

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

November 8, 2006

(Approved by the Executive Council on November 22, 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: Ted Crowell, Ann Herbst, Deborah Sweitzer, Judith Bernstein, and Candy Shell.

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Conviviality Event in Petaluma. On the heels of the recent “phenomenally successful” *Conviviality Events* at the Doyle Library, Reneé Lo Pilato suggested that AFA sponsor a similar event at the Petaluma Campus in the spring. Janet McCulloch said that a plan is already in the works for the late spring and that the focus will be on the new build-out.
2. Academic Calendar. Reneé Lo Pilato suggested that, somewhere on the Academic Calendar, PDA days should somehow be annotated with an asterisk or bullet to explain in more detail what faculty members’ PDA/Flex responsibilities are and to clarify which ones are mandatory/ institutional days and which ones are Flex days. Brief discussion followed about New Faculty Orientation Day, the fact that it is one of regular faculty’s 177 working days in the academic year, and the fact that some regular faculty aren’t aware that it is an obligatory work day. In addition, Janet McCulloch noted that there is some discussion about reducing the total number of working days from 177 to 176 by converting New Faculty Orientation Day to a Flex day, and giving new faculty Flex credit for attending the orientation. Changing to an even number of days in each semester would eliminate a recurring problem related to the calculation of CalSTRS service credit that affects faculty who retire mid-year.
3. Hourly Assignment Procedures. Michael Ludder asked whether AFA and the District have copies of Hourly Assignment Procedures on file for every department. Janet McCulloch said that Judith Bernstein, AFA Office Coordinator, has been working with Fran Golden, Academic Affairs Executive Assistant, to confirm that we do. Janet also noted that the District is bringing faculty resignations to the Board for approval to codify the fact that those faculty are no longer employees of the District. If a faculty member resigns, s/he is no longer in the pool and has to reapply. A better alternative for those faculty members who wish to remain in the pool would be for them to request a leave of absence and not take an assignment.
4. Petaluma/Off-Site Coordination Task Force. Cheryl Dunn requested clarification about the reasons behind the formation of this task force. Janet McCulloch said that the purpose would be to develop one or two hardcore models for how coordination between the Santa Rosa and Petaluma campuses (or other locations) might best work, and to figure out job descriptions and compensation for coordinators. Janet said that she and Kimberlee Messina, Academic Senate President, would serve as ex officio members of the task force, AFA would have two representatives, and two department chairs (who come from different kinds of departments with different types of concerns) would also serve. Linda Weiss, Reneé Lo Pilato and Cheryl Dunn reiterated their interest in serving as AFA representatives on the task force.

MINUTES

The October 25, 2006 Executive Council Meeting minutes were unanimously accepted with the following amendment: the second to last sentence in Action Item #1 will read: Linda Weiss *and René Lo Pilato* expressed interest in serving on the task force (*additions in italics*).

ACTION ITEMS

1. Final Wording of Outlook Resolution. Janet McCulloch noted that the approved version of this resolution would be forwarded first to the Academic Senate for review and discussion, and then ultimately on to negotiations with the District. She noted that Academic Affairs is committed to bringing everyone into the fold, and Human Resources has said that they will make sure that, when people are hired, they will be provided with all the information they need to get an Outlook account. Following a motion made by René Lo Pilato and seconded by Andrea Proehl, the Council unanimously approved a motion to approve the final wording of the Outlook Resolution as written (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (See attached.)
2. Staff Directory. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #1) and a motion made by Cheryl Dunn and seconded by Paula Burks, the Council unanimously approved a motion to insist that the District include all faculty (regular, probationary, temporary, and adjunct) in the printed and on-line Staff Directories, including names, titles, departments and telephone/voicemail numbers or, as a default if faculty don't have a voicemail number, the department office or service center number (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). Janet McCulloch noted that AFA would forward this motion to Susan Bagby Matthews in the Public Relations Department.
3. Draft District Policy & Procedures #4.7.1: *Reporting Absence and Leave Time*. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #2) and a motion made by René Lo Pilato and seconded by Andrea Proehl, the Council unanimously approved a motion to take the Draft District Policy & Procedures #4.7.1: *Reporting Absence and Leave Time* forward contingent on proofreading and making the changes as identified by Council and noted (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
4. Donation to Community College Initiative. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #3) and a motion made by Greg Sheldon and seconded by Johanna James, the Council unanimously approved a motion to donate \$2,000 to Californians for Improving Community Colleges (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Staff Directory. Council members reviewed the AFA officers' recommendation that all faculty be included in the printed and on-line Staff Directories. Janet McCulloch noted that, over the years, adjunct faculty members have questioned why they have not been included. Faculty e-mail addresses, for which there is a standard protocol (first initial, last name), are readily accessible on the Campus Wide Information System; however, telephone/voicemail numbers are not so easy to find. Council members suggested that the faculty member's title also be published, and that everyone who does the College's work should be included. Following a motion made by Andrea Proehl and seconded by Michael Ludder, the Council unanimously approved a motion to move this item to an action item (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
2. Draft District Policy & Procedures #4.7.1: *Reporting Absence and Leave Time*. Council members reviewed Draft 5 of the procedures and engaged in lengthy discussion. Janet McCulloch noted that the background behind the development of the new policy is that many faculty members who are absent do not file Notice of Absence forms, and there hasn't been a process or procedures in place that the District could enforce to remedy the problem. The following issues were identified: 1) the entire document needs to be proofread; 2) on Page 1, Item #1, the first sentence after the underlined sentence is a fragment and makes no sense; 3) there's a stray comma at the end of the second line in Item #1.a; 4) why does a Travel Request Form have to be generated for any travel other than for college business? 5) the District consulted with their counsel who confirmed that no Travel Request Form is needed when traveling within the District; 6) with

regards to Item #9 on page 3, Article 29 in the Contract is being rewritten to remove vague language about regular faculty “covering” for each other (it’s unrealistic to expect regular faculty to substitute for each other on an ongoing basis) — when that language has been agreed upon, it will be incorporated into the procedures; 7) on page 3, Item #10, the phrase “substitutes may be acquired” should be changed to “substitutes may be *hired* or *assigned*”; 8) in Item #10.a., the phrase “suitable alternative assignments” needs to be clarified; 9) on Page 3, in Item #8, it needs to be clarified what happens when adjunct faculty are absent during final exam week (or the entire paragraph except for the last sentence should be deleted); and 10) the most current version of pertinent Contract language should be incorporated into the procedures. Further discussion followed about the circumstances under which adjunct substitute work is load bearing, the meaning of the phrase “day-to-day substitute” as it’s defined in the Ed Code (when it’s clear that the person will be returning), and the reasons why hiring substitutes in other community college districts isn’t a problem when it’s a problem in this district. Johanna James noted that, in the newly negotiated Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Contract, it specifies that, if the District doesn’t provide a substitute, no sick leave will be subtracted. Janet McCulloch clarified that regular faculty should be filing a Schedule Change Form and not a Notice of Absence Form when trading, in order to formalize who the “instructor of record” is (this is a liability issue for the District). The Senate will review this draft at their next meeting, Janet will proofread it and review the changes that the Council discussed with Dianne Smith, and after that the final version will be presented to the Board for approval. Following a motion made by Renee Lo Pilato and seconded by Andrea Proehl, the Council unanimously approved a motion to move approval of this document to an action item (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

3. Community College Initiative.

- Donation. Janet McCulloch noted that the statewide campaign is in dire need of signatures and money, so that paid signature gatherers can be hired. Greg Sheldon reported that the SRJC student effort to collect signatures is moving very slowly. The AFA PAC balance is currently \$2,200 and approximately \$600 will be transferred into the account in the next few days. AFA has donated \$2,100 to the campaign thus far. The District has raised \$18,000 through vendors; however, the statewide campaign’s goal for SRJC is \$42,000. Following a motion made by Greg Sheldon and seconded by Johanna James, the Council unanimously approved a motion to move the approval of a \$2,000 donation to an action item (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
- Petitions. Johanna James informed the Council that a petition, along with an affidavit and instructions, would be attached to the November 9 edition of the *AFA Update*, which will explain the benefits and necessity of gathering signatures and making a donation. In order to avoid using the campus mail system, Candy Shell and Johanna James will pick up petitions and donations from faculty who call the AFA office. Brief discussion followed about the guidelines for disseminating and collecting material of this nature. Council members were encouraged to collect as many signatures as possible and to make a donation to the statewide campaign.
- District and SEIU. As mentioned earlier, the District has raised \$18,000. Johanna James reported that, at last week’s Bay Faculty Association meeting, she learned that SEIU is neither opposing nor supporting the initiative.

4. Academic Affairs Reorganization: Part 1 of 2. The Council reviewed a document, the first part of which (the criteria checklist) was presented to the Board in the spring. The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) also distributed the checklist to the Department Chair Council and Instructional Managers (DCC/IM) over the summer. The second part of the document was a counter-proposal from faculty in the Applied Technology Department. Janet McCulloch noted that the point of sharing this information with the Council was to let faculty know that they can come up with their own proposals for reorganization, based on their own criteria. Although the District has the right to change the way they organize departments, they are not interested in forcing these changes on departments, and they cannot change reassigned time for department chairs without entering into negotiations with AFA. Lengthy discussion followed and included these comments: 1) the way in which the process is occurring is very short-sighted

and some basic assumptions aren't necessarily correct; 2) the process was administratively driven with little input from departments; 3) concerns about curriculum organization and who should be teaching what fall more properly into the Academic Senate's arena, not AFA's; 4) this kind of reorganization provoked a three-year battle at Diablo Valley College; 5) some departments are confused about where they are in the process, where it's going to end up, and whether or not they have to move; 6) the deans have hired consultants; however, the process seems to be stalled; 7) proposals cannot be funneled through DCC, as they are an ad hoc group that is neither advisory nor part of the shared governance process—they have no decision-making power; and 8) it is up to departments to have discussions amongst themselves, communicate their interests to the VPAA and take charge of their own destinies.

5. Evaluations: Should Adjunct and Regular Faculty Processes be Parallel? Janet McCulloch requested guidance from Council members regarding this issue and noted that she also wants the Academic Senate to have this discussion before AFA renegotiates this Contract article. Many chairs are feeling unhappy, overwhelmed and confused about their role in the adjunct evaluation process. At the Public Safety Training Center, where adjunct faculty members are evaluated every semester for the purposes of the program, many teach miniscule portions of courses (e.g., four hours once a semester on a Saturday), which makes it difficult to schedule observations. There are also deeper, more systemic issues, such as whether or not adjunct faculty should serve on evaluation teams, and whether or not adjunct faculty should be treated as professionals and the same as full-timers in terms of the student contact portion of the job that they both perform. Lengthy discussion followed and included these comments: 1) 62% of SRJC's courses are being taught by adjunct faculty — they are colleagues who should be treated with respect; 2) an adjunct, who can be fired at any time, could end up evaluating a person who may be his or her boss — how can one be fair in that situation? 3) faculty who are tenured also have a hard time being honest in evaluations of faculty who have been at SRJC for a long time; 4) parity pay/enhancement pay from the State implies that there is no difference in classroom instruction between an adjunct and a full-timer; 5) chairs are afraid of a mountain of work from adjunct faculty team evaluations; but last year only five adjunct faculty asked for a team evaluation; 6) chairs feel overburdened because they have to orchestrate the teams, make sure they have an observer for every faculty member, and make sure that it's all done; 7) the chair doesn't have to be on every team unless requested, and a committee can do the coordination for the chair; 8) the majority of adjunct evaluations currently involve one observer who writes a report, reviews the student evaluations, and meets with the evaluatee; 9) the Ed Code requires that adjunct faculty be evaluated and it's important that everyone who is teaching our students is doing a good job; 10) it's important to get input from students and provide feedback to faculty; 11) people spend a lot of time on evaluations and perceive this as a huge workload issue; 12) maybe the faculty process should be streamlined and the report form standardized like the classified evaluation process; 13) the classified evaluation process doesn't really provide helpful feedback; 14) what is the product of all these hours of work? It just goes into dead space; 15) on the other hand, we need to have a paper trail and document when someone isn't doing a good job — an honest evaluation is what's best for our students and a poor evaluation can prevent regular faculty from getting an overload, and adjunct from being rehired; 16) adjunct faculty should also be required to do self-evaluations; 17) the chairs objected to that because they said it was going to be too much work; however, there's value in a colleague giving feedback about one's course syllabus and outline, and this provides a big opportunity for adjunct colleagues who are looking to get hired as tenured faculty; 18) AFA should sequence its concerns to give chairs, some of whom don't have adequate support or assistance, some breathing room to deal with their huge workload issues (including the reorganization and the new program review process); 19) AFA needs to address what happens once the evaluation has been completed (i.e., people need to read the reports and make things happen); and 20) the evaluation process works if faculty have the guts to do what they need to do for their programs. Janet requested that Johanna James and Michael Ludder mention the idea of the adjunct self-evaluation at the next Academic Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.