

---

---

## **UFF Fall Consultation Meeting**

September 26, 2018

FSU/Westcott Building

3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

---

---

Attendees:

University

Kyle Clark

Sally McRorie

Renisha Gibbs

Janet Kistner

Rebecca Peterson

Carolyn Egan

Lisa Scoles

Lynn Hogan

Adam Donaldson

UFF

Jack Fiorito

Michael Buchler

Scott Hannahs

Irene Padavic

Matthew Lata

Nancy Kellett

Robin Goodman

Dr. Harsh Jain

**Meeting begins at 3:05pm**

### **1. Approval of Agenda Items**

Mr. Matthew Lata began by announcing agenda item #9 was being struck.

Renisha Gibbs thanked him for this and welcomed everyone to the consultation. A quick round of introductions was made, with UFF introducing one new member of their team, Dr. Harsh Jain.

### **2. Minutes from Consultation Meeting 5/2/2018**

Ms. Gibbs asked if UFF had received the minutes from the last consultation, had the opportunity to review them, and if there were any additional edits or corrections.

Dr. Jain thanked her for sending them in advance and verbalized that UFF approved of the changes.

### 3. Turnaround time for travel reimbursement with the CONCUR system

UFF

Mr. Lata proposed the meeting move on to the next agenda item, that of the new CONCUR Travel Reimbursement system being utilized for faculty travel documentation and reimbursement.

Ms. Nancy Kellett continued, stating that she has heard from several people who claim to have had difficulties with the CONCUR system. She detailed her experience with it, a trip for work in the first or second week of June. She did not receive reimbursement until 2.5 months later. She stated that it was a fairly large amount of money, but she did concede not all of the delay in reimbursement was due to CONCUR. Some of the delay was due to the fiscal year turning over right at that time. Some was due to employee error in entering the travel into CONCUR. She finished that she hopes it will get easier to use in the future. She said that her unit has gone back to paper forms to track travel, and she was instructed by fiscal employees in her area not to enter anything into CONCUR.

Vice President of Finance and Administration Kyle Clark replied to her to please let him know immediately when these issues are happening; please do not wait until consultation. He continued that in Ms. Kellett's travel situation, the travel rep was not aware that she had gone to this conference. The trip wasn't entered in the system until 8/2/18. It was then approved on 8/6/18.

Ms. Kellett replied that she had notified a rep that she was traveling and she has the email that she sent saved.

Vice President Clark continued that in this instance, there was an irregularity in the lodging line, which the lodging rep then worked with the traveler to correct. His feeling is that the issue is not so much with CONCUR itself, but perhaps training employees on how to most efficiently utilize it. He continued that training materials for CONCUR is an area his office continues to look into; he has offered to send over training resources previously. A similar issue occurred with CONCUR due to lack of training in the Math Department. He understands this is a change and it's new and different, it's a challenge, but there are a lot of benefits to this system that didn't exist with the old system. He himself benefitted from it on a recent trip when a flight was cancelled. Both reported instances of issues with CONCUR seemed like they were issues on a training level. As of the previous Friday at 4:00 p.m., there were 400 requests in the system at various levels. Normally it's around 800, so his office is staying on top of it and turning them around quickly.

Dr. Scott Hannahs offered that his department had a reimbursement through CONCUR that took quite a bit of time. He continued that the coordinator in his department who deals with travel is very well trained and experienced. Dr. Hannahs continued that he believes the interface to CONCUR leads to mistakes, such as the one of it being over or under \$150. The interface is not that intuitive and allows these mistakes to happen.

Vice President Clark replied that if there are suggested tweaks, he would be happy to hear them and make changes. Most major universities have adopted the CONCUR system. But there are always opportunities to tweak and perfect things. He stated that he would look into setting up a time when these issues can be discussed along with appropriate resolutions.

Dr. Michael Buchler stated he had a different issue pertaining to CONCUR he was hoping to discuss. He was making reservations to go to a conference in San Antonio, the plane fares he was getting on CONCUR were appreciably more expensive than the prices on the airline website. After investigating, he discovered that CONCUR was actually cheaper comparing apples to apples but it wasn't letting him get Delta's new "economy" air class. He ended by stating that he is very frugal, and attempts to extend his travel budget as much as possible.

Vice President Clark asked Dr. Buchler to confirm that he was attempting to book via the method where they don't assign the consumer a seat number.

Dr. Buchler confirmed this was correct, adding that those seats were about \$50 cheaper.

Vice President Clark responded that he is surprised to hear that. He was expecting to hear the opposite, and promised to look further into this matter.

Dr. Jack Fiorito offered that he made a trip to Baltimore in June, and he picked the option that allowed him to select his seat in advance. He continued that he was told afterwards that he could not get reimbursed for the extra \$19.

Vice President Clark answered that he will find out about the basic economy aspect. He wants CONCUR to have that tool, but has heard a lot of complaints about people trying to book that. Most people want to have a seat assignment in advance to know that they have a seat on the plane. In order to get deeper discounts, especially air travel, FSU needs to be able to show a consolidated volume of consistent travel. That will come through on CONCUR. Silver is giving 20% off on trips throughout the state of Florida with free change fees and free baggage fees.

#### **4. Clarify email policy for retirees**

**UFF**

Dr. Hannahs directed the discussion towards the next agenda item, stating that he is seeking a clarification on the faculty email policy for retiring faculty members. He continued that he sees a discrepancy between the new Email policy that was distributed, and the CBA. The CBA says retired faculty members are eligible for an email account. The new email policy says that they get one if it's determined by the unit where they have a courtesy appointment, and there are a bunch of restrictions on that. He sees a problem in that the policy implies the unit has the option of declining one. He suggested a tweak to the wording of the email policy, along the lines of: "retired faculty can continue to use their email account, no courtesy appointment is required."

Dr. Irene Padavic added that the way it is seems to be conflating the two groups.

Renisha Gibbs expressed appreciation for the feedback. She continued that her office has held some very in-depth discussions about this policy. She elaborated that the CBA does say "shall" but it also says "subject to university policies." She added that her office will review the language of the policy and make sure that it's having the intended impact.

Dr. Padavic responded that UFF had drafted out a proposed wording, and asked whether it could be passed along for consideration.

Ms. Gibbs replied that she is happy to take a look at anything UFF has brought.

### **5. Consistency in the timetable for grade appeal policy**

**UFF**

Dr. Fiorito sought to move the discussion to the next agenda item, stating he had a couple of questions regarding the grade appeal policy. He brought a copy of the policy that he referenced, stating that in his capacity as Chair and Interim Chair in recent years, he has experience dealing with the grade appeal policy. He continued that the policy still refers to the Dean of the Faculties, which does not exist anymore, and refers to Dean of Graduate Studies. He directed attention to page 2, where it states “as part of the step 2 process, within 20 calendar days thereafter...” He asked whether the meeting itself is supposed to occur within 20 days, or whether just the arrangement of the meeting is supposed to occur within 20 days. He believes the language to be ambiguous.

Dr. Fiorito continued, stating he had an additional question on this topic. When there is a department chair, a program chair, and in some appeals (related to an MBA program) a program administrator, who should be the presider in those situations? He also continued that the same question he raised a moment ago in regards to 20 days pertains to step 3 in the process and that he had a student argue that they wanted to schedule the meeting much further in the future, well past the 20 days. He anticipated that the response today might be that it’s an issue that should be brought to the Faculty Senate, but thought he would bring it up here and ask how can this situation be cleaned up.

Dr. Janet Kistner replied that Jennifer Buchanan in her office has already begun working on this issue, taking the inaccurate titles out and changing the language regarding the number of calendar days. She is working to put together a proposal to the Faculty Senate. If Dr. Fiorito is in agreement, Dr. Kistner will have Jennifer Buchanan reach out to him to speak about incorporating his concerns into her revisions.

Dr. Fiorito thanked her and stated that that idea works for him.

### **6. Informing faculty about components of raises**

**UFF**

Dr. Buchler stated that the compensation history page in the FSU web system is so much nicer now. It’s a lot clearer. He continued that one category UFF would like to be able to see have greater clarity is merit pay. Currently, merit is shown as a combined amount, but UFF would like to see merit pay split out into Dean’s merit and Departmental merit.

Ms. Gibbs answered stating she believes this question has been raised before and she understands why it’s been brought up again. On the administrative side, when merit pay is entered in, the system groups both types of merit together as one. It would necessitate a large amount of work by a large number of

employees to be able to break those out in the system. She continued that it's not a goal of hers or her office right now to increase manual processes. In fact, she has actually been trying to move the opposite way.

Dr. Buchler responded that since these categories are negotiated separately, he thinks faculty have a right to know where that line of separation is.

Ms. Gibbs sought to clarify, stating that her office provides UFF with lists that show a breakdown of both types of merit increases.

Dr. Buchler replied that they have not received those lists.

Provost McRorie elaborated that the Deans have two buckets with which they can reward faculty members with an increase, the Dean's merit and the Departmental merit.

Dr. Padavic stated that if she were ever to receive Deans, she would like to know. It would make her feel good and would make her feel appreciated.

Provost McRorie offered that it's a possibility that someone may get a 0 in Dean's merit but have gotten a bigger bump in the other column.

Dr. Robin Goodman asked whether in the future it would be possible to see a breakdown of Dean's merit vs Departmental merit when they are received?

Ms. Gibbs replied that at this time she is not making any plans to increase manual processes for her office with all of the other labor-intensive work that is going on around the campus currently.

## **7. Legislative Update**

**UFF**

Mr. Matthew Lata asked if there is any update on legislative action or if not much would be known until November. He continued by expressing appreciation to President Thrasher for sending out the communication to register to vote, and UFF is hoping that message will be sent out again prior to November.

Vice President Clark asked if they had noted that the University is setting up areas for early voting participation as well.

Mr. Lata replied that they had and are very appreciate of that as well.

Vice President Clark continued that he and the University were happy to do that, although it was a bit of a struggle with the city to get it arranged but they wanted to make it happen. He continued that there was a laundry list of 30 criteria that had to be met at the facility to get it approved. The Tucker Center was the only place that made sense for it.

Dr. Hannahs replied that he thinks it's great that the University did this, and he's glad they did.

## **8. Campus Surveillance system**

**UFF**

Dr. Irene Padavic transitioned to the next agenda item, stating that UFF has learned through a librarian, who is not in the room, that there's going to be a facial recognition system implemented on campus. She and her team have a bunch of questions about this. First, where will the cameras be?

Vice President Clark answered that there is not a facial recognition system being implemented on campus. He is in the process of exploring a facial matching system in collaboration with FSU PD. Facial recognition is not a term that's been used in any of the exploratory meetings about this on campus. The project is still in its early stages, and other options are being discussed. The technology that would be used would be installed along the card reader access system right at the front of the library.

Dr. Padavic asked if this technology would just be limited to the libraries.

Vice President Clark replied that what is being looked at right now is the libraries or places that need 24-hour access. The program would be piloted at the library; again right now it is only an idea. But if it does come to pass and works well, it could potentially be expanded to other 24-hour areas. He finished by stating that he would be happy to provide an update to UFF at the next consultation.

Dr. Goodman inquired as to whether this would be something that the faculty could be involved with implementing.

Vice President Clark answered that he wouldn't think so since it's a security measure. If the University was considering putting it into a department, then the members of that department would be reached out to first and involved in discussions about where and how would make the most sense for them to implement it. He continued that the swipe system currently in place is very antiquated and there are many more technologies available now, such as retina recognition, finger print recognition, and more. He and Facilities have been exploring ideas on how to move away from the current system.

Dr. Padavic sought to clarify, and asked whether the overriding goal is to supervise and protect access to the buildings, not necessarily to have cameras watching everywhere.

Vice President Clark confirmed this was correct, stating that it's about access to a facility. It's not about playing "big brother."

Dr. Hannahs requested a clarification between facial match vs facial recognition technology.

Vice President Clark responded that he is not an expert in either. He and his team are just exploring how to get the most efficient safety measures in place. During the Richard Spencer Event at UF, FSU sent a

number of its police force down to help out with that event, and they reported back that UF has more security measures in place than FSU does. That's a message that he and his office have taken to heart. He continued that things like closed circuit cameras in parking lots and more license plate readers on and throughout campus are other security measures that are being considered.

Dr. Hannahs asked if UF has policies on the use of the video recordings from their cameras.

Vice President Clark answered that he does not know, but that he isn't talking about cameras being put in offices; he is discussing installing them on legacy walk and in parking garages.

Dr. Padavic thanked him and stated that his replies adequately addressed her concerns on this issue.

Dr. Hannahs offered that he is worried about the possibility of mission creep. First, the cameras are outside, and then next they're talking about putting them in hallways. He is concerned about a progression. He continued that a policy for the actual use of the footage will need to be discussed.

Vice President Clark replied that if a point is reached where there are cameras going into buildings, he will sit down and have a discussion about it, but that is a long way off currently.

#### **9. Grievance Distribution**

**STRUCK**

\*This item was struck from the agenda\*

#### **10. Other Business**

Ms. Gibbs stated that if nobody had any other items for discussion, she will consider this meeting adjourned, and thanked everyone for their time.

**\* Meeting adjourns at 3:48pm\***