

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

February 28, 2007

(Approved by the Executive Council on March 14, 2007)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

*Janet McCulloch, presiding	*Paula Burks	*Joyce Johnson	Andrea Proehl
*Alix Alixopoulos	John Daly	*Michael Kaufmann	*Greg Sheldon
Michael Aparicio	*Cheryl Dunn	*Renée Lo Pilato	Linda Weiss
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Johanna James	*Michael Ludder	Lynda Williams

Also present: Ted Crowell, Ann Herbst, Warren Ruud, Deborah Sweitzer, Judith Bernstein, and Candy Shell.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Hourly Assignment Communication via E-mail. Michael Ludder raised a concern regarding the use of e-mail as the only means of communication about hourly assignments. He briefly described a situation in which an instructor, who has an off-campus e-mail address, did not receive notification of the “bidding” time, and almost did not receive an hourly assignment. In this particular department, according to Michael, faculty on the Santa Rosa campus received both a hard copy and an e-mail; however, faculty on the Petaluma campus only received one e-mail. The faculty member eventually received an assignment; however, the question remains as to whether e-mail is a sufficient means by which communication about assignments should be conducted. Commenting that one e-mail is not sufficient and should not constitute official notification, Janet McCulloch said that this issue would be added to the agenda for further discussion at this Council meeting.
2. District-wide Committee Work, College Service and Flex. Ted Crowell raised a concern on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, whose members meet weekly for 2.5 hours in addition to spending a great deal of time outside of meetings working on Title V issues, repeat codes, etc. They believe that their time commitment is far in excess of what regular faculty are required to do for College Service and they would like AFA and the District to explore the idea of granting Flex credit for some of the hours. Janet McCulloch noted that she has already followed up on this issue, having recently spoken with both Staff Development and the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Curriculum Committee Chair has been instructed to develop a list of special projects that would be eligible for Flex credit, and Staff Development will follow up. Janet noted that other District-wide committees, for which the time commitment is extensive, might want to also explore this idea.
3. Lecture/Lab Ratio. Lara Branen-Ahumada said that many faculty members are expressing their ongoing concerns to her about the inequity created by the lecture/lab ratio. There have been some suggestions about creating various categories of lab, as all labs are not created equal. Lara requested that the Council schedule a discussion of this issue, so that she can report back to the faculty members who have expressed concern. Janet McCulloch said that the AFA Negotiations Team is working on this issue, and noted that the District believes that faculty should choose between a raise and a workload adjustment.
4. Faculty Response to AFA Update re: Rank 10/COLA. Greg Sheldon reported that two faculty members approached him with comments about the *AFA Update* re: Rank 10/COLA. The faculty members made mention of the strike at Hartnell College, which led to a resolution within 12 hours.

MINUTES

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes from the February 14, 2007 Executive Council Meeting, which were accepted as written.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Nominations of AFA Officers and Other Positions. The following nominations for AFA officers and other positions were made and seconded:
 - President - 2007-09: Ann Herbst (Nominated by Michael Kaufmann, seconded by Johanna James) (Janet McCulloch declined a nomination to run for a third term as AFA President, saying that she believes that it is not a good idea for an organization to become too highly identified with one person.)
 - Vice President for Santa Rosa - 2007-08: Johanna James (Nominated by Ann Herbst, seconded by Greg Sheldon)
 - Vice President for Petaluma – 2007-08: Cheryl Dunn (Nominated by Reneé Lo Pilato, seconded by Greg Sheldon)
 - Secretary/Treasurer - 2007-08: Paula Burks (Nominated by Johanna James, seconded by Lara Branen-Ahumada)
 - Conciliation/Grievance Officer - 2007-08: Janet McCulloch (Nominated by Ann Herbst, seconded by Cheryl Dunn)
 - Chief Negotiating Officer - 2007-08: Deborah Sweitzer (Nominated by Greg Sheldon, seconded by Cheryl Dunn)

(Deborah Sweitzer formally announced that 2007-08 would be her last year of full-time service to the District and last year as Chief Negotiating Officer, as she is planning to go on a pre-retirement, reduced-load program the following year. She said that she believes that the person who is serving as Chief Negotiating Officer should be fully employed by the District and recommended that the Council plan an orderly transfer of duties through a Chief Negotiating Officer-Elect position.)
 - Negotiator/Data - 2007-08: Warren Ruud (Nominated by Greg Sheldon, seconded by Reneé Lo Pilato)
 - Negotiator/Note Taker - 2007-08: Ted Crowell (Nominated by Lara Branen-Ahumada, seconded by Reneé Lo Pilato)
 - Negotiator/Positions 5 & 6 - 2007-08: (at least one must be adjunct faculty)
 - Michael Kaufmann (Nominated by Michael Ludder, seconded by Johanna James)
 - John Daly (Nominated by Greg Sheldon, seconded by Paula Burks)
 - Communications Officer - 2007-08: Janet McCulloch (Nominated by Johanna James, seconded by Paula Burks)
 - Chief Negotiating Officer-Elect - 2007-08: Janet McCulloch (Nominated by Cheryl Dunn, seconded by Greg Sheldon)
 - Bay Faculty Association Representative (BFA) - 2007-08: Johanna James, the current representative to BFA, suggested that it would be more useful for both AFA and BFA for this position to be filled by a member of the Negotiations Team. The Council agreed to leave the position open until Fall 2007 to allow for maximum flexibility in Team member load and schedule adjustments.

Elections and appointments are scheduled for the March 14, 2007 Council meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Proposed Revisions to AFA Bylaws. Council members reviewed a document that contained changes to the Bylaws recommended by AFA officers. It was suggested that the first sentence in Article III, Section 7, paragraph A (re: the duties of the Conciliation/Grievance Officer) be modified to read:

“ . . . shall represent the **All Faculty Association** and *advocate* for the rights of members of the unit.” An alternative phrase was also suggested: “*advise and represent* the rights of the members of the unit.” Brief discussion followed regarding: 1) the connotation of the terms “advocate” and “advise”; 2) AFA’s primary role in the conciliation and grievance processes; and 3) whether the Contract should always be read literally (e.g., holding the District to a legal standard) rather than more expansively (advocating for better and fairer treatment of faculty). Consensus was reached to modify the sentence in question to “represent the **All Faculty Association** and *advise and represent* the rights of the members of the unit.” A second issue was raised re: the requirement in the Bylaws that candidates running for an officer position must submit a statement, even when an election is uncontested. Following brief discussion, consensus was reached that candidate statements may be submitted, but would be required only in the case of a contested election. The officers will bring a proposal including revised language for that section of the Bylaws to the next Council meeting. Following a motion made by Lara Branen-Ahumada and seconded by Johanna James, the Council unanimously approved a motion to move the proposed revisions to the action agenda for the next Council meeting (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

2. Support Needed for Faculty and Students. Council members engaged in lengthy discussion on this subject and identified the following needs: 1) readers (it was suggested that guidelines be developed re: when faculty would be eligible to apply for instructional support, so that everyone would be treated the same way); 2) classroom and lab aides; 3) pay for coordinators; 4) access to the Bookstore, Health Services, the cafeteria and bathrooms on weekends and evenings; 5) administrators on duty on weekends and evenings; 6) equity in pay for tutors on the Petaluma campus (they are paid \$8.25 per hour whereas tutors on the Santa Rosa campus are paid \$18 per hour; 7) orientation for adjunct faculty; 8) access to Health Services for non-credit students; 9) access to Disability Resources for non-native speakers with learning disabilities; 10) access to psychological services for non-credit, non-native speakers; 11) matriculation and assessment services for non-credit students on the Santa Rosa and Petaluma campuses, as well as for off-campus students; 12) an increase in the number of departmental administrative assistants; and 13) full-time hires to replace retirees. Several Council members also commented that faculty are being worn down. With the increase in class sizes, the lack of support services on weekends and evenings, and the additional responsibilities associated with Student Learning Outcomes, curriculum review, and the new Program Review Process, faculty are being asked to do more while getting paid less. Many faculty are torn between, on the one hand, wanting to do what is best for their students, wanting to cover what is in the course outline of record and having a sense of obligation to the discipline, and, on the other hand, not being fully compensated. It was noted that only 52% of SRJC’s credit courses are currently taught by full-time faculty, whereas many other districts are doing a much better job of reaching the goal of 75% of credit courses taught by full-time faculty. At the conclusion of the discussion, Janet McCulloch said that she would follow up with Staff Development regarding the status of their plans to develop an orientation for adjunct faculty, and would contact the State Chancellor’s office regarding whether or not non-credit students, who are exempt from paying the Student Health Services fee, may utilize Student Health Services.
3. E-mail as an Official Means of Communication. Janet McCulloch reported that AFA and the District are attempting to move in the direction of requiring that all faculty be on the Outlook e-mail system, to reflect the way that students want to communicate with faculty and to reduce the use of paper and the cost of postage. The District is pursuing ways to best accomplish this goal. In meetings with John Hemeway and Randy Gallimore in Computing Services, Janet said that it has become clear that it would not be a good idea to be forwarding messages to other ISP’s. The Help Desk would not be able to provide troubleshooting for other ISP’s, there may be incompatibility issues, other ISP systems may go down at critical times, and there are difficulties associated with confirming whether or not messages were received. Offers of employment, messages from Staff Development about Flex, and key messages from the College, AFA, and the Senate are some of the types of important messages that the District wants faculty to receive. Computing Services is working on a more limited distribution system that would have limited access and strict controls as to who would be permitted to send messages. Faculty would be allowed to opt out of the larger DL.Faculty.All distribution lists, thereby dramatically reducing the amount of unwanted e-mail they would receive. (They could also receive individually

sent messages.) It was mentioned that requiring all faculty to have an Outlook account would result in an up-to-date staff directory. At a certain point, AFA and the District would need to develop guidelines about how many times a message (re: offers for hourly assignments, for example) would need to be sent out in order to be deemed sufficient. The Council engaged in lengthy discussion and comments included the following: 1) official messages should be flagged with a “read receipt” so that there’s acknowledgement the e-mail was received; 2) Dominican University and Laney College forward e-mails to off-campus ISP’s (Janet will follow up to see how that system is working); 3) this system still won’t make it any easier to track down faculty phone numbers; 4) studies show that using an in-house server has been shown to raise reliability of e-mail delivery; 5) it’s difficult to ensure privacy of student-faculty communication if confined to the District’s server; (it was noted, however, that there would be no requirement that Outlook be used for communication with students); 6) it might be helpful to set up different e-mail accounts for particular classes (it was noted that the Computing Services is not fond of the idea, as it would involve a great deal of manual labor); 7) the District should provide an orientation to Outlook; (according to Janet, the Human Resources Department has committed to providing hands-on training); 8) one can direct messages from students in a particular class to a particular folder in Outlook; 9) in addition to problems with spam, the level of security in other systems differs and viruses can be a real problem; and 10) the District has purchased a site license for Turnitin, which is an entirely separate system that can be used for plagiarism and other things. Janet said that she would do some research to see what other colleges are doing in regards to this issue.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President’s Report.

- Institutional Planning Council (IPC). Janet McCulloch reported that there is continued discussion about IPC’s new role in the Program Review Process, and how the work of IPC will change once the new process is implemented. IPC will be responsible for creating bands of funding priorities and ensuring cross-component coordination of the use of certain funds. IPC’s recommendations will then be forwarded to the Vice Presidents and the President, who will decide what to do based on the amount of money they believe that they have in the budget. Departments and clusters will compose initiatives in the Program Review Process, and those plans will be evaluated and ranked based on institutional goals and initiatives. The intention is to clarify the linkage between planning and budget. In response to a question posed by Janet at the meeting, Dr. Beebe, Vice President of Business Services, said that banding priorities would be used in making decisions about cutting budgets when downsizing departments or programs. Deborah Sweitzer, who is completing her second year on the Linkage Task Force, added that the new process includes room for a narrative, in which one can explain the causes for enrollment fluctuations and indicate long-term plans to stabilize enrollments. Several Council members raised concerns about whether there would be any fundamental changes as a result of implementing this new Program Review Process, which was developed to respond to issues raised in accreditation review.
- College Council (CC). Janet McCulloch reported that CC is continuing discussions re: the District Online Policy and Procedures, which she revised further, incorporating material from the accreditation standards for distance education. CC has agreed to remove much of the language that AFA found objectionable, and they are working on finalizing another draft to be circulated to constituent groups. Janet also reported that there was further discussion at CC about therapy animals. After a review of other college’s policies and consultation with the State Chancellor’s and Attorney General’s offices, consensus was reached that only employees, who have a doctor’s recommendation, would be permitted to bring therapy animals on campus.

2. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

3. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.