

TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA
NEGOTIATION MEETING
February 17th, 2020
Eastern Florida State College
Melbourne Campus
Student Union
Melbourne, Florida

The transcript of the United Faculty of
Florida Negotiation Meeting taken before Diane Lynch, Court
Reporter, held on the 17th day of February, 2020,
commencing at 2:00 p.m.

RYAN REPORTING
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS
1670 S. FISKE BOULEVARD
ROCKLEDGE, FLORIDA 32955
(321) 636-4450
FAX: (321) 633-0972

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

EASTERN FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE:

DR. SANDY HANDFIELD

DR. LINDA MIEDEMA

DARLA FERGUSON

BARBARA KENNEDY

UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA:

DUSTIN FILES

ANDREW LIEB

ROBIN BOGGS

DR. DEBRA MARSHALL

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 DR. MIEDEMA: All right. This is the opener for
3 this year. What we talked a little bit about, just so
4 everybody's up to speed on it, is rather than taking a
5 look at just one article, to look at one issue, one
6 topic. And if it affected more than one article, that
7 we'd look at those things to open them up. And the
8 reason for that was, next year is the opener, and I
9 won't be here to do the negotiations. So if we can
10 handle --

11 MR. LIEB: And I would like to kind of put on the
12 record, too, that it's been a very nice collaborative
13 the last couple years, and I do want to say on behalf
14 of our side, and faculty, that we really do appreciate
15 it. Thank you for helping foster an environment. And
16 also for -- just for the staff side too, and
17 administration, that it's nice to see this moving
18 towards that direction where we do appreciate
19 everything that all the provosts, all the admins,
20 everybody are doing. Sometimes we don't get to say
21 it, but we do appreciate that.

22 DR. MIEDEMA: Thank you. If there's one thing
23 I'm proud of over the last few years, it is that we
24 move towards a collaboration. Because I really think
25 that's the only way that you make headway. And I will

1 miss that part of it. The paperwork, not so much.

2 DR. HANDFIELD: We'll call you and let you know
3 what's going on.

4 DR. MIEDEMA: So I'll turn it over to Andrew
5 first.

6 MR. LIEB: We can talk about our issue that we
7 want to raise, which is evaluation. But before I do
8 that, I did want to kind of throw out a couple things
9 that, while not for bargaining this year, have to deal
10 with the UFF Brevard survey that we did. In the
11 spirit of that collaboration, we want to share things
12 that we think could be addressed, even outside the
13 contract, if it's a way for us all to improve, we
14 could.

15 DR. MIEDEMA: Absolutely.

16 MR. LIEB: To start with, though, I will say that
17 salary was specifically excluded from this survey.
18 However, it had the single highest write-in response.
19 We are not trying to open it into a full book
20 bargaining, as we previously discussed. We know that
21 we're trying to allow administration the proper time
22 to budget and prepare for a much more serious money
23 negotiation with the full book. But I did want to
24 pass along that that's -- even when I tell them I
25 don't want that response, that is still my number one

1 response.

2 The other one was -- or another one of the four
3 was You-do-it. And faculty continuing to request for
4 additional assistance with the ADA compliance stuff.
5 Whether it is with the closed captioning or how to
6 format. Because we've had some great workshops, that
7 kind of stuff, but people still are feeling kind of
8 inundated with the overwhelming sometimes seemingly
9 workload. And it ranged from that workload side to
10 the technical. But we had some suggestions with it,
11 but, obviously, it's just -- one suggestion that
12 somebody made was a designated staff member to oversee
13 and provide direct support. In other words, give them
14 the authority to say, yes, or no. I mean, we have
15 Jessica Dillow, who does a wonderful job helping, I'd
16 say, all of us probably at some point or other. But
17 at the end of the day, she doesn't have the ability to
18 say, no, that can't be that way, to somebody, to where
19 that could be helpful. And the implementation of an
20 improved tracking system, similar to what assessment
21 uses, to where we could just have a faculty member log
22 in, and if it pulls from Banner, and it says, okay,
23 how many errors, how many suggestions, any commentary
24 about your errors. Versus, right now, we are
25 essentially having the department chairs collect and

1 put it all together, which is fine for a short term
2 solution, but chasing after faculty can be somewhat
3 challenging.

4 DR. MIEDEMA: One of the things that will help
5 with that piece of it that we are working on currently
6 is, we are working on getting a new chief information
7 officer position filled. And the candidates we talked
8 to, we talked about some of those things specifically.
9 Because we know that there are concerns to be able to
10 automate wherever we can automate. And I'm very
11 comfortable with the top candidates, that they have
12 that background and that interest, and they have also
13 stated that they feel that they're -- one of their
14 primary areas of attention is going to have to be
15 academics. Because that's where the bulk of the
16 changes and things that need to be done need to be
17 done. So I'm very positive that that's something we
18 want to continue to work on.

19 MR. LIEB: That's awesome.

20 DR. MIEDEMA: Even when I'm no longer here. And
21 I'll put my quarter in.

22 DR. HANDFIELD: We have a jar going, every time
23 she says I'm retiring or I'm leaving.

24 DR. MIEDEMA: I have to put a quarter in.

25 DR. HANDFIELD: So we're going to do lunch when

1 she leaves.

2 MR. LIEB: That's going to be a nice lunch.
3 Another thing on there was the faculty schedule form.
4 It was something that I wasn't really aware, looking
5 at, until someone pointed out, to those of us that
6 don't teach these other semesters, like an eight-week
7 first or second, that if you put it on your schedule
8 now, it looks like you're there the entire semester,
9 when, in fact, you're not. Which is why I was trying
10 to schedule a meeting with Robin, and unbeknownst to
11 me, she did not have class on that Monday for the
12 first four weeks.

13 DR. MIEDEMA: Well, that is one of the topics
14 within our scheduling that we want to propose as we
15 look at it. And that's exactly -- so that's very
16 good.

17 MR. LIEB: And then the last one was the
18 plagiarism, just seeing a sharp uptick in academic
19 dishonesty rates. And I don't know if it's due to
20 places that Course Hero, not just, you know,
21 SparkNotes and the ones like that. But now, this is
22 an online repository that, essentially, students take
23 your documents that you give them, and they upload
24 them. One of our faculty members went and found her
25 syllabus right there. And some of them don't feel

1 that it's necessarily wrong to take that and then
2 submit it to you as an assignment, which is
3 problematic. We'd like to kind of establish some
4 clear process for faculty, just to track it. To
5 where, has this student been counseled about
6 plagiarism? If they have, that means that I can treat
7 this very differently than if they haven't. One idea
8 that we had or we talked about at AAC was a creation
9 of a one sheet, to where it just has different tiers.
10 If you resolve it the first time with the instructor,
11 nothing else -- no further action needed, great, you
12 fill it out, that part, and sign it. You'd give it,
13 in my mind, to the associate provost, who could scan
14 it to some kind of data store or repository. And then
15 just put a simple line in Banner, in the comments
16 screen, saying the student was counseled regarding
17 plagiarism on. So that if I have a student who
18 becomes -- who I catch plagiarizing, I can e-mail the
19 associate provost and say, hey, has this person been
20 counseled for this before?

21 DR. MIEDEMA: I think that's a great idea. It'd
22 be a similar tracking mechanism to what we use for
23 CATS and some of those other programs. It's just
24 remodeling that. And, again, I think when we get this
25 new person on -- Jose has been very responsive to

1 requests that we've made in the last week too, so I
2 think we're on a good track. But I think that's an
3 excellent point. I agree. I think we need to look at
4 those things.

5 So those are just the survey highlights. And
6 then the second page in there was the re-openers that
7 we were looking at. And we said evaluations, so we
8 tried to pick one that would allow us to touch on a
9 lot of things that clean up any lingering language
10 that we might have found. This was the one. So for
11 us, we were looking for kind of a two-fold process.
12 One, a revision of the current evaluation and forms.
13 And then two is the creation of a new evaluation and
14 form. Specifically, one that allows for feedback with
15 supervisors, to where I think it's something you guys
16 would like to have. Like we have the student-faculty
17 opinion surveys. Essentially, creating something of
18 similar design that would work for the immediate
19 supervising administrator. As well as one for the
20 college level too, for, like, the president or vice
21 president, again, with only questions pertaining to
22 what faculty may be interacting. Because I don't
23 think I or anybody else is going to pretend for a
24 minute to understand completely what every one of
25 those duties are that are, you know, done, but we

1 could talk about larger -- if it was the president
2 one, for example, you know, vision for the college,
3 those kinds of questions. Supervising administrator
4 could be, you know, effectively communicate or
5 responds within a reasonable time, those kinds of
6 things, just to provide it as a wholesale thing, just
7 to deal with evaluations. And we could also, I
8 believe, if I looked at some of this -- some of the
9 Aspen Award finalists have something of a similar
10 nature, to where you could have feedback going both
11 directions. Said it fostered that open communication
12 environment. So those were kind of -- I know that's a
13 lot in there. It is all on that second page, though,
14 the different areas. Like, with the evaluation forms,
15 I think we probably should start there. And most of
16 those are going to be, I think, fairly easy. It's
17 largely simplifying, I think. I mean, when I went
18 through and looked at several of the different
19 college-wide and coordinator ones, the -- we
20 essentially just cloned the same evaluation that --
21 it's not really perhaps needed. Department chairs are
22 either doing their responsibilities that are listed,
23 or they're not. And so we can create a simple one
24 sheet that deals with their responsibilities, and do
25 that for each one of those. And that way we don't

1 have this four-page, five-page monster to fill out for
2 every department chair, every program coordinator,
3 every manager on you all's side, and then for the peer
4 review side of the same issue.

5 DR. MIEDEMA: We have two things we would like to
6 bring into consideration when you're looking at the
7 current evaluation and the forms. One is the area of
8 the student appraisal, student feedback. Right now is
9 kind of a difficult process, because you have to send
10 it out, and faculty have to opt in which two classes
11 they want to have. If you're annual contract, it's
12 supposed to be all of them. If you're on a continuing
13 contract, it's supposed to be two. Because that form,
14 the feedback you get from the students, is reviewed by
15 you, we'd like to just see that everybody -- just make
16 it simple and have everybody fill it out. Whether
17 they choose to or not is certainly up to them. We're
18 not going to mandate it, like they've done at some
19 colleges. At some colleges, you can't get your final
20 grade until you fill out your evaluation. And I don't
21 think we want to force students to do an evaluation,
22 because I think that skews the results. And we aren't
23 looking at this as any kind of punitive, it's just a
24 management system. If we could just --

25 MR. LIEB: So, essentially, same system, just

1 have all of the ones enabled so we don't have to keep
2 enabling and disabling?

3 DR. MIEDEMA: Yeah. So that's one of the things
4 that we had talked about doing. We also would like to
5 see something in the evaluation that address
6 participating in program assessment. Because we are
7 running into a few concerns here and there with
8 specific programs that affect our programmatic
9 accreditation, but we're not getting the feedback that
10 we need from faculty on how -- on the assessment of
11 their courses and their program, which is required by
12 their --

13 MR. LIEB: Even though it's listed under the
14 faculty responsibilities in Article 8?

15 DR. MIEDEMA: Yes. Yes. So we are in a
16 situation where we are at risk with one of our
17 programs right now because we're not getting that
18 feedback.

19 DR. MARSHALL: So what you're saying is, you want
20 something specific on the faculty evaluation form
21 where the supervisor can --

22 DR. MIEDEMA: Yeah.

23 MR. LIEB: Like a check box or something, the --

24 DR. MIEDEMA: Yes, no, or not applicable. If
25 it's a program that doesn't have one of those, then

1 you don't have to worry about it. But there should be
2 something there that puts a little more emphasis on
3 the fact that assessments need to be done.

4 MR. LIEB: Okay. And one thing we're looking at,
5 too, is the modality. Because we have increased
6 different types of offerings, between hybrids, between
7 lecture, between online, between lab, all these
8 different variables, that we want to find a way to
9 kind of make the form more flexible for that too. To
10 where if a faculty member's predominantly teaching
11 labs, but we go to -- like in welding, we'll use that
12 for an example. He's phenomenal in the lab. He's
13 good in the classroom, but he's phenomenal in the lab.
14 But we've only ever evaluated him based on that
15 classroom. Unless you've gone by and seen him in the
16 middle of the day working with the students, it
17 doesn't --

18 DR. MIEDEMA: Doesn't translate.

19 MR. LIEB: -- translate. To where that's what
20 makes him such a great instructor. That and the
21 connections with industry. But it's just the way he's
22 able to work in the lab, not teaching the classroom
23 side of it.

24 DR. MIEDEMA: Well, we do the same thing in
25 nursing clinicals, we don't evaluate --

1 MR. LIEB: Right. So that'd be another modality.

2 DR. MIEDEMA: -- in the nursing clinicals at all.

3 DR. HANDFIELD: So doing all sections would
4 address that.

5 MR. LIEB: Sort of. But for the observational
6 side, it would be challenging. But we'd have to
7 figure out a way that works, to where it's not overly
8 burdensome, of everything is going to always be
9 observed, but figure out how do we open up to allow
10 those things to be observed if that's what the choice
11 that was made. And then the other part of that goes
12 along with the written goals and assessments and
13 figuring how to perhaps work those in, and in a better
14 and more unified way. Instead of having to go back
15 and find my old evaluations, and say, what were my
16 goals again? To where we could find a way to either
17 adjust that or re-envision it, to where it's something
18 that we could find more useful.

19 DR. MIEDEMA: I have no problem with that. I
20 think that's a good thing for us to work towards. And
21 like you said, it does address -- attach itself to a
22 lot of different areas within the contract. And I
23 think to clean those things up will make next year a
24 lot easier.

25 MR. LIEB: That's the hope.

1 DR. MIEDEMA: What we would like to address, just
2 so we can get the broad picture out there, is the area
3 of scheduling. And that also impacts a lot of
4 different areas. When you're scheduling -- as you
5 said, if you're doing a schedule that you're
6 submitting or posting, if it doesn't show a part of
7 term, it doesn't -- it's not real helpful. The same
8 thing happens with overload. You request overload,
9 and it makes a big difference, if you're teaching
10 overload in the summer and you got 400 points, but
11 you're doing three different sessions, or you're doing
12 400 points all in the same eight weeks, you know. And
13 it helps us as we start to take a look at that if we
14 have some kind of way of addressing part of term. So
15 that's one of things we would like to consider in that
16 area. We also realized as we went through, in our
17 area of definitions, one area we don't define that is
18 a scheduling concern is the definition of hybrid. And
19 hybrid has been considered in the past to be 50
20 percent online and 50 percent face-to-face. But we've
21 never really defined, is that 50 percent of the
22 student's time, or 50 percent of the faculty's time?

23 MR. LIEB: It's funny you should say that. We've
24 had basically an entire working group trying to figure
25 this out. But I think it'd be good to codify -- once

1 we figure out a recommendation that works for
2 everybody, to actually codify that in the contract. I
3 think it's a great idea.

4 DR. MIEDEMA: Exactly. So that's a piece that I
5 would like to see included in there, what that
6 definition might be, but we just need to take a look
7 at it. In Article 8.3, which is priority for
8 scheduling assignments, we have that big discussion
9 about how load is determined by the faculty or the
10 department chair. That it's tenured faculty, then
11 it's this, then it's this. Which is fine, but that's
12 really not a contractual thing between faculty and
13 administration, because we don't get involved until
14 there's a problem. I'm not sure that that benefits
15 anyone in the -- to have that language in the
16 contract, simply because we can't enforce that, we're
17 not there when you're doing the initial scheduling.
18 We're only getting it when there's a problem. So I'd
19 like to re-look at how that's worded in there, because
20 if it's faculty to faculty, do you need it in the
21 contract? Because it's not faculty --

22 MR. LIEB: I think as long as we create --
23 establish the boundaries of the faculty side of it and
24 make it clear that it's a -- that's the --

25 DR. MIEDEMA: It's a faculty --

1 MR. LIEB: To where, if there's a conflict
2 between the two tenured faculty, you guys need to know
3 at least that, hey, this was followed. So I think I
4 understand what you're saying. Not saying to
5 eliminate that stuff, you're saying to -- how can we
6 make it clear that this is the faculty responsibility,
7 this is --

8 DR. MIEDEMA: I don't want Sandy to be
9 responsible for vet tech, as an example, scheduling,
10 when she wasn't there when they had the discussion.
11 Because how does she know that it was done? But if
12 there's a conflict, then she goes back and says, okay,
13 how did you do this? But she's not going to do that
14 for all 25 programs that she's responsible for, just
15 if there's a conflict that comes up.

16 MR. LIEB: And I think that the form that we were
17 piloting this semester and has since been revised, for
18 the schedule request form, I think that will help.

19 DR. MIEDEMA: I'm getting to that one too. One
20 of the things we want -- with that scheduling form and
21 looking at overload, that is part of the concern too,
22 is that we want to make sure faculty have the
23 opportunity for overload, but our current system does
24 not always allow the face to face campus to know what
25 has been approved online as overload, and vice versa.

1 So we'd like to make that a little more transparent.
2 And we're open for suggestions on that, but that is
3 one of the areas we'd really like to take a look at.
4 And then throughout the contract, we still refer to
5 e-learning. I'd just like to change that word if we
6 could.

7 MR. LIEB: I think we can probably come to an
8 agreement about that being a scrivener's error at this
9 point.

10 DR. MIEDEMA: Yes. That was kind of my thought
11 process. And then in Article 8.12, which it talks
12 about load points and how many faculty could
13 automatically have, we had conversations in the past
14 about a maximum load, and we've never come to any kind
15 of thought process on that. So what I would propose
16 to take a look at is to come up with what is a
17 reasonable max, and then put some language in there
18 that says, "unless mutually agreed to based on
19 exceptional academic need." There can be times that
20 it's going to need to be more than that. But to not
21 -- what I want to do is not to have everybody --
22 probably half the faculty right now, we're evaluating,
23 as a whole group of provosts, for the number of
24 overloads that they have. And that's a lot of time,
25 and it slows down the whole process. I don't want to

1 slow down the process. So my proposal would be that
2 we come up with some kind of maximum that would make
3 sense, but then to raise up the minimum to 90 points
4 from 60 points. So that within that first group,
5 where faculty have the right if there's a need, as
6 long as they have good evaluations, instead of being a
7 max of 60 points, we'd actually make that a max of 80
8 points. That is a simple process, it's just
9 immediately approved.

10 MR. LIEB: 80, or 90?

11 MR. FILES: You said 90 first.

12 DR. MIEDEMA: 90. Oh, did I say 80 the second
13 time? Sorry.

14 MS. FERGUSON: She's retiring.

15 MR. LIEB: I know that that's -- if we're talking
16 about a hard cap, it's something we definitely have to
17 talk about and have some longer conversation on our
18 side, because I can tell you that that will be a huge
19 issue with some people that I -- yes.

20 DR. MIEDEMA: And that's why I said --

21 MR. LIEB: Technically, the contract already
22 gives you the ability to do that. That's what I've
23 never understood.

24 DR. MIEDEMA: Yeah. We have the ability to say
25 no, but because we have not had a mutually agreeable

1 max, we have been hesitant to say no. Because when it
2 comes to overload, there's two trains of thought. One
3 is, they get to 450, 500, 600, 800 overload points,
4 how can they be doing a good job, because of the
5 fatigue factor? But if a faculty member needs that
6 income for their lifestyle, and we don't give it to
7 them here, they're going to go somewhere else to do
8 it. And I'd rather have them teaching for us than
9 teaching for someone else. So it is a balancing act.
10 And we don't want to be punitive in it, and we don't
11 want to be so rigid about it that no one can ever do
12 that. Because there are times when it makes sense.
13 And it also makes sense whether or not you're teaching
14 400 extra points all in the same subject matter, or
15 are you teaching five different classes. If you have
16 one preparation, because you're repeating your class
17 five times, it's a lot easier than having five
18 different classes that you're trying to keep track of.
19 So we would just like to try and do something. We
20 have worked with faculty in the past who -- some of
21 those who have had really excess amounts of overloads,
22 and, actually, after a few years, they've come to me
23 and said, it's time to hire a new faculty member,
24 because I'm getting tired. And I don't want people to
25 have to get to the point that they have to come and

1 see me because they're getting tired. I'd like to,
2 you know, figure out what that magic range can be. So
3 that's kind of the thought that we had. That's it.
4 Simple, right?

5 MR. LIEB: Easy, right?

6 DR. MIEDEMA: So that's kind of where we'd like
7 to take a look at. Do you -- where would you like to
8 go at this point in time? Do you want to talk more
9 about the current evaluation and the forms? Do you
10 want to have time to think about it? Are there any of
11 the things that we could look at now, or do we need
12 some time to digest?

13 MR. LIEB: I think probably want some time to
14 digest on some of these things. I think we could,
15 perhaps, with the evaluations, talk about what's
16 working, and then maybe come up with a list of what's
17 not. And then what we could do for the next meeting
18 is, if we take a look at, like, the peer evaluation,
19 the -- that kind of stuff. If you guys want to look
20 at the supervisor evaluation of the faculty member.
21 Because you'll know more than we will what's working
22 from you all's end. So that way, the next meeting, we
23 could say, here's what we're thinking for all of these
24 things, and maybe get a lot of that knocked out. I
25 did have one in there for -- listed as the transfer

1 evaluation, and it's not really a revision, more that
2 I noticed that between the article and the form,
3 there's a little bit of -- the article, itself, seems
4 to imply that it is strictly the point system that's
5 listed at the very end of that form, is the only thing
6 that matters. I know that was not the intent. If we
7 just want to add in there, saying that the two
8 recommendations and the point system will be used to
9 determine -- it's just a minor thing. I don't want to
10 change what it is. I don't know -- has it been
11 working for you guys, or have we not had to use it
12 yet? Because I know it's new.

13 MS. FERGUSON: It's rare.

14 DR. MARSHALL: Has it been used at all?

15 MS. FERGUSON: It's been years.

16 MR. LIEB: The last time I knew, I think, was
17 when James Brawn came to Palm Bay. But there may have
18 been one previous to that, but I don't know if we've
19 had people apply for transfer but then they hired
20 outside. That's what I don't know.

21 DR. MIEDEMA: I don't know of anyone that we've
22 actually used the form on yet.

23 MS. KENNEDY: And that was, what, eight years
24 ago?

25 MR. LIEB: When we did this form?

1 MS. KENNEDY: James Brawn.

2 MR. LIEB: Oh, yeah. Brawn was a while ago.

3 DR. MARSHALL: But I think it would only --
4 really the only time that you would have to consider
5 this is if you had multiple internal candidates who
6 wanted to transfer. Then you have to make a decision.
7 So I think what we were trying to smooth out for you
8 is the discrepancy between that form, and then the
9 actual language in the article. There's kind of a
10 little bit of vagueness between the two. So you would
11 have to tell us what you think would work to fix that,
12 if you think it's a problem. It may not be.

13 MS. FERGUSON: What's that article for transfer?
14 Do you all know?

15 DR. MARSHALL: Transfer is 6.14, on page 33.

16 DR. MIEDEMA: Yeah, I think that's a simple
17 enough one to do.

18 DR. MARSHALL: And that matches up to (d)(4), and
19 that information right in that section there. If it
20 needs to be aligned with that form that's in the
21 appendix.

22 MR. LIEB: Right. Because that's the voluntary.
23 The point system is a finite kind of -- when it's the
24 involuntary. But the issue was, what happens when you
25 have two people that are voluntarily? So it's not an

1 issue of changing the evaluation or the process, it's
2 just, essentially, make sure it's clear that we know
3 that it's the recommendations, plus that point system,
4 for the voluntary. The involuntary, we've never
5 messed with, because I think it's better to have, I
6 think, a definite number or way of determining it,
7 versus anything that could be considered subjective if
8 it's involuntary.

9 DR. MIEDEMA: If it's involuntary, it needs to be
10 very clear cut. I can't recall any time we've
11 actually done it involuntary, but it could happen.

12 MS. FERGUSON: Oh, yeah, it could happen. Yeah.

13 MR. LIEB: Only when there's been a program
14 moved, I believe. But even then, most of the time
15 they're usually open to a program being moved, so it's
16 not necessarily involuntary. So, again, to my
17 knowledge, we haven't used this form at all, because
18 there hasn't been a conflict between two full-time
19 faculty wanting the same transfer opportunity. Again,
20 I don't know that I would have knowledge of it unless
21 somebody that was involved in that decided that
22 something's not right and came and talked to me. So
23 if it has been a problem, to let us know. If you guys
24 think it's something as simple as adjusting a
25 sentence, if you have a suggestion for that, we're

1 open to it as well.

2 DR. MIEDEMA: Yeah. I was just looking at that,
3 because I think that's exactly what it is, is just a
4 sentence. If more than one faculty member has
5 requested a transfer to an open position, provost
6 should use the point system plus recommendation --

7 MR. LIEB: Plus the two recommendations. Okay.

8 DR. MIEDEMA: But then what I'd also put in there
9 -- let me just write that in so I don't forget. To
10 determine the person receiving the transfer. But I'd
11 put a sentence in there, before transfer points will
12 be signed as follows -- that say, involuntary
13 transfers will follow --

14 MR. LIEB: The normal procedure? Because we
15 already involuntary transfers --

16 DR. MARSHALL: Well, they're on the next page, I
17 believe.

18 MR. LIEB: -- on the next page, under 6.14(j).
19 It's already there.

20 DR. MIEDEMA: Involuntary transfers will follow
21 the guideline, the --

22 MR. LIEB: Guidelines in 6.14(j).

23 DR. MIEDEMA: 6.14(j). Yeah, I think that's real
24 simple. I think that clarifies the process. So we
25 can mark one as done.

1 MR. LIEB: Like I said, some of these are easier
2 ones.

3 MR. FILES: Is there anything addressing, heaven
4 forbid it happens, there's an actual tie in points?

5 MR. LIEB: That's where the recommendation -- you
6 mean for involuntary?

7 MR. FILES: No, for voluntary.

8 MR. LIEB: For voluntary, that's where the
9 recommendations will come into play as well. And
10 that's because the provost will have access to
11 information that you or I probably don't have. If I
12 know that -- if she knows that I've had a lawsuit
13 against you that's been ongoing for three years,
14 perhaps they don't want to move me to your campus. I
15 mean, it's not -- we don't want it to be punitive, and
16 it should be very clear cut, but --

17 DR. MIEDEMA: It's just like right now, any new
18 hire, I have to -- it has to be approved by me. And
19 it's not that I know 99 percent of what comes through.
20 I take the recommendation to the faculty and staff
21 who've done the interviews. But there are a couple of
22 times that I knew something about the candidate that I
23 couldn't share, and I'd say, I can go with your number
24 two recommendation, but not your number one. And so
25 it's that same type of a process.

1 MR. LIEB: Correct. And that's what we're trying
2 to mirror.

3 DR. MIEDEMA: There may be something that we know
4 that -- which doesn't happen very often. But every
5 now and then, there'll be something that -- and
6 sometimes I don't know about it, but the president
7 does. He'll say, do you know this about the -- nope,
8 I didn't know that.

9 MR. LIEB: What do we think has been working with
10 the evaluation system that we currently use? Maybe
11 that's an easier conversation, to say -- because if we
12 know what we think is working, let's try not to throw
13 the baby out with the bath water kind of thing.

14 DR. MIEDEMA: Sandy, you --

15 DR. HANDFIELD: I hate your evaluation. I think
16 it could use some tweaks. You know, it seems like
17 just a -- so a "yes," "no," and sometimes I think that
18 there are perhaps some gray areas, for perhaps some of
19 the questions.

20 MS. FERGUSON: How long has this been -- as long
21 as I've been here, I -- this has been in place.

22 MR. LIEB: Index N was revised -- we did part of
23 it full book, but that was largely a formatting and
24 smoothing of language, to make sure that they --
25 annual faculty members weren't necessarily expected to

1 have the same three points that a full-time faculty,
2 tenured one would have.

3 DR. MIEDEMA: Now, this current process, let's
4 start by just walking through the current process.
5 For an annual contract employee or faculty member, we
6 do an annual classroom observation, and annual goal
7 setting, and an annual evaluation. So there's three
8 steps to the process for someone on annual. Now,
9 annual contract goes up to six years. So that's a lot
10 of time and energy on your part to do those things.
11 Are there things that we can do to streamline? And
12 that's not for right now, but that's for our
13 discussion and our thought process for next meeting.
14 What of that process for the annual contract works
15 well? Do you like seeing your faculty -- and you do
16 some evaluations too, right?

17 MS. KENNEDY: No.

18 DR. HANDFIELD: That's just because it's been a
19 personal preference of mine that I felt, if I were in
20 their shoes, that if I'm going to be the one, as the
21 provost, to evaluate, I would want an evaluation based
22 upon what --

23 MR. LIEB: Based on your observation.

24 DR. HANDFIELD: -- my provost saw. Not someone
25 else's observation. I just felt it was more fair.

1 But even for, like, a tenured faculty member, for me,
2 like, three years is a really long time before you
3 actually sit down in front of me again to have a
4 conversation. I personally wouldn't mind it being on
5 an annual basis as well. Even with the goal setting,
6 you know. It's a lot of times just an e-mail exchange
7 of --

8 MR. LIEB: I think we could perhaps consider or
9 look at differentiation between what we mean if -- so
10 if you still had the three in the six year actual
11 evaluation cycle, nothing necessarily precludes from
12 saying, hey, let's have a sit down every year to talk.
13 I don't know that we want to get into an annual true
14 full-blown evaluation every year. Because, I mean, we
15 had 283 faculty last time I counted, and that's a lot
16 of observations. To where -- that'll be your whole
17 year ever year, it would seem like. So, I mean, I
18 think we can find a way to balance the -- increase the
19 communication, as I think what I'm hearing you ask
20 for. Is --

21 DR. MIEDEMA: Maybe there's an abbreviated thing
22 we can do, that in between years, this is what we do.

23 DR. MARSHALL: Or instead of making it one, we
24 have it at three now, instead consider two?

25 DR. MIEDEMA: It's possible. So there are

1 different ways we can take a look at it. That's why I
2 thought, let's start by talking about annual contract,
3 because that will open up a discussion a little bit
4 about what is doing well.

5 DR. HANDFIELD: Yeah. Because it's hard to sit
6 down -- and, really, you answer those questions yes or
7 no, based on one day out of a three-year period. And
8 you knew I was coming. So, you know, you're on stage
9 that day. So did you check all the boxes? You knew
10 exactly what I was going to be looking for.

11 MR. LIEB: So I guess I'm the rare bird that just
12 -- I just don't change anything. I figure they should
13 see what they -- I normally do. I know I'm -- sorry,
14 I'm thinking backwards on this. So for the annual
15 faculty, because it's up to five, six years, what
16 you're saying is that instead of having a full-blown
17 evaluation every year, just stagger it, have a semi --
18 some form of a follow-up communication check-in for
19 the annual contract faculty members, like, year one.
20 Year two, do an actual evaluation. Year three, a
21 follow-up. Year four, an actual evaluation. Is that
22 kind of what I'm hearing?

23 DR. HANDFIELD: Well, I guess I misunderstood.
24 Because I thought annual would remain annual, until
25 they have tenure. But tenured faculty --

1 MR. LIEB: Okay. So you were referring to
2 tenured?

3 DR. HANDFIELD: Yeah.

4 MR. LIEB: Sorry, I was trying to get my lines
5 uncrossed.

6 DR. MARSHALL: So all tenured faculty are on a
7 three-year cycle for evaluations. We want to make
8 sure that we're clarifying the difference between
9 evaluations and MCC, and we're not talking about the
10 six-year MCC cycle here. So what you're suggesting is
11 that we shorten the three-year cycle somehow. It
12 doesn't have to necessarily be full-blown every year.
13 You'd be okay with a full-blown in year one, and then
14 something else perhaps in year two, three. Or a
15 full-blown every other year, something -- a different
16 cycle, a little shorter.

17 DR. MIEDEMA: Just an opportunity for that open
18 communication. I think that that would be real
19 helpful.

20 MR. LIEB: I think the communication side's the
21 key. And as we revamp or re-look at these, to where
22 -- with the evaluation, I don't want faculty to feel
23 like -- because I can already imagine the e-mails
24 right now.

25 MS. KENNEDY: And who suggested that at the

1 table, right?

2 MR. LIEB: That would be a question, absolutely.
3 And so before I'd commit to any of that, I think we'd
4 have to figure out, how is it that we can do this in a
5 way that doesn't make faculty feel unburdensomely
6 evaluated or on edge. At the same time, we do need to
7 increase that communication. I think that's
8 important.

9 MS. FERGUSON: And that is key. In an
10 evaluation, nothing that they're evaluated on should
11 ever be a surprise. You know, if you sit in front of
12 -- like, on staff side, we used to have, I think,
13 eight pages. Remember that old thing? It's down to
14 one page now. Because it was cumbersome. You had to
15 fill in this, fill in that, and it was hard for the
16 supervisor to sit down face to face with that staff
17 member. But one thing I -- in all our supervisor
18 training, there should never -- if you bring somebody
19 in to evaluate, there should never be anything on that
20 that surprised them, because the communication. You
21 tell them as they go.

22 MR. LIEB: And I think we could also -- looking
23 at this form too, there are some things in here that
24 are what I call paperwork or document tracking. Did
25 they go to all the scheduled inservice activities,

1 except on approved leave? Those kinds of things, yes,
2 they need to -- we need to find a way to get it, but
3 we have every one of those things spelled out, to
4 where we might be able to refer to a -- to the
5 responsibilities list in Article 8, for example. Has
6 the faculty member met all these? And then, if no,
7 which ones? That way it's a fill-in or add, versus
8 give me everything. Let's just focus on if there's an
9 issue. If there's no issue, problem solved. I mean,
10 that takes care of, I don't know, like, eight of
11 these. Because my goal, honestly, would be able to
12 get this down to maybe one, two pages. And the reason
13 for two pages is for the commentary, where people
14 could fill in information.

15 DR. MIEDEMA: Same thing if you go to the very
16 beginning, where it says the faculty self-evaluation.
17 You attended all of this stuff every term. Why not
18 just say, I've done it every term that was --

19 MR. LIEB: I agree.

20 DR. MIEDEMA: Rather than say, I have to check
21 yes, no, or not applicable, for the summer term.

22 MR. LIEB: I agree. Like I said, we could
23 simplify it quite a bit. I mean, honestly, I think
24 the goal is just -- I don't know for sure yet, I'm
25 still processing, the goal is to be a way of -- we

1 create that increased communication if we separate the
2 goals out from the evaluation, to where the goals
3 could be talked about on an annual basis. What's your
4 goal for the year? Versus, okay, let's talk about
5 this once every three years. And I know I can't be
6 the only person that had to go back and double check
7 what my goals were. I thought I knew what they were,
8 but I wasn't going to go into the meeting if I didn't
9 know for sure these were my goals, and whether or not
10 I had completed them.

11 DR. MIEDEMA: And maybe the goal setting sheet
12 and the evaluation becomes the tear-off, and that's
13 what you carry forward with you. Just a thought.

14 MS. BOGGS: Maybe it could be automated.

15 MR. LIEB: How dare you suggest such a thing?

16 MS. BOGGS: You can have two terminals in your
17 office, one for the faculty, and you're sitting there,
18 and you --

19 DR. HANDFIELD: You can also have that totally
20 update. So, I mean, at the end of, like, that second
21 year, then we review, like, a status update.

22 DR. MARSHALL: Similar to how we have the MCC
23 structure?

24 DR. HANDFIELD: Right. Yeah.

25 DR. MIEDEMA: So what of this evaluation, if you

1 look at it, what do you find the most useful?

2 MR. LIEB: As faculty? Or from you all's
3 perspective?

4 DR. MIEDEMA: Both.

5 MR. LIEB: I think from our perspective, I think
6 it's the dialogue, and it's that -- one, the feedback
7 of, hey, where can I improve? Or do you have a
8 recommendation -- I almost want to avoid what we were
9 calling intrusive advising, to where you knew that
10 they knew what was going on with you, but your
11 aspirations or the things that you cared about, your
12 committees or projects, to where they could say, hey,
13 you know what, what have you tried about this kind of
14 committee, or give the suggestions and have that
15 dialogue. So I don't know that it's so much a
16 formalized part of this right now, but I think, for me
17 anyway, that's always been the best part of the
18 evaluation, just having that dialogue.

19 DR. MIEDEMA: When I was doing faculty
20 evaluations, I would put this aside and say, okay,
21 talk to me and tell me what's going on. What do you
22 think is going well? What do you think is not going
23 well? Then, at the very end, we take a look at this
24 and say, well, looks like you filled it all out.

25 MR. LIEB: And I think that's probably a far more

1 effective way of doing it. So if we could find a way
2 to formalize that in a simplified version of this.
3 This still respects what we have in the contract.

4 DR. HANDFIELD: So, you know, like the Course
5 Scholar, and so it needs updating since we don't have
6 that anymore for --

7 MR. LIEB: Trying to avoid sometimes, perhaps,
8 some of the certain labels like that. Otherwise we
9 run into what we just ran into with e-learning, where
10 it says Eastern Florida online. By the way, there is
11 another discrepancy in language between tenure and
12 rank change. It has to do with the discipline and the
13 profession, I think. Dustin, you can clarify that if
14 I'm wrong. So we may want to change the one word in
15 the rank change to mirror what is in Appendix N
16 already, and already in tenure. I know it's -- to me,
17 it's a scrivener's. If it's not, if we want to wait
18 for the full book, I'm okay doing that too. But it's
19 an easy -- we all know what it means, but --

20 MR. FILES: It says discipline, when it should
21 say profession.

22 MR. LIEB: Right. When I updated -- when we did
23 the tenure, I remember from four years ago, I didn't
24 get anything from rank change at that time, so I
25 thought that it was consistent. I was wrong with that

1 assumption, and I probably should have done more
2 investigation. But this would at least fix that part
3 of the problem.

4 DR. MIEDEMA: I'll put it down, we'll talk about
5 it.

6 DR. HANDFIELD: Maybe clarify, because a lot of
7 the faculty, whenever they do come in and talk with
8 me, like when you ask about the discipline program and
9 their new goals, do you plan to implement a new
10 programmatic assessment? Well, what's that? What do
11 you mean by that? So --

12 MR. LIEB: So why that could be applicable to
13 someone who's a program manager, perhaps -- I mean, so
14 are you trying to say I should implement a new
15 assessment in my class, or we -- I think I see what
16 you mean by that.

17 DR. HANDFIELD: And then even with the community
18 service goals, I understand, but is that something
19 maybe more for the MCC, versus being part of the
20 evaluation, you know, with whether they're going to be
21 doing more than 20 hours of community service. Is
22 that really -- because that doesn't affect the job
23 that they're doing in the classroom.

24 MR. LIEB: Right. Because I think the
25 evaluation, in the beginning, when we did it, it was

1 much more holistic and looking at all aspects. And I
2 think in order to -- if we go to this more
3 conversation-driven method, that we can probably
4 separate some of these things out. Again, I'll have
5 to go through and figure out which ones we're actually
6 really talking about.

7 DR. HANDFIELD: Maybe it's replaced with, like,
8 the goals that they have set the previous year. Did
9 you meet the goals? If you did, or if you didn't, why
10 or why not?

11 MR. LIEB: To where the goals aren't necessarily
12 punitive, which is -- I would say, is a no-go to begin
13 with. We can't do that --

14 DR. MIEDEMA: So that section, section six, that
15 is the goals for upcoming academic year. This is what
16 we use for the annual contract individuals. We also
17 know that with the mentoring group, they're telling
18 them not to join a college committee the first year
19 and not to get involved in the community service,
20 because they need to focus on the classroom. So --

21 MR. LIEB: Especially now that they have a
22 five-year cycle.

23 DR. MIEDEMA: This creates a hardship for them.
24 They meet what they're being told in their mentoring
25 program, or they meet what's being done in the

1 evaluation. And we need to make sure that those two
2 are better aligned. I always tell my new faculty,
3 goals for the first academic year is to acclimate to
4 the classroom. That was the number one goal.

5 MR. LIEB: I wish I was told that. I think I was
6 thrown onto the assessment committee the first year
7 with you.

8 DR. HANDFIELD: With you, he turns around and
9 looks at me.

10 MR. LIEB: I still blame Dorothy and Debbie, but
11 yes.

12 DR. MARSHALL: So how about this for -- maybe for
13 our next session, so -- because you have a better
14 grasp on what you want to see here, I think, than we
15 do at this point. Maybe you can come back to us with
16 a revised --

17 MR. LIEB: What you think it should look like,
18 and we can go from there.

19 DR. MARSHALL: -- evaluation form. In the
20 meantime, maybe we can work on those responsibility
21 checklists in the back a little bit. And that gives
22 us a place to come together again. And I think once
23 we get those responsibility checklists done in the
24 back, then we go back and look at those evaluation
25 forms, to revise them, so that they match the

1 checklist. Right?

2 MR. LIEB: I think that would probably be the
3 best plan of action. I mean, we'll still take a look
4 at the evals, see if there's anything we can think of.
5 But I think if you all led the charge there, that'd be
6 really helpful. Because the only experience I've had
7 is from the receiving of these. And then I don't
8 remember what the huge difference with the library
9 evaluation is, but that's one we'll have to look at
10 get some more information to --

11 DR. MARSHALL: I think once we get the
12 instructional faculty one smoothed out, we can maybe
13 then use it as a template for the others too.

14 MR. LIEB: Yeah. Then I'll reach out -- at that
15 point in time, we can then reach out to library to see
16 what -- because I know I'm out of my depth there.

17 DR. MIEDEMA: I can tell you that most of the DC
18 and program manager peer evaluations that I see all
19 say exactly the same thing. And there's very little
20 comment. Just everybody -- every department chair and
21 every program managers want equal. So it's not being
22 real helpful.

23 MR. LIEB: So what's it doing?

24 DR. MIEDEMA: It's just an exercise in paperwork,
25 in most cases. So, yeah, I think it's a good idea to

1 take a look at those responsibilities. And maybe
2 that's the piece that we send out to faculty, simply
3 one or two questions.

4 DR. MARSHALL: Here's the checklist, are they
5 doing it?

6 DR. MIEDEMA: Here's the checklist, are they
7 doing it? What would you like to see them do
8 differently? And get that conversational feedback.

9 MR. LIEB: I think that would help with the peer
10 evaluation form too, it would make that a lot more
11 simplified.

12 DR. MIEDEMA: Absolutely. Because the ones I
13 reviewed, and I review three of the college-wide every
14 year, they never say anything. Other than the
15 person's wonderful.

16 MR. LIEB: Because the only one that they are
17 filling out at this point is the peer evaluation,
18 correct?

19 DR. MARSHALL: Correct. But we'll model this on
20 whatever the checklists are.

21 MR. LIEB: But we can model them on what the
22 responsibilities are instead. I think that's a good
23 idea.

24 DR. MIEDEMA: And all of them -- there'll be 20
25 yes's and maybe one no, in the whole list. And it

1 doesn't -- and no comments.

2 DR. MARSHALL: So you don't know what the no
3 means. Right.

4 DR. MIEDEMA: And no comments. So all I do is
5 tally that up and give it to the program manager or
6 department chair, and say, here is your evaluation --
7 your peer evaluation, which means nothing. So I would
8 really like to be able to give them something that
9 they can use. Your faculty think you're wonderful,
10 but you're never in your office. Okay, that helps me
11 to at least have an idea, and you'd have an idea of
12 what's going on. When you're in your office, you're
13 wonderful, but most of the time you're with those
14 stupid students. Okay. But I think that would be
15 helpful. And it also gives us the opportunity to give
16 positive feedback to individuals, which I don't think
17 any of these forms really allow us to do.

18 MR. LIEB: There is nothing guided in that
19 direction, I would agree, yes. They can all write in,
20 but we all know what write in usually means.

21 DR. MIEDEMA: And I would write comments in there
22 saying, you got listed as meeting all the
23 requirements, I'd give you higher if it was available.
24 Because the form doesn't lend you to be able to make
25 those positive comments.

1 MR. LIEB: Okay. So then if we'll look at that
2 for next meeting, I think that will be helpful. With
3 this scheduling thing, I was just kind of in the back
4 of my brain remembering one thing with scheduling,
5 with the issue with librarians and Fridays. I don't
6 know if that's been resolved or not. But I don't know
7 if that's something we need to think about. I don't
8 think we should probably do it today, because I don't
9 know that we're -- anybody's ready for that.

10 DR. MIEDEMA: What we have done with that
11 question -- the question came up with librarians and
12 their schedule, and do they need to be here Fridays.
13 And we're trying to find the standard. We've asked
14 the librarians, themselves, to give us information of
15 what the library standards are. In this era of
16 electronic resources, do we need to have a librarian
17 available per campus anytime the library is open? Do
18 we need to have someone available for the college-wide
19 at all times when the library is open? And we've
20 asked them to actually go out and do the research for
21 us, so that we can come up with a comprehensive
22 process of looking at it that makes sense to
23 everybody. We did look and see how many librarians
24 per student are in each of the 28 state colleges.
25 That was very eye-opening. Because there is no

1 standard. It varies from 700 to 3000 per librarian.

2 DR. MARSHALL: Where are we? Do you know?

3 DR. MIEDEMA: We're about midway. So we're in a
4 good location.

5 MR. LIEB: We're about one to 1500, I think.

6 DR. MIEDEMA: But is that appropriate? So
7 there's got to --

8 MR. LIEB: So looking to differentiate between
9 the reference desk responsibilities, between the Ask a
10 Librarian with the consortium, with all --

11 DR. MIEDEMA: Exactly.

12 MR. LIEB: That's good to know. I hadn't heard
13 that part yet.

14 DR. MIEDEMA: We are working on that. And we've
15 met a couple of times with the librarians to talk
16 about that, and I've asked for more detailed
17 information. Because just telling me one faculty per
18 3000 students doesn't really mean anything to me. I
19 need to know if there's a standard out there, through
20 the library association, to whoever the accrediting
21 people might be that says, our recommendation is you
22 have no more than this, our recommendation is that
23 there's someone physically available to students at
24 all times, 24/7. Then we need to know that. I just
25 need to -- but I don't have those standards. Because,

1 again, that's not my area of expertise either. And
2 I'll be the first to admit that. So Debbie Anderson
3 and some of her colleagues are currently looking at
4 that information. So we're continuing to work on that
5 issue outside of --

6 MR. LIEB: That's good to hear. I mean, because
7 I know setting their schedules can be challenging at
8 times, and figuring out what are the standards that we
9 need it to be probably is a really good first step.

10 DR. MIEDEMA: That's the place to start.

11 MR. LIEB: Thank you for going that route with
12 it.

13 DR. MARSHALL: So is that something that will not
14 necessarily be part of this session, and maybe will go
15 over to full book bargaining?

16 DR. MIEDEMA: It may be. It may not need to be
17 bargained at all, when we finally get it said and
18 done. Because the hours of the contract say 189 --

19 MR. LIEB: 189 days of availability. Which I
20 cannot stress the word "availability" enough to some
21 people.

22 DR. MARSHALL: So you're going to try and fit it
23 in the framework we already have.

24 DR. MIEDEMA: Yes. If we can do it that way,
25 that's what I -- that's how I prefer to be able to do

1 it. That way, if there's any language change that
2 needs to be done with full book, it's minor.

3 MR. LIEB: And I think as long as we're able to
4 allow flexibility at the local level for how --
5 there's students at Palm Bay, that if we know that
6 they need -- for whatever reason, they don't want to
7 use the computer, they want to talk to that person at
8 the reference desk, that we can still maintain
9 flexibility. I think that's good, and we just need to
10 make sure we keep the contract flexible in that way as
11 well. So, yeah, it's probably a good thing to figure
12 out eventually.

13 DR. MIEDEMA: And what we've done in the past is,
14 we've let the librarians tell us when they need to be
15 open on a Friday and Saturday and when they don't need
16 to be. Because they know what the door count is.
17 They know how many students are coming in and coming
18 out. So if they send me an e-mail saying, this Friday
19 is between terms, there's absolutely no one who's
20 coming in the library, I'll say, close it down. I
21 don't have a problem with that. There's no reason for
22 us to be open just for the sake of saying we're open.

23 MR. LIEB: And then figuring out the rotation of
24 who's ending up doing the Fridays and that kind of
25 thing. We can --

1 DR. MIEDEMA: And that way we just reschedule the
2 staff to fit their hours in where they need to fit
3 them in, but not have to work that Friday if there's
4 no need to be open then. Between semesters, why are
5 we open on a Friday?

6 MR. LIEB: You got me. We're not a public
7 repository, so it's not like we have to maintain
8 access for the public.

9 DR. MIEDEMA: Exactly. So they tell me when they
10 think that we should close on a Friday. Nine times
11 out of ten, I'll tell them, fine, go ahead.

12 MR. LIEB: Okay. So that's -- like I said,
13 that's good to hear. I'm glad to hear that there is
14 progress being made there.

15 DR. MIEDEMA: Dee Sibley's off this week, so I
16 don't have the most current update. She's been the
17 administrative liaison for the librarians. I've sat
18 in on each of the meetings, but I haven't seen the
19 documentation that's come through yet.

20 MR. LIEB: Okay. And then if you are able for
21 next time, do you want to give us an idea of phrasing
22 that you would like for the priority of scheduling
23 assessment? Because I think that's going to be an
24 easy one that we can check off as well.

25 DR. MIEDEMA: I think a lot of this in the area

1 of scheduling is very easy to do, but I didn't want to
2 jump the gun and say, here's the language that I want.
3 I wanted to have that discussion first, and then we
4 can sit down and we can -- but I think several of the
5 things under the scheduling are very, very easy for us
6 to do. We can take a look at the form, because we do
7 want to put part of term in there. I think that
8 helps, again, with the communication and the openness.

9 MR. LIEB: And then that schedule request form, I
10 think -- because I believe it is now in the document
11 center. I don't know how it was submitted to document
12 center, because it was not me. Okay. So it does
13 exist. We could reference it if we need to in that
14 section, in that language, if we want. Because one
15 thing we do need to change or figure out how to do is
16 the line in there that says, faculty need to request
17 the next entire year's worth of overloads now, at the
18 end of the spring semester. Because in practicality,
19 it's not what we do. Then comes the question as to
20 how much time do we need to give the chairs to do it,
21 and I've heard a variety of answers from the chairs
22 I've talked to. Everywhere from six weeks to one week
23 to I want it, like, two years ago. And finding that
24 happy medium, I think with -- in light of the books
25 and stuff, to where the majority have been kind of

1 ending up around the month lead up time from when the
2 schedule is due. From when it is due. Not the
3 publish date, but when it is due. So that after that
4 point --

5 DR. MIEDEMA: And maybe it's as simple as not
6 even having that.

7 MR. LIEB: Or just taking the line out.

8 DR. MIEDEMA: Just taking the line out
9 completely, and then saying -- the department chair
10 puts out a notice saying, I have need for a class
11 here, here, and here, who would like it? And, you
12 know, which way -- you're a department chair. How
13 would that work better for you?

14 MS. FERGUSON: First come, first served?

15 MR. LIEB: What's worked best for me, honestly,
16 is having them send me what they want. And then I
17 build the schedule based on -- well, if they haven't
18 figured it out by now, I have built it based on
19 historical enrollment.

20 MR. FILES: I was the one that came up with a
21 month out. This way it gives us enough time to get
22 everything in order, get --

23 MR. LIEB: But if we added that to the --

24 MR. FILES: The big part is textbooks. I mean,
25 they can't start in textbooks until we have the

1 schedule set. I mean, if they start in textbooks
2 before we have the schedule set, it's a nightmare
3 changing things.

4 DR. MIEDEMA: That's why it really needs to come
5 from the department chairs. Those of you who are
6 actually having to do it, what makes sense. We put
7 that in to try and make it easier, so you at least --
8 and also to help us over the summer, when department
9 chairs are off, and we have a need to add another
10 section, or supposedly off --

11 MR. LIEB: We get off time?

12 DR. MIEDEMA: That we would know someone who'd be
13 interested, so that we can help to facilitate that
14 during the summer. And you don't come back three days
15 before class starts to find out you need to build five
16 more sections, but that we could start to help in that
17 process over the summer. That's primarily why we put
18 that lead time in there. If that's causing more chaos
19 than it's solving, then we just take it out.

20 MR. LIEB: I don't think that it is. I think the
21 part that caused a little of the chaos in the
22 beginning, that has since subsided, was the fact that
23 people didn't realize, because they don't read, the
24 fact that they had to have by the end of spring term
25 what they wanted for the next year. And that's where

1 I know we did that short-term fix, which worked out
2 well. And then finding a way -- that form kind of
3 came out of that. Because, originally, we were using
4 Excel spreadsheets online, and then Dustin had access
5 to the full version of Adobe, which is extremely
6 helpful, I've discovered. I just finally got access
7 to that. Just don't tell anybody. But that form does
8 make a difference for me, because then I can grid out
9 and figure out, all right, these people all want 60,
10 to make sure I'm meeting contractual -- like in the
11 summer, faculty have the right to 120, whether it
12 hoses my adjuncts over or not. Faculty have the right
13 to do it, and, contractually, I have to give it to
14 them. So then with the current semester, I think
15 that's why the transparency of the campus versus the
16 online will be helpful. Because if we met the 60
17 already, and then you're requesting another 90, that's
18 a bit different than someone who is saying, this is
19 their only overload or only two overloads. Because if
20 we both have two online, but you have four overloads
21 on campus, that's not a -- in the past, I've
22 discovered that the chairs online, particularly, did
23 not know that to be the case.

24 DR. MIEDEMA: Well, it's a communication that's
25 the transparency, because one hand doesn't know what

1 the other one has done. And we want to be equitable,
2 we want to give the opportunity for overload to
3 faculty, and we don't want to do it this way. We want
4 to try and keep it as balanced as we can for those who
5 want it. Some don't want it, that's fine. But I
6 would guess that well over half of our faculty do
7 overloads every semester.

8 MR. LIEB: I would go with more than that.

9 DR. MIEDEMA: And that's just a guess, because I
10 have no way of tracking it at this point of time.

11 MR. LIEB: The only way to track it is in the
12 stipend and overload pay column that HR has. And I
13 only know that because they -- when they give me the
14 union form, one time they left that column in, and I
15 was like, what's this? Because it made -- that's not
16 my base salary, so I have confusion. So I know that
17 it exists, but even then it's not a clear-cut
18 differentiation between stipends, overload. I know
19 with the paystub, we'd love to see some way of that
20 being resolved, but that's not a bargaining issue,
21 it's just a paystub issue. Sometimes people can't
22 always tell the line item what they're being paid for,
23 where they can't track how many times that they've
24 actually received ADPA. Unless they go back and
25 physically track the years. So they don't know why

1 the base salary sometimes is where it is, or with the
2 overloads, they don't know if they're actually being
3 paid for the right amount of overloads or not, because
4 it just says "overload."

5 DR. MIEDEMA: Well, that's the way we like it.

6 MR. LIEB: I've directed people to go to the
7 website, because it has a lot more information there.
8 But even so --

9 DR. MIEDEMA: I'm only kidding.

10 MS. FERGUSON: In Banner, it's broken down to
11 each assignment, but on --

12 MR. LIEB: On the paystub itself, it is not. So
13 once they go in --

14 DR. MARSHALL: We have asked, and what we have
15 been told in the past is that there are only a certain
16 number of line items that can be broken out, because
17 of the program or software or whatever. Whatever the
18 format is they're using, they have a limited amount of
19 space to break things out. So, I mean, as an example,
20 I can use myself, I have gotten ADPA a few times, so
21 -- and I teach overloads, but not always. So I always
22 look at my stub, and I think, okay, I don't exactly
23 know what my base salary is, what's being added into
24 my pay because of ADPA. They've done a better job
25 lately of breaking out the overloads, so you can see

1 at least the courses you're being paid overload for.
2 I also, every semester, have independent study
3 students. I don't see that broken out, it just comes
4 in a lump sum. So having those line items would
5 benefit us, because then we would be able to see,
6 here's your base salary, here's everything we're
7 adding. So we would know, and I could make that
8 calculation to know, am I being paid the right amount?
9 Which I'm sure I am, but I would like that peace of
10 mind.

11 MR. LIEB: Because I know the college continues
12 to send out every -- the beginning of the semester
13 what your base salary is for the next year, which I
14 think is great. I'd love to see that base salary
15 number, though, available on the Titan web somewhere,
16 under the pay information or something, just to tell
17 you, this is your base.

18 DR. MARSHALL: But the base includes ADPA. I
19 want to see it broken out. I want to see, here's your
20 base according to contract, here's all the extra.

21 DR. MIEDEMA: Well, with our new chief technology
22 officer --

23 MR. LIEB: That's what I keep hearing, especially
24 for textbook selection, which is a whole other
25 nightmare.

1 DR. MIEDEMA: One of the things I did ask the
2 candidates as I was interviewing them has to do with
3 our Canvas shells. And I said, you know, for -- we
4 encourage faculty to -- even if they're teaching
5 face-to-face, to have a Canvas shell, because students
6 can access that information outside a classroom. Then
7 we get to a hurricane, and we shut it all down, so
8 neither faculty, staff, nor students can get into it.
9 And so I asked several hurricanes ago if we could host
10 Canvas at a third party outside the state of Florida,
11 where people -- where there's not a hurricane, and
12 people can still access it. And I was told that we
13 could not do that because it was a FERPA issue. So
14 when I talked to the new candidates coming in, they
15 said, oh, yeah, you have to put in a couple more
16 levels of security, but we've done it where we already
17 are at.

18 MR. LIEB: Most places have.

19 DR. MIEDEMA: So I'm very excited about these two
20 candidates, if either one of them become the selected
21 person coming in, because I got answers to several
22 questions that made me happy. So that will be fun.
23 And I think -- not to burden this person with
24 everything at the same time, but we will make a
25 priority list.

1 MR. LIEB: Don't worry, we have a parking lot in
2 AAC for this new person as well.

3 DR. MIEDEMA: Okay. So when do we want to get
4 together?

5 MR. LIEB: How long do you guys need? Two weeks?
6 Three?

7 DR. MARSHALL: I mean, I'm good with two, but
8 that's --

9 DR. MIEDEMA: And is this time on Mondays --

10 MR. LIEB: This time on Mondays, everybody does
11 not have class, to the best of my knowledge. So
12 Monday afternoons work.

13 DR. MIEDEMA: Is 2:00 p.m. a good time?

14 DR. MARSHALL: March 9th?

15 DR. HANDFIELD: Or March 2nd? March 2nd would be
16 the two weeks, right?

17 MR. LIEB: Yes.

18 DR. MARSHALL: Do we want to do the 2nd? I'm
19 good with that. Are you all good with that?

20 MR. FILES: I won't be here. I'll be away for
21 military training.

22 DR. HANDFIELD: So the 9th then?

23 DR. MARSHALL: So we're going to go to the 9th,
24 or you're not going to be here?

25 MR. FILES: No, I'll be here on the 9th.

1 DR. MARSHALL: So we're going to the 9th.

2 MR. LIEB: That's fine. We'll just -- if we get
3 a chance to get ahead on some of the other things,
4 then just both sides will start trying to think ahead
5 and --

6 DR. MIEDEMA: We can send them back and forth.
7 And we can send any information back and forth. We
8 won't finalize it until we get here, but we'll at
9 least have a chance to have taken a look at it.

10 MR. LIEB: Yeah. I think it's much better to be
11 figured out and bargained once we we're here. But
12 when we know where we're starting from, it makes that
13 a lot easier.

14 DR. MIEDEMA: Absolutely. Well, I like the
15 direction we're looking at. I think it's beneficial
16 to all parties, and I think we can come up with some
17 plans that will make the whole process easier for
18 everybody. So I'm real excited about it. I think
19 it's a great idea. And I'll take a look at your other
20 lists and see if we can work on any of those other
21 things before May.

22 MR. LIEB: I felt like you guys should have that.
23 It just --

24 DR. MIEDEMA: No, I appreciate it.

25 MR. LIEB: I figured this is the third or fourth

1 survey that I've done. I was like, you know, we've
2 never -- I don't know why we haven't, but -- so I just
3 wanted to share what the big trends were. And the
4 aggregate -- kind of when we were looking at doing
5 those other new opinion surveys for the faculty, their
6 supervisor or the VP or president, is finding a way
7 that we could aggregate it, UFF would aggregate it,
8 and send it. Just so that way there's no fear, okay,
9 well, I'm going to call IT and find out who said this,
10 that kind of thing. We could just -- and you guys
11 don't have to look at a million different forms. You
12 would just see the one sheet per person, here's your
13 aggregate numbers for the Likert things, here's the
14 comments anybody's made, that kind of thing. So that
15 way it would be taken off you all's plate on that end
16 too. And I did look it up, and Survey Monkey is
17 considered secure in industry standard for something
18 like that. They have the ability to send out single
19 invites, so that if I were to send to an individual
20 e-mail address, here's your link, that link will work
21 once. You give it to somebody else, you've just given
22 away your ability to fill out a survey. A new one
23 will not be issued. But we could also then track to
24 see -- if they say, well, I didn't do it, we can find
25 out from there who did, where, that kind of thing.

1 But, again, that would keep that off your plate, so
2 there's no misperception, I think is the best way to
3 put that, of a finger on the scale. Because I know
4 there isn't, but -- and then gives you guys
5 aggregates, so you're not looking at 283 of these
6 things, you're looking at one each.

7 DR. MIEDEMA: Do you have any examples of where
8 that's being used in other colleges?

9 MR. LIEB: Robin has a couple. I don't have the
10 with me, but --

11 MS. BOGGS: One of them was University of
12 Northern Texas.

13 DR. MARSHALL: There are a handful. FIT also
14 does it.

15 MS. BOGGS: And the AAUP has some guidelines that
16 I've looked up too.

17 MR. LIEB: So we're not trying to recreate, we
18 just think it's a good idea. Plus, I know, when I
19 looked at the Aspen stuff again, the transparency
20 factor seemed to be very huge on their application
21 process. So even if some state colleges don't have
22 that same level of feedback available, it'd be
23 something that would help us stand out above them when
24 it comes to transparency. Say, look, transparency,
25 this goes upwards and downwards. The feedback goes

1 down, the feedback goes up, so everybody's being held
2 accountable and in the best interest of the students.
3 That was the real reason I started keying in on it. I
4 was like, you know, this is actually an idea of trying
5 to make ourselves look better. And then it kind of
6 spiraled from there.

7 DR. MIEDEMA: Okay. Well, then we'll plan on
8 that. I appreciate everyone's time and energy. We
9 are adjourned.

10 (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF BREVARD

I, DIANE LYNCH, Court Reporter and Notary Public,
certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically
report the foregoing UFF Negotiation Meeting and that the
transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic
notes.

DATED this 17th day of February 2020.

DIANE LYNCH
Court Reporter