Table Talk
Faculty Contract Negotiations
January 25, 2013
9:00am-12:00pm

Members present: Jillian Daly, Cece Hudleston-Putnam, Emily Malsam, Tom Nomof, Diane Wirth,
Michael Sundquist, Gene Womble

Recollections: Michael Sundquist

Absent: Michael Guerra, Rose LaMont

1. The meeting began with a discussion about how to define the subjects that fall under Workload for faculty. We decided to create a matrix that would crosswalk all our cohort union contracts and the categories negotiated in their contracts under Workload in order to have a concrete image of negotiable workload topics.

2. Next, we once again debated the processes we would use in order to negotiate maximum class size. We agreed to look at both Columbia College and MJC data at our next meeting.

3. Our discussion of class size led to a workgroup analysis of each of our cohort contracts to determine whether workload was described using unit load or load based on hours. For instance, YCCD describes load in hours in Appendix B of the Faculty Contract. We discovered that most districts in the cohort also use hours for load, often called a “Lecture Equivalent Hour” or LEH. A third of the contracts describe load using units; in these districts, then, if a course is three units but meets for four to five hours, load would remain at 15 units a semester but student contact hours would be greater than 15 hours. Faculty would be paid based on the unit values even though the hours are greater.

4. Next, we determined that all of our negotiated cohort contracts contain language describing work week formulas. The traditional work week formula for instructional faculty (non-compressed calendar), including in our district, is a 40-hour week divided up into blocks of time as follows (NOTE: Under the compressed calendar, 40 hours = 42.5 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOAD</th>
<th>Student Contact Hours</th>
<th>Prep/Grading/Curric.</th>
<th>Office Hours</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Hour Load</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula changes based on load hours, as shown in several examples below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20 Hour Activity Load</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Differential Load</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counselor Load</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We agreed that we would create draft work week language under our workload article.
5. We then moved on to reviewing research Tom Nomof provided on lecture and laboratory load as described in our cohort contracts. Many set loads with a laboratory hour being 75% of one LEH; however, we were attracted to the equitability in some contracts that defined several different kinds of laboratory classes that set loads at different percents of one LEH, such as 65%, 75%, 85%, depending on the amount of instructor work involved. We agreed to gather more data on these models.

6. The discussion then moved on to how we wanted to describe load in our new workload article. YCCD is the only contract that describes load for every discipline in an Appendix based on hours. Both teams agreed that we would like to move in the direction of the rest of the State in describing load in more holistic terms—for example, describing categories of load such as Lecture, Laboratory (with different percents for different kinds), Activity, Counseling, Librarians, English differential, etc. We agreed to focus research in this direction.

7. The meeting ended at 12:00pm.
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