

## **AFA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

October 26, 2011

*(Approved by the Executive Council on 11/9/11)*

Executive Councilors present (noted by \*):

*Warren Ruud, <i>presiding</i>	*Cheryl Dunn	*Andre Larue	*Mary Pierce
Paulette Bell	*Terry Ehret	*Reneé Lo Pilato	*Audrey Spall
Paula Burks	*Brenda Flyswithawks	*Sean Martin	*Mike Starkey
*Ted Crowell	*Karen Frindell Teuscher	*Dan Munton	*Julie Thompson
*Dianne Davis	Lynn Harenberg-Miller	*Margaret Pennington	

Officers/Negotiators present: Ann Herbst, Jack Wegman  
Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4246, on the Santa Rosa campus.

### **MEMBER CONCERNS**

None

### **MINUTES**

There being no corrections or additions, the Council accepted the minutes from the October 12, 2011 Executive Council meeting as submitted. (Approved minutes are posted at [www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml).)

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. Presidential Forum Questions. Warren reported that the District has invited seven constituent groups—the Associated Students, the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, management, AFA, SEIU, and the Foundation—to submit one question each to be posed to the two candidates at the Presidential Forums scheduled for October 31 and November 2. (Originally, the District had asked each group to submit two questions, but later reduced the number to one in order to allow time for open questions from the audience.) Warren mentioned that he had received three suggestions in response to the email he sent out requesting ideas for AFA's question for the candidates: (1) the importance of achieving parity; (2) the Task Force for Student Success report recommendations; and (3) relative to faculty and the quality of instruction: the impact on instructional programs and student access caused by the absence of a competitive salary schedule and full-time replacement positions. Warren recommended against asking a "yes-or-no" question, suggesting that it would not reveal much about the candidate. Instead, he recommended that AFA's question be put into a broader context, for example: "In thinking about the final years of the budget crisis: as SRJC comes out of the financial trough over the next five or six years, what do you see as the three most important challenges facing the college? Pick one and, based on your past experiences, tell us the specific approach you would take to meet that challenge." Warren said that Vice President of

Student Services Ricardo Navarette plans to review the submitted questions and provide feedback to the groups. Each group will then need to submit its final question by Monday, October 31 at noon. In addition, each group will need to designate a speaker who will pose the final question to each candidate.

Councilors engaged in a lengthy discussion and made the following comments and suggestions:

- For a Part A and Part B question: "What would you like to do in the next year? What would you like to do when the District comes out of the budget crisis?"
- AFA's question needs to focus on the issues that fall within its purview, because no one else is going to ask those questions that address AFA's responsibilities.
- Whatever the question is, add to it: "In what way do you anticipate your relationship with AFA working in negotiations? What's your vision and how would AFA play a role in it?"
- Ask the candidate to address how he has worked in the past with bargaining agents.
- AFA ought to confirm with other constituent groups what they're going to ask, to make sure that they're not planning to ask the same question we are.
- Does AFA have to pose the same question to both candidates? If the first candidate answers the question in a particular way, it might cause us to think we need to change the wording of the question before posing it to the second candidate.
- If the successful candidate turns out to be someone who has a business model in mind, how would that approach affect the issue of access to community college? Given the budget deficit that SRJC is still facing and the recommendations of the Task Force on Student Success, we need to be concerned. How do the candidates view the community college's role in terms of access and student success?
- "What other answer can you give us besides, 'There's no money'?"
- "Can you give us an example of what you've done with no money (e.g., any creative things you've done to illustrate any of these points)?"
- It would be beneficial to ask a question that elicits their approach to problem solving. For example: "These are the problems at SRJC. From your experience at other community colleges, how would you see yourself addressing these problems?"
- We might want to ask where the candidates would funnel ongoing growth money. "Suppose, for example, the District was going to receive 50% of what it was funded prior to the cut. What would you do, assuming no constraints?"
- A question like that would force the candidate to prioritize, and knowing his priorities would be very valuable.
- We could phrase the question something like this: "Last year we lost \$9 million. This year we lost \$12 million. If you found out you had \$6 million, what would you do?"
- We could pose the opposite question, instead: "Suppose our budget were cut in half. What would you slash?"
- We need to put our question into a broader context, such as: "How do you approach problem solving?" instead of "What are you going to do when you win the lottery?"
- The question could be asked in such a way as to lead the candidate to revealing how inclusive he is in decision making.
- It would be better not to ask the "lottery" question and, instead, pose the question about what the candidate would do if half of what the District lost was restored.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Council reached consensus on the basic question: "If you found out that half of your budget was restored and you had no constraints, what would you do with the money?" Warren requested that those members of the Council who are skilled at wordsmithing work on honing the final language and email their edited versions to the Council. The Council then briefly considered who might be the best choice to pose the question at the forums. After brief discussion, they came to consensus that an adjunct

Councilor should ask the questions. In addition, it was suggested that two adjunct Councilors be selected, with one asking the question at the first forum, and the other asking the same question at the second forum. Mike Starkey agreed to take the lead in coordinating via email with the adjunct members of the Council to agree upon the selection of the individual(s). Warren noted that the deadline for submission of the final question to Ricardo Navarette is noon on Thursday, October 27, and he said that he would submit the agreed upon question as discussed at the meeting if he did not receive another edited version from Councilors in time.

2. [CCCI Resolution re: Task Force for Student Success \(TFSS\) Recommendations](#). Councilors received an electronic copy of the CCCI resolution prior to the meeting for their review. Warren asked the Council to consider this additional discussion item, which was added after the agenda had been published on the Web due to the critical and urgent need to inform the SRJC Board of Trustees about faculty concerns regarding the TFSS report recommendations. Warren expressed interest in forwarding the CCCI resolution to the Board as soon as possible and in letting the Board know that AFA is in full agreement with the concerns expressed in the resolution. (As an aside, he mentioned that AFA officers and FACCC staff have engaged student leaders in conversations about the importance of students getting more involved politically, and about a potential idea for the future that would involve AFA, SEIU, Associated Students, and the Board of Trustees working together when communicating with local representatives in the State legislature.) Councilors expressed strong support for the CCCI resolution. By unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Mary Pierce and seconded by Brenda Flyswithhawks to move this item to action.
3. Spring 2012 Retreat. Warren reported that the Cabinet has discussed the idea of inviting CCCI's advocate David Balla-Hawkins to the Spring 2012 retreat to talk to the Council about statewide advocacy and, also, the idea of inviting student leaders to participate. Warren mentioned that, as part of CCCI's new contract agreement with Mr. Balla-Hawkins, CCCI member colleges will receive one local workshop at no charge. If the Council wishes Mr. Balla-Hawkins to present another workshop to the SRJC faculty at large, AFA would need to pick up the cost. Warren suggested that either one of the first two Saturdays in early February (before PDA Day and the President's Holiday weekend) would be an optimum date to schedule the retreat. He asked Councilors to check their calendars and respond as soon as possible to the Doodle poll that AFA staff sent out earlier in the day. It was suggested that the retreat be held closer to the Santa Rosa campus and that the new Culinary Café be considered as a possibility. Warren directed AFA staff to look into that option, and he requested that Councilors submit to staff any other ideas they might have for the retreat location.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. CCCI Resolution re: Task Force for Student Success (TFSS) Recommendations. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #2), by unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Mary Pierce and seconded by Brenda Flyswithhawks to adopt the [CCCI Resolution in Response to the Draft Recommendations of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success](#) as written. (The TFSS draft recommendations are posted at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/SSTF.htm> , along with other resources, links, and information about opportunities to provide feedback.)

### **MAIN REPORTS**

1. President's Report. Warren Ruud presented brief reports about the following two items:
  - Revision of District Safety Policy and Procedures. Environmental Health and Safety Coordinator Doug Kuula has been charged with writing a new District safety policy. The first draft of the revised procedures, which for the most part are mandated by state and federal law, have expanded in size to about 15-20 pages and are more substantial than they used to be. The District will be requiring that every new employee—management,

classified, and faculty—receive two hours of safety training. Warren noted that the broader issues relative to the safety training fall into the purview of the Academic Senate. Working conditions and salary, however, fall within AFA's scope of interest and, given that adjunct faculty members do not receive pay for and have no requirement to perform college service activities, the District ought to pay them for participating in any required training. Also, AFA would have a concern about what would happen if someone doesn't comply with the training (i.e., what is the due process?). Warren said that he expects the Senate to be very thorough in its consideration of the broader issues.

- Board of Trustees Redistricting. Every ten years, driven by the census, districts are required by the Ed Code to adjust the boundaries of trustee areas within the districts in order to balance the populations or to develop a different organizational plan, which may need to be approved by the electorate. Currently, the District is comprised of five areas, including four areas—each represented by one Board member—and one “super” area that is represented by three Board members, each elected at-large within that district. The Board has the option of spreading out the District's population evenly into seven areas or adjusting/balancing the populations proportionately in the existing five areas. There are pros and cons to each option. If the District were to decide to reorganize into a new structure, a county educational redistricting committee would provide assistance and oversee the process to ensure compliance with state law. Warren reported that the Board announced its decision at its last meeting to stay with the current five areas and adjust the populations within each area so that they are all proportional.

2. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report was conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.