

Minutes

Department Chairs
October 5, 2012 9:00 a.m.
Room I-122

	Present	Absent	Excused		Present	Absent	Excused
Rona Axelrod	X						
Maria Cahill	X						
Kathy Clark	X						
Jo Ann Lewin	X						
Doug Nay	X						
Tina Ottman	X						
Joyce Rollins	X						
C. Seefchak	X						
R. Swanson	X						
Myra Walters	X						
Richard Worch	X			Staff			
				Vicki Polce	X		

- I. Meeting called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Richard Worch.
 - a. Harrel - Program Coordinators are welcome to stay to discuss re-organization.
 - b. Worch – Turned meeting over to Seefchak and her committee to discuss the Chairs Position Description model.
 - i. Agenda was distributed.
 - ii. Minutes were distributed. Minutes approved by motion of Clark and seconded by Rollins.
 - iii. Worch – explained role as Chair is a coordinator. Agendas set by chairs. Keep to a timeline. Two things in matrix that will be discussed. Job description of department chair. Combined with what the chair is doing along with faculty responsibility. VPAA’s have been asked by the BOT to explain chairs duties. E-mail was for information gathering only.
 - iv. Worch – Old Business is discussing the matrix. New Business is where do we go with the information provided.

- II. Seefchak begins Chairs Position Description Power Point discussion
 - a. Seefchak - Committees often get a bad rap. This committee has been outstanding. Everyone has the same document from which to work. Power point slides also included. Committee members: Kathy Clark, Joyce Rollins, Caroline Seefchak, Myra Walters, Rona Axelrod. No individual needs or gains considered.
 - b. Worch – As professionals putting together policy and procedures for the future, cannot take in to consideration any personal gains. Remove our individual thoughts and write this as professionals.
 - c. Seefchak – Written with the department chairs in mind. Not each department’s

individual needs. One section where the chair manages department specific things. For that section, all will have an opportunity to give input.

- d. Rollins – Reminder of committee’s task. To begin construction of what a chair model should look like. Included some of what we do now, but also what the model would look like in a perfect world. Load might look different. Composition might look different.
- e. Clark – all items were well researched.
- f. Seefchak – there is a reference page.
- g. Harrel – Allbritten is well aware chair structure/compensation needs to be reviewed. Open to what this committee might bring forward.
- h. Seefchak – Committee members will chime in to explain how certain items were written.
- i. Clark – Duties fell under each category. Divided by Responsibilities, Descriptors, and Documentation. Can use this information for evaluation purposes. Did discuss full time vs. adjunct. Contractual responsibilities.
- j. Harrel – In some of the models and references from other colleges and universities, where does it state about your restriction to supervise other faculty?
- k. Clark – For full time Faculty, it is in the Union Contract.
- l. Harrel – Chairs are given a lot of responsibility and little authority. Opening the collective negotiations, this may be a perfect time to fix this to say we do need to have more authority. Peer review model where you are led by your peers. Chairs have faculty evaluation status. Allbritten share at one town hall meeting that one of his most challenging evaluator was his department chair who was one of his peers. Let’s not be limited by what we have now.
- m. Clark – If we had a P&T process, it’s always done by peers.
- n. Harrel – opened it up to be selected by your peers. Peers would nominate department chairs.
- o. Rollins – Five members did agree to propose that we would have authority. Wanted to see if everyone agreed.
- p. Seefchak – Hillsborough College model – one person in same role called Program Coordinator. This person is off the collective bargaining agreement during their tenure as coordinator/chair. Retains faculty status. Is not a part of the bargaining unit. Gives faculty member more latitude to supervise. This is a popular one. That would be an 11 month contract.
- q. Rollins – If given authority, then chair needs to be selected by the department.
- r. Nay – In any business organization, first line manager is the first one to evaluate and bring it home. We should be doing the same.
- s. Harrel – Have a pilot process ready by January 2013, so when it’s time to nominate next round of chairs in March 2013, we would be able to use this model. Harrel leaves meeting at 9:30 a.m.
- t. Seefchak – Continues with Power Point. Comments/Concerns so far?
- u. Lewin – What is an anchor paper?
- v. Seefchak – An anchor paper essays subjectively. Documentation for the department.
- w. Rollins – Everything there would fall in to your department process.
- x. Axelrod – We all do different things. Do not fit the same mold.

III. Next section of Chairs Position Description model

- a. Seefchak - "Is a leader within the College" (Page 2, Section 2 of Power Point) can be changed to 'Maintains general knowledge and understanding of the College's organization,.....'
- b. Walters – Policies within specific area that need to be mentioned here.
- c. Swanson – Raises concerns about taking a faculty member from a small department to be the chair.
- d. Seefchak – Some faculty may not have the skills to lead.
- e. Walters – it really boils down to what's in the best interest of the College.
- f. Ottman – also affects your full time adjunct ratios
- g. Seefchak – The next step for model is to be approved by the Dean's Council.
- h. Clark – before it goes to faculty?
- i. Seefchak – We can't decide that today. There are a myriad of items that need to be discussed.
- j. Seefchak – This is the model that Dr. Allbritten is leaning toward. We are looking at this as what's best for Edison State College. Most of us are doing what is in the model.
- k. Walters – It is very important that the chairs do not get a full release. They still need to teach to remain in contact with the students and their issues.
- l. Rollins – Agrees that chairs still need to teach.
- m. Seefchak – This model is not set in stone. It is the committee's recommendations.

IV. Administrative and Organizational (Page 2, Section 3 of Power Point)

- a. Seefchak – Are there any comments on this section?
- b. Lewin – If we are going to continue with an on-line chair as well as a regular chair, we are losing two faculty to administrative duties. Should that be rotated between departments?
- c. Rollins – Should the department that has the on-line chair get an additional faculty member? Remember, this is what we want, not what we are currently doing. We want to have more control over the department.
- d. Worch – Everyone is bringing up excellent points. There are two things to take in to consideration. 1) If Dr. Allbritten's goal is to expand the role of the chair by streamlining the organization, this model fits very well. 2) If the role of the chair is to be mentor/helper of individuals that are their peers and see them through and get a stipend because of that, then this is a model that goes beyond that. The committee has done one excellent job on the model in bringing these things to our attention.
- e. Walters – If we are going to have associate deans, are some of the things we do now would go to an associate dean? The model is a fair assessment of everything we are trying to do.
- f. Worch – We do have a time line for reviewing this. We need to move on. I know some of you in the room teach at 10:00 a.m. Those of you that can stay, we can extend the meeting or because we need to get other feedback, we can entertain bringing the chairs back for another meeting very soon. Whatever you would like to do, I am more than willing to do it for you.

- g. Seefchak – I want to get through this model before 10:00 a.m. So what does everyone want to do?
- h. Lewin – Would like to see us reconvene.
- i. Seefchak – Let's continue on until 10:00. Anything else here that we need to discuss?
- j. Walters – Assessment should remain in the model going forward.
- k. The group agreed.
- l. Lewin – Would like to talk about textbooks.
- m. Seefchak – Can talk about textbooks at the end.
- n. Ottman – Would like to see a training component in the model.
- o. Seefchak – Training model is at the end.
- p. Seefchak – Change Capstone to 'where applicable'.
- q. Rollins – Graduation information. If a chairs wants to decide what Math courses are needed at an AA degree, than the Match department should make those decisions. Wouldn't want another department to make that kind of decision.
- r. Seefchak – the next section is important. We need to think about some of these points.
- s. Clark – Faculty searches to be discussed.
- t. Walters – Model says chairs would be reviewing faculty credentials
- u. Seefchak - There are things that would be changed if we went with the supervisory model.
- v. Ottman – Would we be doing adjunct observations?
- w. Several chairs agreed that they were currently doing this now.
- x. Ottman – At what point do we say we need a second chair?
- y. Seefchak - Everyone needs to be thinking about what they would like to see added to the model that would be department specific.
- z. Nays – Review RQF's?
- aa. Seefchak – Is this something we want the department chair to do?
- bb. Lewin – What is meant by review?
- cc. Seefchak – Look over and check for accuracy.
- dd. Worch – to defend what is up there, in the general order the 2/15/11 COP by Dr. Atkins, one of the duties is viewing credentials for all new adjuncts and full time faculty is one of our duties.
- ee. Seefchak - This was added since we did not know where we are going with this. The way it is proposed is we assist and give input to Dean. This is fluid and can be changed.
- ff. Seefchak – Establishes and maintains a collegial and scholarly environment...We are leaders in our departments and this cannot be over looked.
- gg. Fanslau, Lewin, Axelrod leave meeting at 10:00 a.m. Lewin commends committee for their hard work.
- hh. Worch – Will contact Lewin and Axelrod about next meeting time.

V. Next Power Point Slide, Page 4, Section I

- a. Nay – Who will prepare portfolios for the Adjuncts?
- b. Rollins – Prepare Evaluation Forms?
- c. Seefchak – That does need to be added. The form needs revised.
- d. Nay – Prepare separate form for revising

- e. Seefchak – ‘ Reviews and completes adjunct evaluation forms’ was added to model.

VI. Student Relationships and Teaching. Page 4, Section II

- a. Seefchak – Teaching must be a part of the Chair’s duties.
- b. Clark – Maybe we should not try to decide this right now.
- c. Ottman – All the current chairs are invested in their positions. They care and are concerned about having the best department and pulling the College forward.
- d. Clark – the model has either zero course release or one.
- e. Seefchak – How do we want to fill this blank? Teaches one course per semester?
- f. Swanson – Keeps us teaching and works with this model.
- g. Seefchak - Are we allowed to do overloads?
- h. Rollins – Dr. Allbritten has made a decision on that and he says no on overloads.
- i. Swanson – This is a lot to do. I will not be chair next year so I have nothing in this, but I am a little nervous about stealing academics to do this work. If we only go forward with this, and there may be something else coming down the pike, we might have problems with this, but the ship is going to sail regardless. I would like to suggest that we make it real clear that we look at another version of this which would be to remove half of this and remain half time teacher and half time administrator. If we agree on the current model, we need to come to a unified voice on the teaching/administrative duties. We are going to want to hear from faculty too.
- j. Walters – What are we doing that chairs should do?
- k. Cahill – Could maybe pull from this model and maybe have something we would be comfortable with that would allow us to stay teachers and administrators?
- l. Swanson – That is what I am thinking that we need to have that option on the table. Have two models and we are invested every day. I think we could still be the advocates.
- m. Seefchak addresses the committee members. We can come up with a separate model. Make headings a different color so it will look different. We need to keep this open and nothing says we can’t present two models. Committee how do you feel about that?
- n. Clark – Before we take any more time with that, we may want to ask Dr. Allbritten what does his role look like for department chairs. Is it a full time model?
- o. Swanson – Present the options and they will tell us what they want.
- p. Seefchak – we are not in a position to say what deans/associate deans do. We can only ‘think’ what the department chair will be.
- q. Swanson – Use current proposed model and simply take out what has been discussed.
- r. Rollins – So you have model A as department chairs and model B as department chair/administrator. Leader is less administrative but you are still leading your unit. Administrative would take on a more administrative role.
- s. Seefchak – This can easily be done with what we have. I would not putting that together and sending it everybody. The committee can look at it before I send it out.

- t. Walters – In order for me to consider these models, I would like to have a consensus. How many courses do we think a chair should teach per semester? A number of you realize how time consuming our jobs are. I cannot think of one thing that anyone has asked me to do that the chair has given input. Do you think that the chair should teach one a year or two a year? What has to come out of the position description consensus?
- u. Seefchak – One model would be one course per academic semester.
- v. Swanson – Would like to disagree. We said one course per semester because we like to teach, I think this is zero.
- w. Cahill – Others that have had this job, do teach like one a year, maybe two. There should be a model out there that would indicate that.
- x. Seefchak - Maybe we should add 'has the option to teach one or two courses a year'.
- y. Clark – Then the overload comes in to play again.
- z. Rollins – There is a reason to stay in touch with the students.
- aa. Swanson – That's the reason to argue for a second model.
- bb. Rollins – I suggest one course per year.
- cc. Nay – With the half model, 2 courses per semester.
- dd. Worch – We have to take in to consideration a couple of things here. I heard that Dr. Allbritten may not allow overloads for chairs, but we have a contract that does allow it and I'm not sure the federation is going to allow for that issue in the next union contract. The next thing is if we teach in a bachelor's program, by state statute, if we happen to be the chair, we have to teach a 25% load if we are the only faculty member and it's cut back that we can't teach any overloads, there are areas that this cannot and does not happen. So in essence, by creating this model, if the whole idea is to create a whole new administrative level and force the College to hire another full time faculty to fill the role that we as chairs are vacating, but is already filled and doing fine, because we have re-written this, and now it seems like now we are going in circles.
- ee. Seefchak – Sometimes you have to go in circles to see the full circle, and that is OK. It's a very good discussion.
- ff. Nay – I would like to make a motion that we consider two courses a semester in the half time model.
- gg. Seefchak – All in favor?
- hh. Worch – Even at two a semester, you cannot me the 25%. We are charged with presenting something. We don't want to turn something in and then the question comes back to us "Why wasn't this thought about?" Why did that committee not deal with it.
- ii. Nay – We cannot possibly think of everything.
- jj. Swanson – I think we had a motion to go forward?
- kk. Seefchak – I second the motion. All in favor? All were in favor of the motion.

VII. Community, Professional, Page 4 Section III

- a. Swanson – It's great, but it's just that it's overwhelming when you see it in writing like this.
- b. Ottman – That one thing within your department consumes your life.

- c. Seefchak – There are ways to deal with that. I send a Monday morning e-mail to all faculty and staff in my department and it alleviates so much confusion, They get it, they look at it, and they are not always e-mailing me.
- d. Cahill – There needs to be a transition where there is help for the new chair.
- e. Seefchak – The committee talked about a transition but didn't put it in writing.
- f. Clark – I would like to say about the professional development, the QEP is very time consuming, the professional development is another whole area.
- g. Seefchak – Do we have the QEP in here?
- h. Clark – yes we do.
- i. Seefchak - That should be on the agenda of all our departmental meetings.
- j. Clark – It will show that we are supporting it in our departments.
- k. Ottman – It does delineate what percentage falls to you.
- l. Seefchak - This is a preliminary model and we are not able to do that in our position.
- m. Clark – Keep in mind that we (Collier) no longer has a campus Dean. When we were doing this we didn't know what was going to happen at the time so that adds another level of communication.
- n. It could be six months to a year before we get the Business and Technology component approved.
- n. Seefchak – Exactly.
- o. Walters – Keep in mind as we what model we are going to use. If we're on the SACS committee, even a sub-committee, these are working committees. The other things we need to keep in mind is chairs meetings have a lot of work involved, and there is a lot to be done even for the sub-committees and getting to the meetings and I was going to say depending on what time or what hours you teach, one of the things that I have suggested in the past the chairs do not have classes on Friday because it takes away from valuable meeting time.
- p. Seefchak – I was told chairs could not teach on Fridays after noon.
- q. Walters – As we seriously consider the model, there is a lot of planning for the department meetings, so you can try to maximize the time you have with your faculty. All I'm asking you to do is take that in to consideration when we are looking at this.
- r. Worch – Let's propose three dates.
- s. Seefchak – How do you feel about next Friday, October 12, 2012, here in I-122?
- t. Walters – I would like to add one other thing. Listen to the discussion we are having now about all of our meetings, please keep this in mind as we look to the model because as chairs we were asked to be on some of the committees.
- u. Nay – Asks Worch to get three dates and see what will work for everyone.
- v. Worch agrees to e-mail the group with the dates along with the different models to prevue.
- w. Seefchak will put together the two models.
- x. Worch – We need some determination here so we can get it in the minutes. Is this model that we are proposing , maintaining the chair as a faculty position.
- y. Clark – That was unanimously agreed.
- z. Seefchak – You will always keep your faculty status.
- aa. Worch – Are we sure we are comfortable and it is critical where this thing is going. Are we sure it's Dr. Allbritten's opinion that we will not work overloads?

- bb. Rollins – I had an individual meeting with Dr. Allbritten on Wednesday at which point we said he went to Tallahassee last week and he had two major issues he had to address and one was having a release and teaching overloads. We are going to fix the chair model so that the compensation is there , etc. People are not going to be able to teach overloads.
- cc. Clark – Will the compensation be increasing so we really would not need an overload?
- dd. Ottman – if we no longer have overloads, then our salary should reflect an administrative salary.
- ee. Worch – We would go on an 11 month contract. These are things we need to be thinking about. If we put an individual on an 11 month contract, there would be no teaching in the summer?
- ff. Seefchak – On behalf of the committee that put this together, thank you very much for your cooperation.

VIII. Meeting recessed, not adjourned at 10:25 a.m. by Worch until which time we can re-convene.

10/22/12 vp