

FUSA-HCC BOT Bargaining Meeting
April 30, 2007
2:20 p.m.
Dale Mabry, Tech 409

In attendance were the administrative team members: Mark Levitt, Craig Johnson, Karen Griffin, Sue Flaig, Carlos Soto, and Donna Miller. FUSA bargaining team: Michael Moats, Liana Fox, Eric Joost, Mara Manis, Maribeth Mobley, and John Whitlock; UFF Executive Director Ed Mitchell.

Administration stated that it was not yet ready to respond to the form FUSA had proposed.

Article 6.6 Vacancies/Transfers

FUSA suggested adding to the administration's proposal that the job be posted a minimum of five business days. Administration agreed to that and TA'd later during the session.

Article 12.11 Military Leave

FUSA suggested leaving the sentence prior to the letters and the letters A, B, and C in. The administrative proposal included striking these out. Administration agreed and TA'd later in the session.

Article 8.22 Salary Check, already TA'd

FUSA explained how individuals not receiving checks were forced to wait another two weeks for their checks and individuals who had been overpaid were docked the entire amount from their checks. FUSA asked for language stipulating that the check would be issued within forty-eight business hours and language specifying how money would be paid back. Sue Flaig said that she would talk to Barbara Larsen about the issue.

Article 6.21 Committees

FUSA reiterated the concern regarding committees having no charge and no bylaws and the FUSA president not receiving the names of committee members.

Article 13.1 Sick Leave

Administration proposed eliminating A and B, which would result in eliminating the sick leave pool committee. FUSA insisted that any elimination of the committee, not affect the other provisions of the sick leave pool.

Article 8.1.A.1.e Overload Office Hours

Article 8.6.H Summer Office Hours

FUSA proposed adding the words "by appointment" after "be available." Craig Johnson asked FUSA to verify that the intent is that the faculty member will meet the student at the campus where the class is taught. Michael Moats responded that the intent is really that the faculty member should meet the student where convenient for the student. Considering that students might attend a class on a campus other than their "home campus" due to limited course availability, it may be better for both to meet in the faculty member's office or it might be on another campus where the course is being taught. These articles were TA'd.

Article 6.16 Tenure

FUSA discussed keeping the tenure process at three years and adding steps to facilitate a timely process:

- a checklist for the portfolio in the appendices
- the campus tenure committee reviewing portfolios of first year and second year faculty after they have finished the review of current third-year candidates,
- providing training/workshops for tenure committee members
- offering a series of HCC workshops instead of the two mandatory graduate courses.

Article 9 Faculty Evaluation and Development

FUSA again discussed offering a series of HCC workshops instead of the two mandatory college courses. Craig Johnson questioned how many hours FUSA envisioned stating that 90 hours of college work would not be replaced with something like 20 hours. Michael Moats stated that FUSA understands this and suggested that the intent of the two courses could be addressed in internal workshops of 40-60 hours or so considering content could be customized to better address HCC's needs.

The need to move to economic issues at the next session was agreed on by both sides. Mark Levitt said they should have answers on Articles 6.16 and 9 and be able to discuss economics. FUSA will deliver to the administration at least a preliminary economic package for their consideration before the May 25th meeting.

The next meeting was scheduled for Friday, May 25, 9 a.m. – 12 noon, DTEC 409.

Submitted by Maribeth Mobley