

10.27.2023
NTT Negotiation Session
2:30PM

Attendees

Ruth McAdams (notetaker)
Diana Barnes
Pete Murray
Erika Schielke
Sean Collins
Will Kennerly
Sylvia Stoner-Hawkins
Eileen Sperry (zoom)
Ann Showalter (zoom)
Greg Spinner (zoom)
Evan Mack (zoom)
Johanna Mackay (zoom)
Patrice Malatestinic (zoom)

Janet Casey
Rob Manfredo
Julie Delay
Sara Delaney Vero

2:36 Mtg begins. Sean wants to zero in on some new items and some low-hanging fruit. We have a new proposal on **Article III** (management rights), pages 6-7, which puts in writing some of what we suggested during a previous session. We wanted to reduce redundancies, some areas where we were uncomfortable, etc. All changes marked here with track changes. We want to package this proposal with our language on **Article V** (union security and dues checkoff), pages 10-11.

2:40 Sean asks if admin is prepared to respond to our proposal on **Article VI, Section 3**. He is also hoping we can get a response to **Articles IX and XIII**, which we also want to package together. He thinks we're close.

2:41 **Article XVI**: we fixed an error in section 4, we renumbered the later sections to allow for the section that we removed.

2:43 Will Kennerly introduces **Article XXIII** on evaluations.

Section 1A identifies a right to a developmental observation for short-term faculty.
Section 1B on evaluative observations for renewable NTTs. We are introducing a standard rubric for all evaluative observations. It's an appendix in our document. (Rob

has a question about whether a union rep would be present at the post-observation meeting. Sean answers that, yes, this would be where a unit member could request a union rep). Section 1C introduces evaluative observation for part-time faculty. Section 1D on librarians. Section 1E on private music instructions.

Section 2 on reappointment processes for each category. We introduce a standard schedule. The candidate designates an evaluative committee. End goal is that March 15 decision is made. We are introducing a new right to a final terminal year for renewable full-time NTTs who are not renewed. Process for the later reappointments is similar but pared down. Part C on part-time members. Part D on librarians, this mainly memorializes current practice. Section 3 on fair and honest evals. (Rob asks what this means. Ruth responds that this right is already asserted in the FHB, on page 111).

Section 4 clarifies that we're proposing that student ratings are not used.

Section 5 clarifies that scholarly/artistic productivity is optional but not required.

Section 7 on annual letters. We're bringing this practice in line with practice for TT faculty.

Section 10 on implementation. We don't want candidates to be penalized if they don't have the evidence of earlier evals.

The rubric is adapted from the U of Colorado Boulder, who has done the deep dive on how to evaluate teaching. This is in an appendix.

- 2:57 Rob says they'll take a look at these proposals. He concurs that we are close on some of these issues. They distribute some counterproposals. Ruth asks for an electronic copy. Julie sends it.
- 2:59 **Article III, Section 1.** Rob understands that our approach is to attempt to bundle III and V. He respects that. For now, he wants to see if we can agree on some of the language for discussion purposes. Some extremely detailed discussion of these bullet points. [I missed some details because there are 21 bullets and they are not numbered. I number them and start catching some of the minutiae]. They are rejecting our excision of bullet 10. Pete explains that we understood ourselves as folding everything in bullet 10 into our bullet 9. Rob says that this is a helpful clarification. He has some proposed language for the very last paragraph.
- 3:09 We are close on **Article XIII**. Re **Article IX**, Rob is comfortable bundling this with XIII. Rob wants to make a change that keeps open the possibility, albeit a remote possibility, that the admin wants to file a grievance against the union. Sean asks if Rob can provide an example. Rob observes that it does happen. One example related to a workplace where

union reps were on the premises when they weren't supposed to—he acknowledges that that wouldn't be relevant at this workplace.

- 3:13 **Article XVI** (Institutional Support). They are agreed on our language for section 2. Sections 4 and 5, they want to split these so that there's a PT contract and a FT contract. They do not want to be required to provide computers, office space to PT faculty. Pete identifies an error – they did not intend for FT faculty to have to shared offices.

Section 7, they claim it's technologically impossible to provide email forwarding. They reject the "research associate status" language. Ruth asks about the language regarding retirement. Janet responds that library database contracts sometimes exclude retirees, and that this is a source of resentment among TT retirees. But mentions that there are some retirees who have research associate status. Ruth asks where the research associate status criteria are codified? Janet responds it's just the one paragraph in the FHB. Pete asks about email forwarding. Long back and forth. They don't want to help students find their former professors—Rob suggests some possible workarounds. Sean concludes that there are possible creative solutions. We'll all need to think on it.

- 3:33 Caucus called. No notes during caucus.

- 4:26 Meeting resumes. Sean confirms that we'll need to take their proposal on **Article III, Section 1** back to the full committee. We feel that between bullets 9 and 10, we've condensed everything that was duplicative. Rob proposed adding to bullet 9 "or not rehire, reappoint, or renew faculty members" to encompass what's in bullet 10. We agree with their retention of bullet 14. We propose some new language for bullet 19 "conversion to the TT." And we are okay with the change they propose in the very last paragraph of section 1.

- 4:30 Rob proposes a language change on bullet 17.

- 4:31 Sean confirms that we're agreed on **Articles IX and XIII**. Hooray! Rob will put together tentative agreements. Rob proposes adding language about what happens if the admin files a grievance. Sean confirms that's probably fine but we'll look.

- 4:32 Sean moves to **Article XVI**. Sean asks whether a faculty member on serial terminal contracts have access to retirement? Sarah confirms that yes. Diana confirms that retirees get to keep Skidmore email addresses? Sarah confirms yes.

- 4:33 Sections 4-5: Sean reiterates our desire to have one contract for both units. He confirms that we'll need to review this. We really take issue with the suggestion that PT faculty might not be provided offices. Students should not have to meet with PT faculty in public areas! If the college can't provide even shared office space for PT faculty, we need to have a broader convo about what the college can require PT faculty to do, e.g. hold office hours.

- 4:37 Rob observes that next meeting probably not until Dec 15 (9:00AM-1:00PM in dining hall), unfortunately. He wants to spend the four-hour block to use that time to make big strides. Looking forward to some longer sessions in January. Ruth asks whether they will be ready on **Article XXI and XXII** by then? Rob cannot make any promises. He wants to use the time as constructively as possible. Sylvia encourages them to get it done, because she'll be on sabbatical in the spring.
- 4:42 Sean confirms that we'd like to introduce the remaining proposals (on inclusion/service, professionalization, compensation, benefits) by that session.
- 4:42 Meeting adjourned.