

Table Talk
Faculty Contract Negotiations
November 5, 2007

Members Present: Jillian Daly, Dennis Gervin, Brian Sanders, Karen Walters Dunlap, Diane Wirth, Gene Womble
Scribe: Gloria Plasencia
Facilitator: Victoria Simmons

1. The meeting began at 3:00pm in the YCCD Conference Room. The agenda for the meeting and the *Table Talk* for the October 19th meeting were approved.
2. During the Process Check, we discussed the possibility of bringing in YFA Budget Analyst Nancy Sill as a needed resource for the entire group.
3. Five additional negotiation meeting dates were added, taking YFA/District negotiation tentatively into mid-January.
4. A large portion of the meeting was spent in reviewing the negotiation interests of the District Board, the two college campuses, and YFA, and the great majority of the interests were shared. A few of these shared interests include:
 - Attract and retain qualified full-time and adjunct faculty
 - Maintain quality healthcare
 - Establish consistency in the evaluation process across divisions and colleges and between full-time and adjunct faculty
 - Clarify the Academic Calendar process
 - Establish fair and consistent evaluation of online instruction
 - Define general workload terms and the professional work week
5. We discussed the role of the work group that will develop a process for approving professional advancement across the salary schedule and new forms to go along with that process.
6. Diane reported that the data regarding benefits costs of our cohorts will be ready in two or three weeks and Teresa has completed the data gathering on cohorts' salary. Brian agreed to work with Teresa in creating the Total Compensation charts for financial discussions.
7. We then moved on to our first negotiation topic—Evaluation appendices and clarification of the adjunct evaluation process and timeline.
8. We discussed the “story,” interests, and different options to create better consistency and higher quality of peer observations and student/self evaluations. Some of the issues that surfaced in the discussion were what to do when the faculty evaluation cycle is interrupted by a sabbatical leave, whether there should be separate criteria appendices for non-instructional faculty and adjunct faculty, and how to address the different kinds of teaching modes in peer observation forms (eg. laboratory, coaching, class lecture, online, student counseling, etc.). We also discussed the possibility of defining the types of faculty (eg. probationary, regular, temporary full-time, special non-tenure track, adjunct, etc.) at the beginning of the evaluation article.
9. We agreed to return to the topic of evaluation at our next meeting on Friday, November 9th.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20pm.