

CEER (Certificated Employee Employer Relations)

Minutes - February 21, 2020 12:30pm

Members present: Sandra Ammons, Mark Lieu, Jeff O'Connell, Rob Smedfjeld, Shairon Zingsheim

1. Introductions
2. What is CEER?
 - a. Mark, Shairon, and Rob shared their past experiences with CEER.
 - b. Mark saw CEER as having three aspects: working on faculty-district issues that don't need to be negotiated, working on background info before something is negotiated, or developing ways to implement something that has been negotiated.
 - c. Shairon brought several examples of things that had been worked on at CEER, and suggested that items could also be brought to CEER to explore what interest might exist in negotiating later.
 - d. Rob pointed out that the contract indicates that the "sole purpose" of CEER is to "maintain a viable and effective channel of communication" between the UFO and the District, but gives very little information about what that communication should be about. The contract gives the one example that policies being considered by the District that could impact working conditions should be brought to CEER. Additionally, the language emphasizes that CEER is separate from negotiations, and CEER cannot in any way change the contract.
3. Full-Time Faculty Evaluation Process and Tenure Process
 - a. Currently there is no tenure process defined within our contract at all. In looking at suggestions for a tenure process, CEER will also look at the evaluation process for tenured faculty.
 - b. We need to identify the purpose of each process. There was some discussion about the difference between evaluating someone's job performance and creating professional growth opportunities. In particular, what role does the self-evaluation play? In some cases, it can serve as a way for a faculty member to reflect on their own growth over time. On the other hand, the self-evaluations can help the deans be aware of faculty accomplishments that they might not otherwise know/remember.
 - c. Rob shared some documents he found. Two of them were publications by the statewide Academic Senate: "Towards A Model Four Year Tenure Process" from 1990 and "Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluation" from 2013. The other document was CA Ed. Code 87663 which indicates that "peer review" must be included as part of evaluations, but it doesn't define what "peer review" is. Additionally, the law indicates that the local academic senate must be consulted as part of establishing new evaluation procedures. Rob will send out the document links to the rest of the group.
 - d. As an overall strategy, the group agreed that it would be good to have each side work on identifying their own interests (in the context of interest-based bargaining), and then we can come back together to determine what commonalities there are. We can then prepare a summary to hand off to negotiations.
 - e. As "homework", each side will survey their constituents about what the desired components would be for each of the two categories of full-time evaluations (tenured and probationary). Additionally, we will ask for suggestions of model examples from other community colleges. Mark and Rob will take the lead on doing that work for the District and the faculty, respectively.

4. The group briefly discussed some other agenda items for the semester.
 - a. Faculty (employee) access to info through WebAdvisor
 - i. The question initially came up in regard to identifying step & column placement and annual/semester salary.
 - ii. Mark questioned whether there are differences between what each of us actually sees when we log into WebAdvisor. Potentially, based on our positions (past and present), we may have access to different kinds of information.
 - iii. Jeff pointed out that WebAdvisor is going away within the next couple of years, and that something called "Student Self Service" will be taking its place (maybe being combined together along the way).
 - iv. We will have someone from IT present to us at our next meeting.
 - v. In the meantime, the "homework" for all members will be to find out what each of us can access in WebAdvisor regarding our individual employment information.
 - b. Development/approval process for column movement plans
 - i. Jeff and Shairon both shared some background on this. Largely because of changes in administrators, there have been inconsistencies in how courses have been applied or denied for use toward column movement.
 - ii. The current contract language is in Section 8.5. CEER can consider possible clarifications to the contract language and pass those along to the negotiating teams. As part of doing this, we can review past cases.
 - c. Parking issues resulting from the new Fremont campus
 - i. Because there is still so much change going on, it is difficult to know whether or not there is enough parking for faculty/staff.
 - ii. We'll postpone doing anything with this, until things settle more.
 - d. Building access policies
 - i. Decisions were made about locking the new buildings, determining times that faculty won't have access. This is a change in how faculty have had access to other buildings on campus.
 - ii. Given that there are still issues with the keycard technology actually working the way it should, we will hold off on considering this issue for now.
 - e. CEER membership size
 - i. CEER can serve as a pathway to other work with the union. Should we consider expanding the size of the standing committee (which would require changing the contract) to foster learning opportunities? Or maybe just make a point of including guests more often?
 - ii. Mark questioned whether a structural change to CEER should be made that really isn't in keeping with the main purpose of CEER since the pathway to UFO involvement is a side benefit.
 - iii. For now, we will continue with the core six members, and invite guests (depending on interest) for the other items we work on this semester.
5. Determine dates/times for future meetings
 - a. April 3 11-12:30 in Building 19. Shairon will ask David to reserve a meeting room there.
 - b. May 8 11-12:30. Rob will reserve a room and send out invitations.
 - c. In both cases, Rob will send out the meeting invitations.