

Table Talk
Faculty Contract Negotiations
November 9, 2007

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

1. The meeting began at 9:00am in the YCCD Conference Room. The agenda for the meeting and the *Table Talk* for the November 5th meeting were approved.
2. We clarified that the charge of the Professional Development Work Group is to develop the criteria and the process for approving professional development for salary advancement, and that a new form would be created to go along with that process.
3. We agreed to add Nancy Sill, YFA Budget Analyst, as a YFA negotiation team member during all compensation discussions.
4. We agreed to form work groups to help negotiation team members create Faculty Evaluation forms as Appendices to the Faculty Contract. For instance, members of the Virtual Classroom Committee and faculty who teach online will be asked to help create the Peer Observation Form for Online teaching; Counselors will help create the Form for Peer Observation of Counselors, etc.
5. We tentatively agreed to ground rules regarding Student Evaluation Forms, including that the focus would be on evaluating the instructor, not the course; that the faculty member should not conduct their own student evaluations; that peer evaluators could not go “off the form” and ask their own questions of the students; and that all student narrative responses must be typed for confidentiality.
6. We agreed that the Student Evaluation Form for Instructional Faculty should have the following four elements: a cover letter with instructions for the students to be read aloud, a set amount of quantitative questions, a group of added questions for laboratory formats, a few questions for narrative responses.
7. Brian, Jillian, and Gene agreed to review current division student evaluation forms along with forms from several of our cohorts and to bring a rough draft Student Evaluation Form for Instructional Faculty to the next meeting.
8. We discussed Adjunct faculty evaluation, which we didn’t get to in the last negotiations, and decided to clarify the language and timeline so they coincide with the changes made to Article 6 (Full-time Faculty Evaluation).
9. We moved on to our next negotiation topic, the Academic Calendar, and worked together in “telling the story.” Some of the issues discussed were the following:
 - The current contract lacks a clear process for adding major calendar changes, such as an Intersession.
 - It’s unclear whether MJC and Columbia can or should be on two separate Academic Calendars.
 - Clarity is needed because we have students, staff and faculty who attend or work at both colleges.

- The current Article 3 doesn't define who is on the Academic Calendar committee at either college, which confuses the process.
 - In the past, faculty felt leveraged as the decision to compress the calendar also came with a big raise.
10. We agreed that the faculty, administration, staff, and students were all stakeholders in changes to the Academic Calendar and found many shared interests, which included creating a calendar with as much unity as possible, with appropriate down time, a calendar that maintained academic standards, that addressed the needs of the community, that aligned itself with surrounding school districts, and that could flexibly respond to maximum use of our facilities.
 11. Faculty interests also included having a voice in determining our working hours and the need to separate small, ongoing calendar decisions from major systemic calendar changes (like the inclusion of an intersession).

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

Approved