policies has been brought up during former President's Staff meetings.	

		Over the past years faculty have reported to the Senate and/or the Senate President on many occasions that their experience as a screening committee member has been negative. There are common reports that committee decisions are overruled by administration, that their recommendations are dismissed without explanation, or that there is an obvious sense that a candidate has been chosen for a job *before* the screening process began, thus reducing the screening process to a "facade".			

Compensation Questions (Sent to Administration and HR by request on July 26, 2023)

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 <u>entire</u> $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?