Table Talk
Faculty Contract Negotiations
February 1, 2013
1:00pm-4:15pm

Members present: Jillian Daly, Michael Guerra, Cece Hudelson-Putnam, Rose LaMont, Emily Malsam, Tom Nomof, Michael Sundquist, Diane Wirth, Gene Womble

Recollections: Tom Nomof

1. The Table Talks of January 18th and 25th were approved.
2. Next, both teams engaged in discussion about the need to begin making decisions regarding workload. After several months of research, analysis, and debate, we felt that we were ready to begin making general agreements and to create an Ad Hoc work group to start writing contract language. We agreed to a “Frankenstein” concept of piecing together parts of “best hits” from other contracts and tweaking them to fit our YCCD/YFA agreements—add a little electricity, and our Workload article could be “alive.”
3. We moved on to our first main topic—lecture/laboratory percent loads. At our previous meeting we had agreed to the concept of expanding our lab percent loads from 65%, 75%, 80% and 85%, similar to contract language found in Chabot Las Positas’ contract, as we all felt this was the most equitable model. In contacting Chabot Las Positas, we found that adjusting some labs upwards to 80% and 85%, resulted in an annual cost of $200,000 to $300,000.
4. We then began discussion on processes we might use to adjust lab percents and also the problems of scheduling labs as overload rather than base load, making labs at the same hourly rate as lecture classes. We looked at several different disciplines, and found that with labs set at 75% it is sometimes difficult to schedule full-time faculty with a straight 100% load. No consensus was reached and we agreed to come back to this topic but to move on to other issues on the agenda.
5. We looked at a document that listed definitions under Workload and agreed to incorporate these at the beginning of our new Workload article.
6. We looked at a matrix listing all topics under Workload in our Cohorts’ contracts, and found they have negotiated the following topics: Weekly Student Contact Hours minimums; Assignment/Number of Preparations; Lecture/Lab Hours; Office Hours; Separate workloads for Counseling and Librarians; FLEX Duty Days; Faculty Advising; Overload; Minimum Class Size; Large Enrollment Formulas; Maximum Class Size; Distance Education; Load Balancing; and Work Week, and Faculty Responsibilities.
7. The next topic for discussion was looking at research on Large Lecture Class Accommodations. After review, both teams agreed to increase the number of percent gradients for Large Lecture
Classes. Currently, we have a formula for a double, triple, and quadruple at 1.25%—so, a class of 40 students is a double with 100 students and a triple with 150 students, etc. The problem occurs when the number of students comes well over 100 but under 150, for example, creating an increased load for the faculty member who will get credit only for a double while teaching an extra 30-40 students. By increasing the gradients to every tenth, faculty workload for Large Lecture Classes more clearly represents true workload; for example, a class with 140 students now can become a 2.8% load.

8. As well as agreeing to increase the number of Large Lecture Class Size formulas, we agreed to include load balancing language to prevent cancellation of low enrolled classes by allowing faculty to add more students in one class to offset lower numbers in another class. The only remaining issue under this topic was at what date should class size be determined. All our cohort contracts used the census date to determine. We decided to do some research analyzing different dates and to bring this back to the table at our next meeting.

9. We created an Ad Hoc work group to start crafting new contract language on workload to bring back to the table for review and approval.

10. We ended the meeting with a brief discussion on Faculty Coordinator positions and how we might want to incorporate workload descriptions into the contract for these instructors.

11. The meeting ended at 4:15pm.

Submitted by Jillian Daly