

MINUTES

UFO Executive Board Meeting
14 October 2020
Held via Zoom
4:30 p.m.

Executive Board Members present:

Jeff O'Connell
Rob Smedfjeld
Andrea Brown
Isabel Reichert
Janice Jones
Jeffrey S. Dean
Emmanuel Garcia
Heather McCarty
Teresa Massimo

O'Connell began the meeting with a request to approve the minutes for two previous meetings. Smedfjeld had emailed O'Connell a few minor corrections and those revisions have been entered by O'Connell.

Before approval of the minutes of May 1, 2020 and September 9, 2020, the Executive Board discussed how detailed the minutes should be. Further, the Executive Board discussed how the UFO would publish its meeting dates, times, and agenda, noting that the minutes will be published on the UFO website, which anyone can access.

A motion to approve the minutes from May 1 and September 9 (with corrections) was made by Garcia and seconded by Brown. Votes in favor of the motion were cast by Garcia, Brown, O'Connell, Smedfjeld, Jones, Reichert, and Dean. There were no votes in opposition and no abstentions.

O'Connell then provided an update on items he is working on in his capacity as UFO President. One issue that has arisen among faculty relates to distance education requirements. He characterized this type of issue as relatively minor and mainly involved clarification of what current policies are and how they impact faculty.

Other issues that O'Connell touched on were more significant (and in the forefront of concern generally) and related to the impact that COVID-19 is having on instruction. One such impact relates to the changing of courses from in-person labs to remote

instruction or online. This change inadvertently decreased the number of hours for some faculty. O'Connell is continuing to work with the District on this issue.

Another issue mentioned by O'Connell related to the clarification of a miscommunication as it pertained to the pay scale applied to faculty with doctoral degrees when those faculty teach overloads.

The most complicated and difficult issue that is being worked on by O'Connell is enacting re-hire rights for adjunct faculty. A significant aspect of this problem relates to deans not knowing the history of employment of adjunct faculty members that the deans supervise. Tracking this is key to correctly applying re-hire rights. It was suggested that keeping track of this by means of the adjunct's evaluations would be a good way to note an adjunct's employment history as a faculty member.

The next topic of the meeting was work done by the UFO Webmaster, Isabel Reichert. O'Connell asked Reichert to show the Executive Board the work that has been done on the form used when a faculty member first joins the UFO. Reichert illustrated the use of Adobe Sign on our enrollment form and indicated that this will make for an easier process. Jones noted that ultimately the UFO needs to submit information to Human Resources. It was noted in this discussion that Adobe Sign provides a way to get receipts and track how a given document was processed.

Another issue that Reichert brought up and asked the Executive Board about was the ability to have additional email addresses for a fee. These addresses would end with the suffix "@ohloneufo.org." Currently, we have a limited number of email addresses and most of those have already been designated. We can have unlimited email addresses for an additional charge. The Executive Board felt that it did not need to pay for email addresses beyond those we currently have available. Within the limited number of addresses that we are able to have without paying the additional fee, Brown indicated that having an email address for the part-time representative would be good. This email, like the others, can then be passed on to future Executive Board members. It was noted that an email for the full-time representative could also be of use. O'Connell will continue to work with Reichert on getting the part-time representative email established and forwarded to Brown.

The next item was an update from Emmanuel Garcia, the negotiations chair. The first item related to the efforts made to communicate with parties involved in previous negotiations to get information on topics that were previously dealt with. Garcia indicated that there were no responses to multiple emails sent to the parties involved in the previous cycle of negotiations. Jones, who was involved in the previous cycle of negotiations, volunteered to speak with Garcia.

Garcia noted that conversations with faculty whose assignments are not in typical lecture or lab formats, such as counselors, would provide insight for the current

negotiators. Further, Garcia said that a meeting with the faculty involved in health sciences (nursing, physical therapy assistant, respiratory therapy) is scheduled. In particular, information on how the teaching loads for those faculty are determined is being sought.

Brown noted that the faculty in the library, who would also fall into this category of faculty whose assignments are outside of the classroom, should be queried. Brown also noted that it would be good to contact faculty with coaching assignments. McCarty indicated that those positions are mentioned in the current contract, in particular the current stipends for coaching assignments.

The next topic discussed by the board related to a training requirement for full-time faculty who evaluate adjunct faculty. Garcia noted that there has been some communication on this topic with the District, but that (as of this meeting) there was no firm conclusion or agreement on the topics that are to be covered in the training. This was noted as a concern, since the training was scheduled for the end of the week. Jones noted receiving an email indicating that the training was being required of full-time faculty doing these evaluations and not optional. The training is only required for full-time faculty who evaluate adjunct faculty. Garcia indicated that the training would be recorded for those who could not attend at the scheduled time, but voiced a preference that the training be in a format which would allow for a question and answer period. The inclusion of questions and answers is especially important, Garcia said, because of the role that evaluations play in an adjunct instructor's employment. O'Connell indicated that the training should be ongoing and done during Learning College Week.

O'Connell suggested that Garcia reach out to Dean Ghada Al-Masri of Social Sciences, who will be leading the training, to get specific information on the topics that will be covered in the training. Smedfeld noted that it is important to know whether or not the topics covered in the training align with topics that were previously proposed by Garcia and communicated to the District. This, Smedfeld said, would allow the UFO Executive Board to determine if the District's proposed training is adequate and appropriate. Brown supported the idea that it is important to have adequate training of full-time faculty who evaluate adjunct faculty.

In response to a question from Dean, Garcia indicated that the VP of Academic Affairs has been thinking about what training the Deans have in advance of the evaluations they perform of both full-time and part-time faculty. Brown voiced the opinion that faculty should have input on the topics covered and that the training should not go forward if it is unclear whether or not the topics of the training met the needs of the faculty doing the evaluations and the adjunct faculty being evaluated.

In response to a question from Massimo, Garcia said that the mention of a training on evaluation has been in the contract since 2017, but a training has not existed until the

present proposed training. Massimo stated the belief that faculty should have a hand in crafting any required training. Wrapping up this topic, O'Connell would follow up with Garcia and others involved in determining the topics for the proposed training.

The next topic for the meeting involved endorsement of candidates for the upcoming election, in which three seats on the Ohlone College Board of Trustees are open. Jones asked whether or not the UFO Executive Board would be endorsing any of the candidates for the Board of Trustees in the upcoming election. Jones indicated that, while it might be too late to do this for the November 2020 election, the UFO Executive Board should consider doing this in the future, as it was done in the past. Smedfeld said that there might be some downsides to the UFO Executive Board endorsing or not endorsing candidates for the Board of Trustees. Massimo indicated that a UFO Executive Board endorsement might be something to consider in future elections held for seats on the Board of Trustees. McCarty agreed that the UFO Executive Board should consider endorsement of candidates.

Jones next brought up the topic of whether or not an administrator can compel online instruction as opposed to synchronous instruction for a particular class, even if the faculty member or members do not wish for the class to be taught in a particular way. Jones asked whether or not the UFO has or should have a position on how a course is to be delivered, whether that be synchronously or asynchronously. McCarty indicated that the concept of "right of assignment" would play a role in this discussion. Massimo asked whether or not the method of delivery of a course is in the contract. Garcia noted that it was not in the contract, but that it was mentioned in the most recent MOU. Garcia further said that "right of assignment" would factor into this determination. Massimo argued for faculty involvement in any determination regarding the delivery method of a class.

The Executive Board took a brief break at this point in the meeting.

After the break, there was a short discussion about Faculty Grievances. Other unions have a "Grievance Officer" who is trained for this role. There was discussion about the fact that several of the recent grievances were a result of our evaluation process. It was agreed that this discussion will continue in the future.

Respectfully submitted by Jeffrey S. Dean, Secretary of the UFO, 16 October 2020