

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION  
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

October 10, 2007

*(Approved by the Executive Council on October 24, 2007)*

Executive Council members present (noted by \*):

*Janet McCulloch, presiding	*John Daly	*Joyce Johnson	*Andrea Proehl
*Alix Alixopulos	*Cheryl Dunn	*Michael Kaufmann	*Mike Starkey
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Peggy Goebel	*Reneé Lo Pilato	Linda Weiss
*Paula Burks	*Johanna James	Michael Meese	<i>Vacancy Fall 2007</i>

Also present: Dr. Mary Kay Rudolph, Vice President of Academic Affairs;  
Ann Herbst, Warren Ruud, Deborah Sweitzer; Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell.

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

**MEMBER CONCERNS**

1. Advertisement for Classified Positions. Renee' Lo Pilato expressed a concern about the recent e-mailed announcements from the Human Resources Department regarding classified employment opportunities relative to the difficulty AFA encountered in concluding the protracted negotiations for faculty salaries and benefits for 2006-07. Janet McCulloch noted that, although the concern is a valid one shared by others, the District does have the right to hire employees as they see fit.
2. Academic Affairs Administrative Assistant Study. Janet McCulloch informed the Council that the District is conducting a study regarding workload performed by administrative assistants with the intention of exploring a possible reorganization of administrative support, which, she said, could include some fairly significant shifting of positions from one department to another. The District has said that there would be no cutbacks and no department would be losing their administrative support; however, several department chairs expressed concern at a recent Department Chair Council meeting.
3. Increases in Class Enrollments. Alix Alixopulos told the Council that a number of adjunct faculty in his department were asked to sign a release form that would allow ten more students into some of their classes. Janet McCulloch added that a portion of the problem in several departments is due to a past practice in which class size is determined by the size of the room, rather than by pedagogical concerns. She said that AFA officers have met with the supervising administrator and department chair, and have followed up with e-mails clarifying the relevant contractual procedures to follow with regards to increasing class sizes. AFA officers also plan to pursue greater compensation for some of the instructors who have more students than they should have in those classes. Janet McCulloch noted that departments or disciplines within departments have the right to hold a discussion about establishing a maximum class size and arrive at a decision, which AFA would have to support. Brief discussion followed about the importance of extending the invitation to adjunct faculty to attend any such meetings. Janet noted that she would make it clear to the chair that it is absolutely necessary to include participation from adjunct faculty in these discussions.

## MINUTES

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes from the September 26, 2007 Executive Council meeting or the September 30, 2007 Executive Council retreat, both of which were accepted as written.

## ACTION ITEMS

1. Appointment of AFA Publications Officer for Spring 2008. Following a nomination made by Paula Burks and seconded by Lara Branen-Ahumada, the Council unanimously approved a motion to appoint Janet McCulloch to serve as AFA Publications Officer for Spring 2008 (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
2. Revision of AFA Reassigned Time and Stipends for AFA Officers: Spring 2008. The Council engaged in brief discussion about the proposed changes to the reassigned time and stipends budget for the Spring 2008 semester. Changes include 10% for the Past President's service on the Negotiations Team, 15% for the Publications Officer and 5% for the DTREC Co-Chair. Following a motion made by René Lo Pilato and seconded by Paula Burks, the Council unanimously approved a motion to accept the revision of reassigned time and stipends for Spring 2008 as presented (11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. 2008-09 Calendar Issues. Deborah Sweitzer, who serves on the Calendar Committee, engaged the Council in discussion about two current issues of concern to that committee.
  - Equal-Length Semesters. Currently, there are 177 working days in the academic calendar, which means that the fall and spring semesters are of unequal length. This discrepancy between the semesters negatively affects the calculation of the final monthly retirement allowance of faculty who wish to retire mid-year at the end of the shorter semester. (AFA has received complaints about this issue from both faculty and the Payroll Department.) In order to remedy this problem, faculty have had to find a way to work an additional day so that they could earn a full 50% or one-half of a year of service credit for the semester. Currently, the academic year includes 171 instructional days, four Professional Development Activity (PDA) Days, New Faculty Orientation Day, and Graduation Day. The State mandates 175 days and most community colleges have 175 days. Any change to the number of days would have to be negotiated. One way to solve this problem would be to reduce the number of working days from 177 to 176. It has been suggested that New Faculty Orientation Day could become a PDA/Flex Day. In that scenario, there would still be an odd number of instructional days (171); however, the length of each semester would be the same. There was no resistance from Council members to this idea.
  - Summer 2009 Template. Abe Farkas, the new dean of Curriculum and Educational Support Services, has been circulating a draft summer template, designed to attract as many students as possible, that would provide for one eight-week and two five-week sessions in the summer. He researched and identified end-of-spring-semester dates for many high schools and colleges, prior to developing the draft, and was hoping to implement it this next summer. Since the calendar for 2007-08 has been finalized, the Calendar Committee is considering the draft template for Summer 2009. One concern that has been expressed relates to the absence in the template of the current three-week intersession between the end

of spring and the beginning of summer, which has been very successful and allows students to complete courses, while freeing up the rest of their summer, so that they can transfer to four-year colleges or universities. Many students from out of the area take advantage of this intersession, which is much less expensive in comparison to other schools, including Sonoma State University, for example. Even though the draft summer template provides for different types of opportunities for students, it does not allow for this particular three-week intersession. Another concern is that the template does not include enough time for combination lecture/lab courses that meet more than three hours per week. On the other hand, the template is attractive to those who are interested in a year-round school model, as the two five-week sessions would be compatible with a compressed calendar (which provides for three 15½- or 16-week semesters).

Cheryl Dunn raised a third concern, which is that schools in southern Sonoma County (including Petaluma and Novato) have a completely different schedule (starting and ending dates) than schools in Santa Rosa. Abe Farkas' research did not include the south county schools. Cheryl also suggested that, if the goal is to try to capture as many FTES as possible, then why create a template that is rigid? Why not offer three-, five-, six-, eight- and ten-week sessions – whatever works for any given department? Other Council members commented that student learning curves on computers are such that it doesn't work well to condense certain courses into a five-week span of time, that P.E. and Dance courses don't work well if they last longer than two hours, and that students in many other classes that don't involve physical exertion can't handle more than two hours of instruction in one class. It was clear at the end of the discussion that Council members still had reservations about the summer template, but that, if it were made to be flexible enough to allow for many different configurations, they would support it.

2. College Service and Professional Service & Development related to Job Description, Professional Growth Increments and Professional Development/Flex Activities. Janet McCulloch initiated the discussion by stating that a full-time faculty member's work week is defined as 40 hours, of which 15 hours are for student contact, 15 hours are for preparation and assessment, five hours are for office hours/student consultation (in-person, via telephone or via e-mail), and five hours are for College Service and Professional Service & Development (CS&PS&D). It is generally acknowledged that some faculty members do far more than their five hours per week in this last category, and some do far less. The Academic Senate has expressed concern about accountability for CS&PS&D. Janet noted that AFA would be consulting with the Senate prior to proceeding with any negotiations in this arena. She added that, although examples of CS&PS&D activities are broadly covered in Article 17 (Job Descriptions) in the Contract, these activities vary widely from department to department. For example, some departments have many more meetings than others, and some have many more full-time faculty available to share in the workload of evaluations and curriculum development, etc. Often departments do not define their specific expectations in writing and there is no minimum standard. Janet also noted that department chairs have an opportunity to make some kind of judgment in the evaluation process regarding regular faculty performance in the area of CS&PS&D; however, again, there is no standard. In addition, there is a great deal of confusion about the difference between CS&PS&D activities in the Job Description, Professional Growth Increment (PGI) activities, and Professional Development and Flex Activities (PDA/Flex).

Deborah Sweitzer informed the Council that, when AFA became a union, they adopted language from the Enchiridion, which was a guidebook on how the SRJC system operated. Since not all departments operate in the same way, general language was placed in the Contract to serve as a guideline. At that time, AFA was not interested in having faculty engage in a “clock-punching routine,” as they thought it would have been unproductive and people simply wouldn’t comply. Janet added that the two documents that currently serve as guidebooks for faculty are the Contract and the District Policy and Procedures Manual (DP&PM).

Mary Kay Rudolph added that she is the first Vice President not to add to the Enchiridion, as she believes that the District owes it to new employees to use policy, and that she agrees with AFA in that she would like to have ultimate flexibility, but with a measure of accountability. Faculty should know what the expectations are and should be given an opportunity to rise to the level of those expectations. Help should also be provided to those who are not meeting the expectations.

Lengthy Council discussion included the following comments: 1) faculty should not have to keep extensive diaries and logs about what they do to satisfy the five hours a week; 2) on the other hand, faculty are not being held accountable; 3) PGI is supposed to be about the effort above and beyond the normal job; 4) faculty should be rewarded so that they don’t wear out and PGI needs to be more all encompassing; 5) it’s contradictory that regular faculty are able to advance to the next step for the first 16 years without any documentation, but then, after they’ve been here a long time and are presumed to be trustworthy, they have to document in order to advance any further; 6) faculty need to know what the expectations are and which activities count for which of the three categories; 7) it’s not clear how curriculum development fits in; 8) the PGI Committee needs better guidelines to help them evaluate the activities that faculty submit for PGI credit; 9) some faculty are doing way too much work — there should be a maximum limit; 10) very limited Department Activities funds are available and it would greatly help reduce regular faculty workload if adjunct faculty could be eligible for compensation for curriculum development, revision of course outlines, and development of the majors through the Adjunct Faculty District Activities Fund (AFDAF); 11) it’s difficult for adjunct faculty to say “no” when asked to help out in their departments without receiving any compensation; and 12) in addition to these District-wide activities, faculty in many departments need to maintain currency, update competencies and keep up with technological advances in their fields. Janet noted that ideas raised in the discussion would help to guide the AFA Negotiations Team in discussions with the District, which has an interest in getting the work of the College done.

3. Guidelines for Council e-mails to Outlook Distribution Lists. A draft policy recommendation from the AFA officers was distributed to the Council for their review. Johanna James distributed a separate memo to the Council opposing the recommendation, noting that, in her opinion, adoption of the proposed policy would involve a curtailment of freedom of speech. The proposed policy was subsequently withdrawn and lengthy discussion ensued. At the conclusion of the discussion, no consensus was reached or policy recommendation made. The officers will be bringing another proposal to the next Council meeting. This proposal will reflect the expectations regarding the use of preferred channels of communication for organizational matters.
4. College Council Revisions to District Policy and Procedures Manual. Due to time constraints, this item was postponed.

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

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.