

FUSA-HCC BOT Bargaining Meeting  
March 2, 2007  
1:20 p.m.  
Dale Mabry, Social Sciences 124

In attendance were the administrative team members: Mark Levitt, Craig Johnson, Sue Flaig, Carlos Soto, and administrative support Karen Griffin and Donna Miller. FUSA bargaining team: Michael Moats, Alex Ambrioso, Walt Ellis, Liana Fox, Tammy Higson, Eric Joost, Mara Manis, Maribeth Mobley, Desi Saludes, Barry Silber, and John Whitlock. Faculty members: Thomas Klee and Joey Naftel.

Introductions were made and FUSA distributed copies of interest-based bargaining rules and then discussed areas of concern, about half of which is language cleanup. The administration suggested that on some of the issues, perhaps both sides could work in committees and then present the agreed upon language at the table.

#### Tenure

Article 6.16.G. and H. – the reference to a fourth year needs to be eliminated.

Article 6.16.E.2. vs. H.1. – the second sentence, may be problematic.

The tenure timeline is not adhered to and needs to be analyzed, perhaps reworked.

Mr. Levitt pointed out a typo on page 16 – “family” should be “faculty” – saying it was the first thing both sides could agree on, adding “That’s it. That’s all we have.”

#### Faculty Evaluation and Development

Article 9.2 – FUSA suggested that required courses be replaced with in-house seminars, resulting in less development hours. Administration pointed out another typo on p. 68: “compete” should be “complete.”

Administration said that it had come to listen and not to present issues.

#### Assault, Battery, or Threats of Injury

Article 8.15 – FUSA discussed instances of verbal abuse, when students have been allowed to return to class, and suggested analyzing this article.

#### Independent Study Compensation

Article 14.6 needs to be moved to Article 8.2.B. Add an 8 to define “independent study,” and under Article 8.2.C., add an 8 for compensation.

#### Faculty Working Conditions

Article 8.1.C.1.g. Counselors are routinely being asked to work in excess of their regular work week with no compensation. Administration said that perhaps it is not a contractual wording issue but a matter of addressing the problem in the department.

## Faculty Evaluation and Development

Article 9.1.B. and D. FUSA prefers omitting these paragraphs, since the goal sheet is duplicated in part by the end-of-term verification form and since administration is unable to adhere to the contract. FUSA emphasized, however, that it did not want the administration to go back and admonish the deans over this issue.

Article 9.1.C. contains no method by which to conduct online student course evaluations. Modifications to the instrument and guarantees that the process will be equal to classroom evaluations must occur.

## Faculty Rights

### Committees

Article 6.21 – Committees need clearly delineated charges and terms of service. The FUSA president has encountered difficulty in obtaining information about the committees.

### Enhancement of Professional Skills

Article 6.20 – The allotted \$30,000 is not enough and \$200 per credit hour is not enough.

### Professional Development and Rank

Article 6.17 – Faculty members applying for rank changes have been instructed to submit portfolios instead of filling out the required form as indicated in the contract. Craig Johnson said that this year, the contract would be adhered to. We would like to see an incentive for increases in rank.

Future bargaining dates were determined:

March 28, 1-4 p.m., tentatively in DTEC 409

April 2, 1-4 p.m., Brandon

April 9, 1-4 p.m.

Submitted by Maribeth Mobley