



# Quick-Look Assessment for Texas A&M University at Galveston

*Dec. 11, 2023*

Submitted by: Joe Pettibon and Deborah Wright



The Path Forward, adopted Dec. 14, 2021, by then-President M. Katherine Banks, cited a need to elevate the branch campuses, including the Galveston campus. The original MGT report for Texas A&M University and the subsequent Path Forward initiative had similar and varying impacts on the branch campuses as it did for the university as a whole. However, a second MGT report, titled Organizational Review Final Report, was commissioned specifically for the Galveston campus, specifically recognizing that the branch campuses are “crucial to reaching students statewide, delivering quality education and ensuring community outreach.” The second MGT report, dated Dec. 2, 2022, had not been acted upon prior to the change in leadership. This report then focuses on a high-level review of the Path Forward impacts in Galveston, considers the second MGT report recommendations, and suggests next steps for consideration by leadership.

## ***General Observations***

Texas A&M University at Galveston is the island campus of Texas A&M University and Texas’ premier marine and maritime public institution of higher education providing both undergraduate and graduate degrees, and driving research and innovation impacting the blue economy. Texas A&M University at Galveston is an important part of Texas A&M University’s mission to serve the state, nation and world, and one that is underutilized and under promoted by the main campus.

Texas A&M University at Galveston is one of two branch campuses (along with Texas A&M University at Qatar), one of two separately funded state agencies within the university (along with the Texas A&M University Health Science Center) and includes the Texas A&M Maritime Academy (TAMMA). TAMMA is the only maritime academy along the Gulf Coast and the only one that is part of a tier 1, AAU institution.

The Galveston campus is unique within the university which creates both opportunities and challenges in how it operates in conjunction with and independent from the campus in College Station. In some ways, the second MGT report was an attempt to recognize both the opportunities and challenges. The campus needs three fundamental approaches to thrive: (1) alignment with the main campus to allow improved collaboration, (2) flexibility to operate to capitalize on being able to be nimble and provide personalized services, and (3) improved awareness and support from College Station, including investments that enhance integration and strategic support.

The faculty and staff of the Galveston campus are dedicated and passionate about the campus and the university, and they have proven to be resilient in managing changes that have occurred, not just in the Path Forward but beyond. In some ways, this combination is driven by their strong desire for the campus to succeed and thrive, and deliver on its mission to impact the blue economy and our state, nation and world.

The campus has been both helped and hurt by its relationship to the College Station campus. It has been helped by being able to leverage the knowledge, expertise and scale of the College Station campus. It has been hurt at times by the failure of College Station campus at multiple levels to appreciate the impact of decisions and processes that inhibit the nimbleness and service quality that should and needs to exist in Galveston.

The biggest issues and threats to the Galveston campus stem from enrollment changes and trends, specifically (1) declining enrollments in marine and maritime specific disciplines which are the four-year offerings, (2) growth of engineering students which typically spend one to two years in Galveston, and (3) decreases in non-resident enrollments resulting from declining competitiveness of tuition pricing. These enrollment trends have had a direct impact on budgetary resources and culture.

Overall, many of the Path Forward changes have not resulted in major concerns across the board but are isolated to specific areas. The second MGT report had not been implemented and is able to be used as a tool for deliberative change rather than a top-down directive that would exacerbate existing issues.

However, the communication channels during and after Path Forward changes have left people feeling disconnected and created uncertainty about navigating issues, processes and support structures critical to the operation of the campus. Further, the approach with centralized units needs to be focused on partnership, not mandates. We need better discussions of decisions.

Like the College Station campus, academic program decisions, especially curricular choices, need to return to the faculty with less top-down directed solutions. This includes department and degree names, what programs should be proposed, and how academic units and programs must be structured.

Also, like the implementation of the Path Forward in College Station, employees expressed concerns over the solid line, dotted line reporting relationships and the appropriate evaluation of staff from a distance in College Station without input from local stakeholders.

Below are observations and recommendations on the initiatives resulting from the Path Forward plan as well as the MGT Organizational Review Final Report specifically for Galveston. This information and assessment reflect feedback collected from 20 meetings with individuals and groups. With the time lag between observations and the report publication, some of the issues raised have already been resolved. Those we became aware of during the creation of this report have been noted. It is also recognized that these observations and recommendations are limited and should be vetted further as these recommendations are not the only possible solutions.

- Organizational Review Components
  - Organizational Structure
  - Aggie Student Experience
  - Communications
  - Student Affairs
  - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
  - Academic Programs
  - Sea Grant Mission
- The Path Forward Components
  - Centralization of Facilities
  - Centralization of Finance and Business Services
  - Centralization of Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness (HROE)
  - Centralization of Technology Services
  - Centralization of Marketing and Communications
  - Restructuring of University Libraries
  - Centralized Advising
  - Faculty Affairs

## ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW COMPONENTS

### Organizational Structure

#### **Observations:**

- The recommendations in the Organizational Review Final Report are not innovative nor do they address the core threats and needs of the Galveston campus. While there is some merit to aligning functions and units with the main campus for improved collaboration and engagement, the broader issue is how to advance the mission of the Galveston campus.
- In discussions of the report, an alternative idea for organizing the marine and maritime academic degree programs of the campus as a school/college under a dean emerged which has the potential to create the kind of change necessary to elevate the campus.
- The dean for this school/college would then align with the deans in College Station with a direct line reporting relationship to the Provost and Executive Vice President (EVP) of the university with a dotted line to the Chief Operating Officer (COO) and Vice President (VP) of the Galveston campus.
- The new school/college is believed to have the potential to elevate the research, teaching and outreach mission combined with the proximity to industry partners, the industrial port and tourism hub to transform the campus.
- Students support the school/college concept with a dean but think there needs to be more discussion with all constituents, including current and former students and external partners.
- Concerns with department heads who have multiple departments to manage due to turnover and depth.
- Many people expressed concerns over staff pay that is not competitive with other local colleges and the higher cost of living in Galveston compared with College Station is not always recognized.
- If we are one campus, then treat us as one campus.
- If it goes through College Station, everyone knows it adds at least two more weeks.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The creation of a school/college housing the Galveston campus academic programs and units should be pursued with the dean reporting directly to the Provost and EVP with a dotted line to the COO and VP. Careful consideration should be given to ensure the dean's authority is appropriate and consistent with other deans, including direct oversight of the school/college budget and has day-to-day management authority of select central functions.
- In addition, consideration should be given for a dotted line reporting relationship of the Associate Dean of Engineering in Galveston to the COO and VP like the newly created dean.
- Instead of specifically funding five faculty lines for the Department of Oceanography in Galveston, College Station leadership should consider an investment of Available University Funds (AUF) in the base budget of the Galveston campus to address highest strategic needs after receiving a formal proposal from the COO and VP.

### Aggie Student Experience

#### **Observations:**

- Engineering at Galveston
  - With the Engineering at Galveston making up a large percentage of the Galveston student population, more efforts are needed to build incentives for students to come to Galveston. Two suggestions were made: (1) directly admit to the engineering majors offered at Galveston rather than requiring students to start in general engineering and (2) allow the major in Marine

Engineering Technology to be an available major for general engineering students in College Station or Galveston through Entry to a Major (ETAM).

- There needs to be more promotion of the engineering majors available in Galveston.
- Students in Engineering at Galveston are not able to see full schedules and register across separate terms which do not recognize time conflicts. Students are served unequally.
- Concern that reporting on facilities is not picking up College Station students enrolled in Galveston facilities and thus underreported to the state.
- Galveston staff cannot help Engineering at Galveston students because they don't have the necessary access and must direct them to College Station.
- Recruitment:
  - Recruiting materials were viewed by students to be outdated with poor information and a lack of materials at recruiting fairs, all of which are being addressed currently.
  - Recruiting was centralized to the main campus prior to the report being finalized in anticipation of the centralization of recruitment in College Station. The centralization in College Station did not occur as planned, so this move was premature.
  - We have been getting out-recruited, so it is great to have access to the College Station recruiting machine.
  - Demand for TAMMA graduates are high, but we are not graduating enough of them. Need to be more creative and active with recruiting strategies like Maine's recruiting agreements in the Rio Grande Valley.
  - Down to 336 cadets in the TAMMA and we should be almost twice that number.
  - The centralization of recruitment brought some benefits in the recruitment efforts, such as enhancing the space on campus for prospective student visits and improved alignment of the high school recruitment processes in the Galveston/Houston region. It is not clear the collaboration for recruitment is occurring in other regions of the state and out of state.
  - College Station expanded name purchases to capture more oceanography interest to enhance recruiting.
  - Galveston recruiters also supported graduate recruitment in the past, but no longer do.
  - Lost access to dorm room for showcasing with campus tours to promote, especially since students under 21 are required to live on campus.
- Enrollment Management:
  - Galveston staff divided across multiple College Station groups with no cohesive oversight.
  - Centralization also resulted in significant challenges to having an overall enrollment services function within Galveston and an opportunity for strategic collaborations and decisions to effect change in enrollments in Galveston.
  - Galveston reported challenges in all enrollment management functions including recruitment, admissions, scholarships, financial aid, student records and registration processes.
  - Overall enrollment is down almost 1,000 students in maritime/marine degrees over last eight years. This reduction is partially obscured in the overall enrollment numbers due to the increase of approximately 800 College of Engineering students on the Galveston Campus during the same timeframe.
- Student Records/Registrar-related:
  - Lack of local control is an issue in student records. Old model wasn't right; neither is the new model; need a better solution.
  - Updating classroom assignments in the scheduling system used to be in real-time and can now take 48 hours to complete. Need local access and control from the Registrar. The Schedule Builder has created difficulty for students across multiple term codes. Facilities planning and reporting is disjointed and difficult to ensure compliance, especially given the small campus size.
  - Cannot get embossed transcript for intramural teams due to lack of access to the registrar services in Galveston.
- Scholarships, Financial Aid and Veterans Benefits:

- Lost insight into scholarship administration and the ability to make judgments locally on how best to utilize resources.
- Use of scholarships for recruiting has been lost with some scholarships awarded after the fall semester starts. Prior asks for dedicated recruiting scholarships went unfulfilled, but this has been resolved with a dedicated \$75,000 now.
- An external partner raised concerns with College Station staff responsiveness over scholarships.
- Lack of visibility in Galveston on accounts for financial aid and how it is utilized. Financial aid needs to be better integrated into an enrollment strategy for Galveston.
- Veteran representative is needed in Galveston. It's a nightmare trying to do paperwork over the phone. A specific example given was taking 1.5 months to resolve an issue with courses not counting for the GI Bill. "They try hard."
- It seemed that every student on the ship this summer had issues with financial aid in some way.
- Financial aid support for advisors is lacking. People in Galveston cannot assist and don't have appropriate contacts, i.e., names of people to call in College Station for help with Hazlewood, courses not counting, etc.
- Non-resident tuition waiver for scholarships at \$4,000 instead of \$1,000 is negatively impacting enrollments. Lack of a waiver of differential tuition for license option students who pay in-state statutory tuition already is negatively impacting enrollments.
- Tuition pricing policies are hurting relationships with other Gulf Coast states and potentially increasing the threat to enrollment goals if another Gulf Coast state creates a maritime academy or partners with another institution.
- Other Aggie Student Experience:
  - International student resources are lacking locally in Galveston.
  - Unclear who is responsible for Galveston reporting accuracy.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Reestablish a centralized enrollment service unit within the Galveston campus. Continue the alignment of the recruitment strategy and support from College Station with a dotted line but return the personnel to the newly established centralized enrollment service unit or ensure that the overall strategy can be managed by Galveston leadership within existing structure.
- Create a task force between College Station and Galveston to either integrate Galveston fully into the College Station term code like the Texas A&M Health Science Center or address all barriers in the existing structure for student, faculty and staff serving in Galveston.
- Scholarships and Financial Aid should establish a higher-level position in Galveston and ensure appropriate staffing and training across aid programs. In addition, the lead position in Galveston should have access to accounting information and be involved in scholarship management.
- Investigate whether any other scholarships and financial aid programs which are available to students on the main campus might also be made available for students in Galveston to avoid location changes hurting students financially and bring consistency to treatment of students across campuses.
- The Galveston campus should pursue a change in the competitive scholarship waiver in support of the TAMMA students to establish the \$1,000 threshold and/or waiver differential tuition for license option students.
- Galveston and the Division of Student Affairs in College Station should pursue a reciprocal arrangement to allow any enrolled student within Texas A&M University that pays a recreation center fee on either campus to access either campus' recreation center without additional cost to the student, taking into account any legal limitations.

## **Communications**

### ***Observations:***

- Website for retirees was changed regarding a Google account which says it applies to College Station retirees. It does not apply to Galveston, and it was not communicated.
- Top-down communications need to do a better job of considering remote staff and how it impacts them and/or how to coordinate messaging across remote sites.
- Facebook ads for Galveston campus lacked TAMMA references.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Specific steps should be taken and communicated on how administrative and operational communications will be improved from College Station and internally to Galveston.

## **Student Affairs**

### ***Observations:***

- Got Division of Student Affairs right with dotted line to College Station!
- Communications and collaborations working well, but really were already doing it.
- Student organizations moving into the StuAct system in College Station is beneficial, including access to Student Organization Finance Center (SOFC), Good Bull Fund and to College Station student orgs.
- Meal plans and parking solved across College Station and Galveston.
- Bring Sea Camp into student affairs, currently in academic affairs.
- Previous reviews did not understand the Texas A&M Maritime Academy (TAMMA).
- Counseling is integral to student affairs and remains in place.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Keep as-is. No changes are recommended.

## **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**

### ***Observations:***

- The MGT report called for changes in Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, but with the passage of Senate Bill 17, this was not pursued in the review.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Continue with the implementation of S.B. 17 requirements.

## Academic Programs

### *Observations:*

- The combining of Department of Marine Biology and the Department of Marine Sciences is not supported by the faculty, and there is strong support for rejecting this proposed merger.
- Students, however, expressed a preference to combine departments to improve course availability and more variety in the curriculum. From their perspective, it is time to move forward as the discussion of this merger comes up every few years.
- Some also suggest revamping Marine Biology degree program to improve competition with TAMU-Corpus Christi.
- Renaming of the Department of Liberal Studies to the Department of Marine Studies appears to have been received well by students, less so by faculty.

### *Recommendations:*

- Unless the merger of the departments is supported by the faculty or there is expected to be a strong long-term benefit, the merger of the Department of Marine Biology and the Department of Marine Sciences should not be pursued. However, faculty of both departments should investigate how they might better serve students in both programs given student input.
- If the faculty do not support the renaming of the Department of Liberal Studies, respect the faculty recommendation.

## Sea Grant Mission

### *Observations:*

- The plans to relocate faculty to Galveston from the Department of Oceanography or even to hire some faculty lines in Galveston for the Department of Oceanography are opposed by the faculty in the Department of Oceanography. Faculty have not been adequately engaged on the goals or value of such a transition.
- The selling of the GERG building and the moving of the equipment and personnel is fraught with concerns from the faculty regarding the significant disruption of their research and the potential negative ramifications if equipment fails to reinitiate after the move.
- The financial plans for the move have not been adequately developed.

### *Recommendations:*

- Do not relocate the Department of Oceanography department to Galveston nor sell the GERG building. Any changes in location, in whole or in part, should be faculty-led and recommended.



## THE PATH FORWARD COMPONENTS

### Centralization of Facilities

#### *Observations:*

- No significant change in the operations of facilities was reported as the Galveston campus had a liaison to SSC that has remained in place, and they continue to operate in that model.
- Some reports of SSC being understaffed in Galveston and lack appropriate training.
- Galveston maintained their shared governance process (comparable to Council for Built Environment (CBE) that was in College Station) for facilities.

#### *Recommendations:*

- No changes are recommended.

### Centralization of Finance and Business Services

#### *Observations:*

- The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for the Galveston campus remained as a direct report of the COO and VP of the Galveston campus. The change to a direct report in College Station did not occur, similar with Texas A&M Health.
- However, business services staff within Galveston departments were centralized within the Galveston campus which created some disruption, particularly in academic departments.
- Business staff in academic departments served as administrative staff, faculty partners, handled HROE duties, finance duties and more. Each department had one, now they are only business staff creating orphan duties like immigration processing for faculty hiring. Some orphan duties are reportedly falling to graduate students.
- Financial management services was the first group to centralize to College Station many years ago before Path Forward and it has been successful, in part, because it is really 100% about process, not strategic.
- Contracts are a black hole in College Station. We know where to submit but don't know who to talk to, process takes too long.
- Sole sources on contracts in College Station often fail to include Galveston and Galveston has to do the same contract and a separate sole source. Can't we include Galveston in purchasing contracts and master orders?
- Concerns raised over the implementation and management of study abroad fees and lack of transparency in the usage.
- Centralizing business staff has increased accountability across the institution.
- Staff consistently raised concerns regarding compensation levels and consistency with College Station and Galveston market.

#### *Recommendations:*

- Do not decentralize the business staff, but ensure the departments have an administrative staff person who can assume duties that are not appropriate to the centralized business staff.
- The Division of Finance and Business Services continuous improvement committee should review improvements to purchasing and contracting processes to address Galveston concerns.
- Galveston leadership should work with the Division of Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness (HROE) on a plan to address compensation levels as budget resources become available.

## Centralization of Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness (HROE)

### **Observations:**

- The entire Human Resources office in Galveston was centralized and reporting lines changed to the College Station campus and placed under Hub 5 with the lead person from Galveston being elevated to oversee Hub 5 which includes all remote locations, including the Qatar campus.
- Significant concerns were expressed about the loss of the lead person in Galveston to this broader role, diminishing their focus on the needs of the Galveston campus, especially due to vacancies in the other remote locations.
- Changes in compensation for personnel occurred without discussion with the COO and VP, creating potential budgetary challenges and equity/morale issues for others in Galveston.
- Leadership in HROE is responsive to the COO and VP, but others are experiencing more challenges. However, this may be on a path to working as the work is 80% about processes.
- Concerns that some research faculty related personnel actions are being interpreted differently between College Station HROE, Hub 5 HROE, Faculty Affairs and the Division of Research.
- Concerns over training issues with Hub 5 personnel manifested in hiring, insurance questions and having to provide information multiple times.
- Challenges getting staff hired to support the engineering labs. Insufficient graduate numbers to pull from and thus staff needed, but four weeks into the semester and still don't have them.
- Concerns about access to handle timesheets and one-time payments in departments with specific programs like Sea Grant and Summer Cruise. HROE required they handle with unit providing information. Yet, incorrect amounts entered at times and payroll reports not checked. Business team in departments handled previously and now rely on HROE to get right.
- Processing times to get student workers on payroll was an issue as students were not receiving proper training for camps with minors, and in some cases, performing work anyway while not on payroll. However, it appears this issue has been corrected based on more recent hiring practices.
- Background checks not completed timely for camps.
- HROE rolled out Jobs for Aggies for student employment job processes without any real training or explanation of the benefits. Previously used WorkDay to advertise student positions. WorkDay supported application screening and hiring committees, but Jobs for Aggies does not. Felt like a step backwards and double work.
- Business staff previously terminated student workers who graduated automatically to ensure they were not paid inadvertently and close out positions, but now HROE only allows the supervisor or chain of command to authorize a termination. They shouldn't get paid without a timesheet anyway, but a best practice was lost.
- Unlike the main campus, there was no splitting of business staff in the academic departments, so this process did not have the same effect of creating orphan duties in the department based on the HROE changes.
- WorkDay does not accommodate matrix reporting structure to provide appropriate visibility on personnel like leave, AWL, etc.

### **Recommendations:**

- HROE and the COO and VP of Galveston should work to establish more local control in Galveston befitting the nature of a branch campus with administrative control. In the absence of this agreement, the Galveston campus should follow the newly established Assistant Dean for Business Services model for human resources support.

## Centralization of Technology Services

### **Observations:**

- The Technology Services function was already centralized within the Galveston campus, and operationally, the function was centralized to College Station, the Executive Director at Galveston remains a solid line, direct report in WorkDay to the Executive Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs in Galveston.
- The current model is working according to all parties, so why change the solid line to College Station.
- Concerns have been expressed that a full change in the reporting lines and centralization to College Station will negatively impact responsiveness and slow processes down; purchasing approvals in College Station was specifically mentioned.
- College Station faculty and students located on the Galveston campus are not identifiable in data feeds, creating issues with Rec Center and Library access in Galveston.
- Loss of privileges in Technology Services systems that directly affect Galveston employees, including O365, Azure and others.
- College Station makes changes in systems affecting Galveston employees, students or retirees and we only find out about when someone reports a problem.
- TeamDynamix Help Desk implementation is raising concerns on timeliness of routing, but too soon to tell. However, the project is being implemented as an unfunded mandate with undefined financial impacts to Galveston. Will it exceed current \$16,000 per year cost?
- Engineering is not adequately supporting the need for computers for their faculty and staff in Galveston raising concerns about commitment to support the programs and sending a poor message.
- Physical security controls are under SSC for building access and keys rather than under someone employed by the university.
- Meetings and relationships are well established and working well across multiple areas.

### **Recommendations:**

- Keep the current reporting structure in place and do not fully centralize. The nature of Galveston as a branch campus warrants a different structure with Technology Services reporting to the COO and VP.
- Move physical security controls for building access and keys under direct control of a university employee.

## Centralization of Marketing and Communications

### **Observations:**

- The entire Marketing and Communications team in Galveston was centralized and reporting lines changed in WorkDay to the College Station campus, and the lead person from Galveston was elevated to oversee other locations.
- Significant concerns were expressed about the loss of the lead person in Galveston to this broader role, diminishing their focus on the needs of the Galveston campus, as well as a lack of communication and discussion with the COO and VP regarding changes.
- Concerns expressed that College Station MarComm does not understand the needs of the Galveston campus.
- Galveston absolutely needs College Station MarComm support, but Galveston MarComm should be only a dotted line to College Station.
- There is increased collaboration happening in some areas, like media releases.
- Centralized MarComm in College Station needs to do a better job of highlighting the Galveston campus in its promotional ads, videos, websites and other marketing materials, including pictures of Galveston activities.

- It was stated that MarComm is 10% process and 90% strategic and therefore, should be driven more by the Galveston leadership.
- Better access to senior leadership in College Station due to centralization with immediate responsiveness and improved transparency.
- It was stated that MarComm is a dumping ground for orphan duties in Galveston.
- Marketing research data access with College Station is adding value.
- Improvements in recruiting materials resulting from centralization and working with enrollment management marketing team in College Station.
- Internal communications broken in Galveston, but unrealistic expectations from some.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Implement the same model being established on the main campus with the deans whereby the Marketing Director for Galveston would be a direct report to the COO and VP of Galveston with operational oversight of the marketing and communications team supporting Galveston. The team would remain part of the centralized Division of Marketing and Communications.

## **Restructuring of University Libraries**

### ***Observations:***

- The decision to remove faculty and tenure from University Libraries impacted employees on the Galveston campus at the same time, something many people did not realize in College Station.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Continue the rebuild of University Libraries and ensure the personnel in Galveston are appropriately supported and resourced.

## **Centralized Advising**

### ***Observations:***

- Advising centralized and every marine/maritime department now has a professional advisor.
- Service improvements noted by some departments, including positive reviews of having their first professional advisor.
- Concerns expressed that you cannot access in-person advising in engineering, but have to work online back to advisors in College Station.
- Engineering communications are sent about College Station workshops not offered in Galveston.
- Specific issue that some courses not offered in Galveston in the spring (ex: linear algebra) and needed advice on how to manage and could not get answers from advisors.
- Challenges expressed with being able to pursue minors in Galveston. One example was taking multiple semesters to get a minor added. Another issue is minors are advertised as available in Galveston, but they cannot access courses in Galveston (ex: Spanish). A third issue is minors (ex: Geology) don't recognize Galveston coursework that is similar and could substitute.
- EAB Navigate is limited to advisors and others, like a program manager, are not able to access. Broaden access.
- Advisor pay differences between engineering and other Galveston advisors is an issue.
- Advising staff in Galveston cannot help all students in Galveston – access is too limited.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Galveston leadership should work with HROE to establish equity in pay across advising positions, consistent with any changes in the academic advisor career path.

## **Faculty Affairs**

### ***Observations:***

- Processing team in Office of Faculty Affairs in College Station is fabulous to work with and responsive.
- Constant changes of processes and/or forms without notice is a challenge (ex: appointment letters for faculty).
- Mandatory Aug. 1 start date and mandatory training had differential impacts in Galveston, including (1) budget for additional pay and travel costs for one week and (2) timing of training for some faculty was problematic due to requirements to serve at sea. Faculty returning from summer cruise assignment should not be made to immediately travel for training.
- Forcing department heads who work more than 12 months, but have 11-month appointments to not get paid in the 12th month resulted in individuals unexpectedly not getting a payment for August as communication of the change was lacking between Office of Faculty Affairs and HROE.
- Common hire dates are a challenge for faculty adjuncts and for emergency hires. There is a perception that some delays in hiring are caused by HROE not having enough space in the onboarding session to accommodate the number of new hires needed to process.
- Faculty One File is not consistently available due to local network controls in Galveston that IT was working to resolve but had not been at time of meetings.
- Galveston wants a new faculty orientation in January.
- Concerns raised over summer appointments for research faculty and payroll issues.
- Lack of understanding of Department of Marine Transportation faculty as some are terminal degree with a bachelor's with the license.

### ***Recommendations:***

- Office of Faculty Affairs should offer a new faculty orientation for the spring semester and provide flexibility for Galveston faculty who may have other commitments preventing engagement.