

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

March 22, 2006

(Approved by the Executive Council 4/12/06)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

* Janet McCulloch, <i>presiding</i>	* Jim Elrod	* Michael Ludder	* Deborah Sweitzer
* Alix Alixopoulos	Peggy Goebel	Joel Neuberg	* Doris Tolks
* Ted Crowell	* Ann Herbst	* Andrea Proehl	* Linda Weiss
John Daly	* Johanna James	* Greg Sheldon	* Lynda Williams

Also present: Courtenay Anderson, Phil Forester, Michael Kaufmann, Judith Bernstein.

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Academic Affairs Reorganization. Michael Ludder and Lynda W. each expressed concern about the proposed reorganization of Academic Affairs. Janet said that she has a copy of the presentation that Mary Kay Rudolph, Vice President of Academic Affairs, made at the March 21 Department Chair Council/Instructional Managers meeting. (Janet was told that it is also posted on the Academic Affairs web site.) She recommended that this issue be placed on the agenda for the next Council meeting, to allow for a thorough discussion that would include the contractual implications of the reorganization (e.g., hourly assignments and department chairs). Janet reported that she has already communicated some of these concerns to Dr. Rudolph.
2. Implementation of Non-Smoking Policy. Johanna expressed concern about the way in which the campus-wide non-smoking policy has been implemented. She said that AFA's endorsement of the proposed policy, which was reached after lengthy discussion, was conditional upon the establishment of designated and sheltered smoking areas; however, signs are currently posted all over campus indicating that designated areas are for a one-year transition period only and that those areas will be entirely eliminated after that. Johanna's concerns are that students won't make it back to class on time, and that the will of AFA (and the Academic Senate) was ignored.
3. Anti-Immigration Legislation. Michael Kaufmann expressed concern about legislation, recently passed by the House of Representatives and currently being debated in the Senate, that would make it a felony to be an undocumented immigrant and also to provide assistance to undocumented immigrants (the latter could affect churches and schools). He said that this legislation, if passed, could have strong repercussions for the College (and not just in the credit or non-credit ESL areas).

MINUTES

There were no additions or corrections to the March 8, 2006 Executive Council meeting minutes, which were unanimously approved as written.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. AFA Donation to the Frank P. Doyle Library Endowment. The Council briefly discussed the idea of making a donation to the new Library Endowment fund. Donations would support the purchase of books, periodicals, databases, and special collections. It was noted that names of donors contributing \$1,000 or more would appear on plaques on the wall of the library. The Council considered donating \$1,000 as an organization and the possibility of matching individual donations from AFA members. There was also brief discussion about the timing of the donation. This discussion will continue at a future Council meeting.
2. Reorganization of AFA Negotiating Team. As an outgrowth of the discussion about re-assigned time for 2006-07, the Council determined that further discussion was needed about the composition of the Negotiating Team. Towards that end, Deborah distributed and reviewed a proposal for reorganization of the AFA Negotiating Team. To eliminate redundancy and save money, the proposal included the elimination of the Past President, the Data Trainee, and the Chief Negotiator Trainee. It also included two options — a five-member team or a six-member team — with varying levels of participation by position in discussions at the table with the District. The composition of the current Negotiating Team was reviewed (7 people, 8 positions), and it was noted that the new role of Note-taker (filled by an existing member of the Team) has been very helpful this year. Two established operating principles were reiterated: 1) a minimum of three negotiators is required in any negotiations meeting with the District and 2) a minimum of two adjunct faculty is required on the Team. Lengthy discussion, focusing on the benefits and disadvantages of a five-person team versus a six-person team, included the following issues: 1) the Council could appoint the Note-taker or the Team could be allowed to make that decision; 2) one person could be the Note-taker or the Note-taker could change on a rotating basis; 3) more negotiators or fewer present at the table with the District — which is preferable? 4) should it be required that two adjuncts are present to participate in the discussions at the table with the District? 5) could the Note-taker be an administrative assistant instead of a faculty member? Following discussion, the Council unanimously approved a motion to table action on this issue until the next Council meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Extra Duty Spring 2006 Stipend for AFA President. Johanna presented the general idea, which would be to grant stipends as needed to supplement reassigned time for AFA officers and Negotiating Team members, when the number of hours that individuals work exceeds what was originally anticipated. In this particular case, Janet has put in many hours beyond the amount allocated to the President as reassigned time. The anticipated continuation of many of these additional hours will be reflected in the officers' forthcoming proposal for 2006-07 reassigned time; however, to make up for the deficit in the current year, the officers are recommending that AFA pay Janet a stipend of \$1,500. Brief discussion followed about how the amount of the stipend was arrived at, how it was calculated, and whether it should be called a "bonus" instead of a stipend. There was general agreement that people should be paid for the work that they do, as long as they keep accurate track of their time and their time is determined to be legitimate. As this issue will inevitably crop up again in the future when officers and negotiators exceed their budgeted reassigned time and/or stipend, it was suggested that this particular situation should establish a precedent, and that the officers should develop a procedure to follow. Following the discussion, the Council unanimously approved a motion to pay Janet, using her base hourly rate, an amount not to exceed \$1,500 as a

stipend for her additional Spring 2006 hours (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). The officers agreed to bring a proposal for an “extra duty” compensation procedure to the next Council meeting.

3. AFA Re-assigned Time Proposal for 2006-07. Discussion of this item was postponed until the next Council meeting.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President’s Report. Janet distributed copies of a document entitled “Santa Rosa Junior College Strategic Enrollment Plan 2006-09,” which was an excerpt from materials distributed at the March 13 IPC meeting. The document presents enrollment figures and defines goals for enrollment and efficiency. The District has developed a plan to increase enrollment by 1% each year for the next three years in order to achieve a stable funding pattern. As a result of enrollment that has been declining since 2003-04 and “zero growth” in 2005-06, the District will receive less income from the State. Janet acknowledged John Daly and Greg Sheldon’s efforts in working with Academic Affairs to increase enrollments. She also reported that some of the departments that have enough adjunct faculty available to teach additional courses are not cooperating in the effort to add new course sections. Lengthy discussion followed about many related issues, including: 1) the need to add more sections of courses that typically fill because they fulfill General Education, A.A. degree and/or transfer requirements, 2) the recent change that improves summer registration priority for high school students, 3) the very real possibility of a “weekend” college and weekend college degree; 4) non-traditional scheduling and the need for support services; 5) the possibility of offering more courses during intersession; 6) reasons why a department might decide that it’s not appropriate to offer a particular course (because it would be competing with other more worthwhile courses, or courses do not compress well into shorter than semester-length blocks of time); and 7) the need to be careful about sending a message which would encourage faculty members to go over a chair or dean’s head if their proposed course to be added was turned down at the department level.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.