

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION  
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES**

October 25, 2006

*(Approved by Executive Council on November 8, 2006)*

Executive Council members present (noted by \*):

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

**MEMBER CONCERNS**

1. Reporting Absences. Lara Branen-Ahumada conveyed a concern from a faculty member regarding the lack of “discretionary” personal necessity leave. It was clarified that personal necessity leave includes “matters of compelling personal importance” that cannot be scheduled at any other time, that it comes out of sick leave, and that trading between regular faculty members is an option as long as a Schedule Change Form is completed and approved by the Department Chair. It was noted that some faculty feel that the personal necessity leave policy encourages dishonesty, some may have concerns about submitting a written request to the President and some are confused about the trade option. Janet McCulloch noted that there have been many discussions in College Council about the vague way that trades are dealt with in the Contract and that Article 29: Substitutes is being rewritten to clarify how trades are supposed to be handled.
2. Disability Insurance for Adjunct Faculty. Judith Bernstein reported that an adjunct faculty member contacted the AFA office to inquire about the availability of disability insurance and, subsequently, to ask why it is not an option for adjunct faculty. Janet McCulloch noted that, in order to participate in the State program, all employees in the unit would have to participate, which would mean asking the full-time faculty to pay for a benefit they already receive at no cost. In addition, there is some question about how the benefits would work in a situation in which an adjunct faculty member goes on disability in the fall and then in the spring is no longer an employee of the District. More information about this issue will be brought back to a future Council meeting.
3. Flex Activities and PGI. Ann Herbst said that several faculty members currently undergoing the Professional Growth Increments (PGI) review process have received unofficial feedback that Flex activities cannot count towards PGI. They are concerned that the policy was changed without any advance communication or negotiations. No official feedback has been sent out yet, although Johanna James noted that the Staff Development Coordinating Committee is under the impression that PGI activities can’t count towards Flex. Some Council members expressed the opinion that the whole concept of PGI might be past its time and that the interplay between PGI and Flex activities may not be an issue in the future.

4. No Readers for Mathematics Department. Janet McCulloch informed the Council that the Vice President of Academic Affairs recently told Mathematics Department faculty not to expect restoration of their reader budget. Faculty members in that department are distressed about this news. On the basis that some job announcements in the past have stated that an instructor could expect to have a reader, AFA is considering the possibility of moving forward with a class action grievance.

### MINUTES

There were no corrections or additions to the October 11, 2006 Executive Council Meeting minutes, which were unanimously accepted as written.

### ACTION ITEMS

1. Appointment of AFA Representatives to Petaluma/Off-site Coordination Task Force. Janet McCulloch informed the Council that action on this item would have to be tabled, but presented some background. AFA has attempted over the last few years to make headway with the District in paying coordinators — not just at Petaluma, but elsewhere — for the job that they perform. To date, three definitions have been added to the Contract, but no job descriptions or compensation have been negotiated. The Tuesday, October 24, meeting of the Department Chair Council/ Instructional Managers (DCC/IM) was devoted to the topic of coordination with the Petaluma campus. At that meeting, Janet recommended the formation of a task force (composed of representatives from AFA, the Academic Senate, the Petaluma Faculty Forum (PFF), the DCC, Classified Senate, SEIU and administrators) to develop recommendations and solicit feedback from the various constituent groups. The Vice President of Academic Affairs later said that there needs to be a process of resolution from all of the groups before proceeding, and although Janet has been told that the Senate and PFF already have existing resolutions, the specific membership of the task force has not yet been finalized. The task force would deal not just with the Petaluma campus, but with other locations, such as the center planned for Healdsburg, and would look at program coordinators, location coordinators and project coordinators. The recommendations ultimately agreed upon by task force members would then come to AFA, as compensation and workload are negotiated items. AFA is interested in developing a separate reassigned time formula for coordinators and does not want the District to take it out of department chair reassigned time. Several Council members said that they have been waiting for the Petaluma issue to be dealt with for many, many years, and others talked about the long wait for support services for weekend classes on the Santa Rosa campus. Linda Weiss and René Lo Pilato expressed interest in serving on the task force. This item will be brought back to a future Council meeting.
2. 2007-08 Calendar. (See Discussion Item #1.) Following a motion made by Paula Burks and seconded by Michael Aparicio, the Council unanimously approved a motion to approve the 2007-08 Calendar Option B per AFA (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). Deborah Sweitzer will be taking Option B to the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and SEIU. It is hoped that the constituent review and approval process will be completed in time for the December Board of Trustees meeting.
3. Draft AFA Resolution re: Faculty Outlook Accounts. (See Discussion Item #2.) Following a motion made by Greg Sheldon and seconded by Michael Aparicio, the Council unanimously approved a motion to approve the AFA Resolution re: Faculty Outlook Accounts as revised (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

### DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Draft 2007-08 Academic Calendar. Janet McCulloch gave a brief description of the history behind the formation of the calendar. She said that AFA was frustrated with the manner in which the academic calendar was being developed and approved, and the Academic Senate felt that there wasn't adequate time for discussion. Two years ago in College Council, AFA expressed dissatis-

faction with the 2006-07 calendar and declined to negotiate it (in accordance with AFA's role as described in the Contract), and subsequently helped to develop an improved version. The Calendar Committee completed the Option A version of the 2007-08 Calendar at the end of April 2006, but there were still some problems with it (e.g., only 14 Friday classes in the Spring). The 2007-08 Option B per AFA is still not perfect, but it is an improvement over previous versions. It includes a Flex Day (no classes) on Wednesday, November 21 (the day before Thanksgiving); a "decent" winter intersession; a Flex Day during Spring Break (outside of the 177 working days); 15 Mondays, and 16 Fridays. One slightly controversial element is an Institutional PDA Day on the Thursday before Spring 2008 finals start (creating a mini-dead week for students). College Council is pleased with this idea and is willing to try it and see how it works. People interested in Student Learning Outcomes like the idea of having some kind of wrap-up to evaluate their program. Greg Sheldon briefly described some of the more unusual aspects of the 2008-09 calendar draft. Johanna James suggested that another idea worth exploring in the future would be a 176-day calendar — by taking away New Faculty Orientation Day, making it a Flex Day, and giving new faculty Flex credit for their orientation that day — thereby making an even number of days in both semesters. Janet noted that having an uneven number of days in each semester creates problems in the calculation of service credit for faculty who retire mid-year. Following a motion made by Michael Aparicio and seconded by Greg Sheldon, the Council unanimously approved a motion to move the approval of Option B per AFA to an action item (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

2. Draft AFA Resolution re: Faculty Outlook Accounts. Janet McCulloch said that e-mail is the way that students want to communicate with faculty and the Outlook e-mail system is the way the College conducts business; however, some regular faculty who have other e-mail accounts don't use Outlook and only 200 adjunct faculty members have Outlook accounts. Many adjunct faculty are under the impression that they can't have an account and many don't have access to computers in their departments. (Although all regular faculty are provided with a computer on campus, adjunct faculty are not.) Janet said that Ken Fiori in Computing Services has committed to expanding the capacity of the system to accommodate everyone and the Human Resources Department is planning to incorporate information about how to get an Outlook account into their packets for new hires. It was noted that Outlook could be configured to forward mail to another e-mail account. In response to a concern about the District mandating that all faculty have Outlook accounts, Janet said that it would have to be negotiated, since it's a working conditions (and workload) issue. At this point, she said that there is interest in seeing what can be done to increase usage over the next couple of years and noted that the Senate might want to look at the pedagogical issues re: the use of e-mail. The officers are recommending that the last bullet of the resolution be revised to read: "...that AFA will consider negotiating the use of *SRJC Outlook* e-mail as the *official* means of communicating..." Lengthy discussion followed and included these comments: 1) it's not appropriate for AFA to initiate a work responsibility; it should be coming from the administration and AFA could support it if the Council thinks it is appropriate; 2) it's not appropriate to ask the Senate to have a discussion, issuing a resolution is different than the way AFA usually initiates things, and signaling an intention to negotiate something in this way is setting a bad precedent; 3) e-mail should not be the only official means of offers of employment because of privacy issues and all the things that can go wrong in cyber space; 4) there are practical advantages to communicating on Outlook and it's good for policies to be more inclusive, but there are legal and privacy issues; also, students have come to expect 24/7 service; 5) it would be better if e-mail was the "primary" means of communication — AFA should start with that as a threshold; 6) the phrase "exclusive of confidential communications" should be added to the 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> bullets; 7) the Contract states that permatization of the schedule and posting on the College's web site constitutes the official notice of an offer, so a faculty member might be sent an e-mail telling them to check the SRJC web site; and 8) this would be an organizing tool and AFA members should be encouraged to get Outlook accounts. Janet said that the purpose

of the resolution was to move the issue to the Senate, and that AFA and the Senate are moving in concert these days on matters that have both academic and workload concerns. Following a motion made by Greg Sheldon and seconded by Michael Aparicio, the Council unanimously approved a motion to move approval of the resolution to an action item (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

3. Draft District Policy & Procedures #4.7.1: *Reporting Absence and Leave Time*. Due to time constraints, this item was postponed until the next Council meeting.
4. Proposed Program Review Process. Kris Abrahamson, Dean of Arts, Culture & Communications, appeared before the Council to present information about the new proposed Program Review & Planning (PRP) process that the Linkage Task Force (LTF) has been working on. An October 11 version of an overview document was shared with the Council. The document, in various stages, has been shared with various constituencies. Kris said that all the constituent groups would have an opportunity to review the final version one last time. The goal of the PRP process is to better link budgeting with planning and it is hoped that Department Chairs will be up to speed by Spring 2007. There is an additional writing component to the process, which asks Chairs to write down some analysis of data in addition to their goals and needs. There will be a shorter annual process; a longer, more comprehensive process will take place every third year. Departments will need to look at Student Learning Outcome measures in a rotating, three-year cycle. In an effort to bring curriculum onto the front burner, Departments will be provided with a list of all their curricula and the last time they was updated (with a more realistic goal of updating every six years, as required by the Ed Code, rather than every four). The Program Review Task Force is specific to Academic Affairs, while the LTF represents all four components (Business Services, Student Services, Administrative Services, and Academic Affairs). The LTF has devised a plan for analyzing the data, which starts with the Department Chairs, then moves to the Deans, who would prioritize at the cluster level, then on to the component level, then to IPC, then on to the Vice Presidents and the President. There will be bands of priority — high, medium and low — at every level. Deborah Sweitzer added that the LTF's objectives for the process include transparency, providing feedback and using commonly provided data. Radiologic Technology and Life Sciences will be part of the pilot program for the long, comprehensive process. Kris went over the overview document and feedback from the Council included the following comments: 1) in some disciplines, student success is not measurable — it's a problem if the outcomes that are measurable are valued more than the ones that aren't (Kris suggested that this concern be passed on to the cluster dean); 2) as all of the mountains and streams of data analysis make their way up the chain, will the decisions made about resource allocation be explained and linked specifically to the data? It was noted that IPC would be identifying priorities and the Vice Presidents would be making the decisions; feedback loops need to occur, an outside consultant will be hired to figure out how the whole process (which will be electronic) will work; 3) the new PRP could significantly impact department chair workload; and 4) evaluation of the PRP and how it works at all levels should occur. Kris will send an electronic copy of the template to AFA office staff, so that Council members can see what it looks like.
5. Evaluations: Should Adjunct and Regular Faculty Processes be Parallel? Due to time constraints, this item was postponed until the next Council meeting.

## REPORTS

1. FACCC PAC Report. Greg Sheldon reported that the California Coalition is very short on funds (they had anticipated that every faculty member would donate \$100 and every administrator would donate \$10,000). Greg recommended that the Council consider a motion at the next meeting to authorize the AFA PAC to send \$1,000 to the Coalition. Janet McCulloch said that she would bring to the next meeting the forms for gathering signatures. Greg noted that they are hoping to gather the majority of the signatures needed by the end of November.