

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

December 12, 2007

(Approved by AFA Executive Council 1/23/08)

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: AFA Officers & Negotiators: Ann Herbst, Warren Ruud, Deborah Sweitzer;
AFA Office Staff: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell.

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

MEMBER CONCERNS

None.

MINUTES

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes from the November 28, 2007 Executive Council meeting, which were accepted as written.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Appointment of AFA Representative to District Staff Diversity Committee for Spring 2008. Following a motion made by Michael Meese and seconded by Reneé Lo Pilato, the Council unanimously approved a motion to appoint Michael Kaufmann to serve as AFA representative to the District Staff Diversity Committee for Spring 2008 (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). Janet McCulloch informed the Council that the name of this committee would be changed to the "District Equal Employment Opportunity Committee."

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. DTREC Public Safety Pilot Project and Evaluation Swat Team. Janet McCulloch, who serves as chair of the District Tenure Review and Evaluations Committee (DTREC), updated the Council about two new ideas under discussion by DTREC.
 - Public Safety Pilot Project. A pilot project has been proposed that would simplify the evaluation process for adjunct instructors who teach less than a 20% load. The plan is to try this system first in the Public Safety department at the Santa Rosa Training Center. DTREC would like to do something about the huge backlog of outstanding evaluations in that department. Part of the problem stems from the fact that many adjunct instructors, who have full-time jobs with police and fire departments, only teach for two to three hours in any given semester, which makes it logistically difficult for evaluators to schedule the observation. Currently, student feedback is gathered in every section of every course

taught every semester. This process is partially mandated for certain of the police academy courses by POST (the certifying agency.) Once everyone has reviewed the student feedback, the documents are shredded. The proposed pilot project would work like this: if adjunct instructors wish to have a classroom observation, they may have one; however, if they wish to waive the observation, then the program coordinator would simply review the student feedback and write a brief report. In order to maintain a paper trail, should problems develop over time, a form will be completed, notations will be made if significant concerns arise, and the supervisor will keep the form. Student feedback will be given to the instructor, who can decide whether s/he wants to keep it or not (the same way that regular faculty handle informal student feedback between formal evaluations). If the pilot project works well, DTREC would consider whether or not to implement it in other departments (although there aren't many other programs in the College in which instructors only teach for two to three hours in a semester).

In the Council discussion that followed, a concern was raised about the possibility that two different forms are currently being used – one from DTREC and one from POST. Janet said that DTREC had been told that Public Safety is using the same form that everyone else in the College is using and that it has been approved by POST; however, she will follow up to confirm. Another concern that was raised was about protecting student anonymity. Faculty should not see the individual feedback; rather, a summary should be prepared and faculty should review that summary. Janet said that she would check to make sure that POST doesn't require that the faculty member see the individual feedback, and noted that the department is very interested in procuring a scantron machine to use for student feedback. Michael Meese, a regular faculty member in the Administration of Justice Department, indicated that POST requires that the department mails them a scantron form completed on a course-by-course basis, not based on the different individual instructors that teach the course over the semester.

- Evaluation Swat Team. DTREC has been brainstorming about how to help departments complete their overdue evaluations. This problem arises when a department has a small number of regular faculty and a large number of adjunct faculty, when the regular faculty are engaged in a great deal of unpaid program coordination, and/or when many short courses at odd times and/or in different locations are offered. They came up with the idea of an "Evaluation SWAT Team" — a team of highly trained individuals who could be called upon to help a department get caught up. Evaluation SWAT Team members would not need to have any substantive knowledge of the field in which evaluatees are teaching. As Janet said, most of the time one can tell what good teaching looks like. Department chairs or program coordinators should be able to determine that the course materials and syllabus are satisfactory. Evaluation SWAT Team members could earn PGI or Flex credit for the training and for performing the evaluations. In the subsequent Council discussion, a number of questions were raised, including about what is a reasonable number of evaluations that a regular faculty member should be asked to do. Janet clarified that adjunct faculty can be called upon to help, as they may evaluate other adjunct faculty as part of a team. In that situation, the adjunct faculty member does the classroom observation, writes a report and has a brief meeting with the chair/coordinator. In response to a question about PDA and Flex requirements, Janet clarified that the State gives SRJC money for the days that are designated as PDA days. PDA institutional days are mandatory for regular faculty, optional for adjunct faculty. If adjunct faculty have classes that fall on those designated PDA days, they have an obligation. Flex days are simply placeholders.

2. Petaluma Faculty Forum Feedback re: Transfer Process to Other Campuses/Sites. Warren Ruud, who, along with Cheryl Dunn, attended the last Petaluma Faculty Forum (PFF) meeting, reported that he and Cheryl gave PFF members an update about the status of the development of a transfer policy. They listened to feedback, which included specific questions and opinions. Warren noted that PFF members want to support the development and preservation of the Petaluma culture. Cheryl added that one of their concerns has to do with being sensitive to the needs of both campuses, and not having a revolving door so that continuity and solid programs can be maintained. She also noted that Petaluma faculty don't want Petaluma to become the dumping ground for faculty who are no longer effective. Janet added that there has been talk on the part of the District about funneling transfers through the Faculty Staffing Committee, which is composed of some faculty (including representation from the Academic Senate) and a greater number of administrators. The Program Review Process, which ranks needs that best serve the entire District, would provide the rationale for justifying the transfer. AFA is interested in forming an intra-district transfer committee, which would be minimally composed of an equal number of faculty and administrators, and would properly support academic programs and maintain the integrity of departments and curriculum. Any District-wide transfer policy would need to function as an umbrella that would provide general guidelines, while allowing each individual department and/or program to develop their own policies to fit their size and special needs. The Council went into closed session for the remainder of this discussion item.

PRESENTATION TO AFA PRESIDENT

1. Recognition of Outgoing AFA President. Council members expressed their appreciation and gratitude to Janet McCulloch for her outstanding work on behalf of the organization and faculty over the four-and-a-half years of her tenure as AFA President.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.

PROPOSITION 92 PRESENTATION

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

*Janet McCulloch, presiding	John Daly	*Joyce Johnson	*Andrea Proehl
*Alix Alixopoulos	*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: Rich Hansen, President, Foothill-DeAnza Faculty Association & Bay Faculty Association; Linda Cushing, Bay Area Prop. 92 Campaign Coordinator; Robert Ethington, Director, SRJC Student Affairs; Jude Rowe, Vice-President, SRJC Student Center; AFA Officers & Negotiators: Ann Herbst, Warren Ruud, and Deborah Sweitzer; AFA Office Staff: Judith Bernstein and Candy Shell.

The meeting was called back to order at 4:20 p.m.

Proposition 92 Presentation. Rich Hansen gave a PowerPoint presentation and answered questions. Following are some of the major points that he made:

- The four main sponsors of Proposition 92 are the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, the California Federation of Teachers, the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, and the Community College League.
- Prop. 92 establishes a system of independent public community college districts and board of governors. It requires minimum levels of State funding, sets fees at \$15 per unit, limits fee increases, and provides for more control over the community college budget. Prop. 92 provides fee stability, funds enrollment and provides independence from politics.
- SRJC's projected increase in funding is \$6.5 million annually by the 2009-10 fiscal year.
- All faculty groups in the State are in favor of zero student fees. Fees always jump up at the worst times — just when students need community colleges the most, they are taxed more. When fees went up in 2003-04, statewide enrollment dropped by over 300,000 students. Community college students essentially pay taxes that go to the general fund during hard times. Prop. 92 reverses that public policy. It lowers fees, locks them in, requires 2/3 vote of the legislature, and ensures that fee revenue benefits will go to students, not the State government.
- Community college funding is currently tied to K-12 enrollment; however, while K-12 enrollment is expected to decline, community college enrollment is expecting to steadily increase. Without changing Prop. 98, students would be turned away. Under Prop. 92, two separate pots of money would be created — K-12 and community colleges — and each will grow separately under the same umbrella based on inflation and each segment's enrollment growth. K-12 would not be hurt under Prop. 92 and taxes would not be increased. Community colleges won't be shortchanged due to overestimated property taxes.
- Currently, State Vice-Chancellors are political appointees of the governor, and the Department of Finance can veto regulations adopted by the Community College Board of Governors. Prop. 92 would double the number of student votes on the State Board, allow the State Chancellor to hire Vice-Chancellors, write local boards into the Constitution and protect local control.
- There was brief discussion about fundraising goals, the media and get-out-the-vote campaigns planned for January, the lack of support to date from district administrators, and initial approval ratings/polling figures.
- Although the California Teachers Association was shown the language and changes were made based on their suggestions, they are still coming out against Prop. 92. Other groups opposed to Prop. 92 include the California Taxpayers Association, the State Chamber of Commerce, the State League of Women Voters and SEIU.
- The opposition claims that not enough is being done to combat other rising costs, such as for textbooks, housing and food. They do not like Prop. 98 and, at the same time, they don't want it to be changed in any way. They do not like the fee limit and want individuals to pay more for their education.
- Linda Cushing said that there are efforts to get the League of Women Voters to change to a neutral position. She encouraged faculty to help support students in getting involved in the campaign. If the people only see faculty, administrators and trustees involved, Prop. 92 won't pass — a student presence is critical.
- Jude Rowe said that the SRJC Student Senate and the State Student Senate have both endorsed Prop. 92. An on-campus event is planned for January.