

## **EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

October 8, 2014

*(Approved by Executive Council on October 22, 2014)*

Executive Councilors present (noted by \*):

*Julie Thompson, <i>presiding</i>	*Terry Ehret	*Sean Martin	*MJ Papa
Filomena Avila	*Karen Frindell Teuscher	*Jacqueline McGhee	*Margaret Pennington
Denise Beeson	*Deirdre Frontczak	*Bud Metzger	*George Sellu
Paulette Bell	*Michelle Hughes Markovics	*Terry Mulcaire	*Karen Stanley
Paula Burks	*Andre LaRue	*Matthew Murray	

Officers/Negotiators/Other Appointed Positions present: Ted Crowell, Dianne Davis, Warren Ruud  
Staff members present: Candy Shell, ~~Carol Valencia~~

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4245, on the Santa Rosa campus.

### **CLOSED SESSION REPORTS**

1. **Conciliation/Grievance Report.** This report and discussion were conducted in closed session.
2. **Negotiations Report.** This report and discussion were conducted in closed session.

Closed Session adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

### **OPEN SESSION**

Open Session reconvened at 4:11 p.m.

Faculty member present: Carmen Castillo

### **MEMBER CONCERNS WITHIN AFA'S PURVIEW**

1. Early Connections Program. Karen Frindell Teuscher brought forward a concern related to a new section discovered in faculty cubbies. The new section allows faculty members to identify "at risk" students through a series of check boxes and appears to connect students with assistance programs, such as DRD, although how communications are processed is not evident. The concerns enumerated by Karen and other Council members included the following:
  - It appears the tracking is maintained on SIS. It is unclear why the information is assimilated and with whom or how the information is shared.
  - Is there a connection to the State Student Success movement?
  - The confidentiality risks for students are high with this tracking program. There are already other, better ways to communicate with our students needing assistance.
  - On behalf of students, this is horrifying.
  - The tracking task is presently optional; but, if it's made mandatory, it would create additional, uncompensated workload for faculty members.
  - This task is not part of a faculty member's job description. (See [Article 17: Job Descriptions](#).)

2. Teaching Fellowship Mentoring Program. Terry Mulcaire reported on behalf of a faculty member that the program's workload for faculty mentors is far beyond reasonable. Many additional hours of extra work are incurred without compensation; no load is given for mentoring.
3. Legal Representation for Faculty Members. Deirdre Frontczak contacted Faculty Association of California Community College's (FACCC's) Jonathan Lightman and Andrea York, asking for FACCC's advice and experience regarding a district's legal support for faculty members in the course of their teaching duties. (See [9.24.14 Council meeting minutes](#) and [8.27.14 Council meeting minutes](#).) They advised that this is a benefits issue negotiated on a district-by-district basis. It was recommended that Rich Hansen, President of the California Community College Independents (CCCI), be contacted to relate specific experiences of other districts in the state. Julie Thompson will bring this topic forward at the CCCI Fall 2014 conference later this month, discuss it with the District, and then report back to Council.

### MINUTES

By unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion and second to approve the minutes from the September 24, 2014 Executive Council meeting as amended (14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

(Approved minutes are posted at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml>.)

### DISCUSSION ITEMS

#### 1. **AFA PAC Contributions**

- a. Allocate an additional campaign contribution of \$500 each from the AFA PAC account to Board of Trustees candidates Jordan Burns and Dorothy Battenfeld. Formalizing previous Council consensus via email, a motion was made, seconded, and approved by unanimous voice vote to move the contributions to Burns and Battenfeld to an Action Item (14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
- b. Revisiting the topic of an AFA PAC campaign contribution for Board of Trustees candidate Kathleen Doyle (see [9.24.14 Council meeting minutes](#)), Julie opened the discussion. In light of a recent *Press Democrat* article about the Board election candidates (<http://www.pressdemocrat.com/news/local/2874639-181/santa-rosa-junior-college-board>), the Council raised some concerns about candidate Doyle's view on Project Labor Agreements (PLAs).
- c. A related discussion ensued regarding questions about the Board's perspective on PLAs with regard to spending bond money. Specifically, if Measure H is approved by voters on November 4, would the Board be open to PLAs, and how does that affect whether or not the Council takes action to contribute to the "Yes on Measure H" campaign? Dr. Chong is requesting a large contribution from AFA's PAC; however, we explained that our account balance limits our consideration to a much smaller amount.

A robust discussion by the Council included the following comments:

- A PLA is a collective bargaining agreement by the District with labor organizations and employers for the duration of a project financed by bond funds. A PLA would not necessarily require that only union workers be hired, but it would most likely set minimum standards on pay, benefits, and working conditions. There's no strong evidence that PLAs increase the cost for projects, but they do decrease the profit for the companies securing the bids.
- The PLA issue is pertinent to both the considered campaign contributions—Board candidate Doyle and Measure H. Also, since AFA relies on the right to collective bargaining, we should be sensitive to supporting that right for other workers. The *Press Democrat* article stated that Board incumbents Burdo, Doyle, and Zumwalt have opposed PLAs in the past and remain opposed; candidates Battenfeld, Burns, and Fishman are open to considering PLAs and want to know more before making a decision.
- The AFA Board of Trustees Candidate Interview Task Force neglected to ask a question about labor views but will remember to do so next time.

- Our Board of Trustees members are not city employees, and they are held to a higher standard with respect to spending taxpayer money. It's their job and fiduciary responsibility to get the biggest bang for the buck.
- It's the Board's job to spend the money wisely, but that doesn't necessarily mean in the cheapest way. For example, their commitment to Rank 10 shows support of the "Legacy of Excellence." By the same token, I would like to hear the Board say they would consider being open to PLAs, which would show support of labor. I want clarification before contributing to either the Doyle or Measure H campaigns.
- The Board has a business interest and must focus on all sides and find optimal balance. As such, they are accountable for the triple bottom line: people, planet, and profit.
- Sometimes investment costs money.
- Whatever the Trustees are bound by, we are not. This is not personal; this is about principle. In the past the Board has not chosen the best way—some Board members that are opposed to a "living wage" have received campaign contributions from those companies that don't support PLAs. I cannot support a candidate or a measure if they don't speak out for the rights of laborers. I don't want to reduce whether or not we make these contributions to one issue, but this is one very important issue. I want a statement of assurance—something to the effect of "fair labor arrangements will be made," "we're in support of PLAs," or something similar—before we contribute any money.
- There appears to be a parallel to how the District views contract and adjunct faculty members in their practice of replacing contract faculty with a growing adjunct faculty workforce. It's the same as choosing non-PLA laborers. AFA should come out with a statement that says we are supporting candidates and a measure which are doing the right thing—the same thing we want for our own labor force.
- There is no absolute evidence that supporting PLAs must cost more.
- It would set a very bad example for our students and college to contribute to efforts that are not open to PLAs.
- The *Press Democrat's* quote about Doyle is incorrect. Kathleen Doyle personally clarified her views with me and was surprised at the quote in the paper. She was on record ten years ago against PLAs but is now open to them. She appreciates AFA's endorsement of her candidacy and any financial contribution would be greatly appreciated.
- The unsettled future handling of the bond [with regard to honoring labor] makes me not want to give a contribution to Measure H.
- We have a mission, which includes sustainability and commitments to the community. We can't think of this issue narrowly. We need a strings-attached approach to our money contribution. We want the bond money to be used in a responsible way and one that does not undermine our values.
- In terms of timing, it seems we need to make a decision now for the Doyle contribution, but the bond doesn't feel as pressing.
- With prior endorsements, we discussed the need to be cognizant of the repercussions if we don't partner our endorsement with a money contribution.
- Whatever we decide on the bond contribution, assuming it passes, we will have to be watchdogs, regardless of whether strings are attached. Maybe a contribution gives us a seat at the table.

Regarding contributing to the Bond campaign, due to a lack of Council consensus, Julie offered to confer with Dr. Chong for further clarity and relate to him the Council's comments and concerns about contributing to the Measure H campaign, specifically about labor and transparency. The Council concurred by straw vote.

Regarding contributing to Board candidate Doyle, Councilors spoke in support of her knowledge and qualifications. Other comments included the following:

- I am completely willing to give Doyle a chance to make very clear whether or not she is open to PLAs as the best choice for our community. I want a clear statement, maybe in writing. She doesn't have to make promises, just be open to PLAs.
- She should consider contacting the *Press Democrat* to say she was misquoted.
- We would consider a vote on giving Doyle a contribution, and the prerequisite would be her putting in writing her view on PLAs.

Julie offered to contact Board candidate Doyle and relate the Council's comments; she will be in touch with the Council via email regarding the results. The Council concurred and, therefore, no action regarding a contribution was taken at this time.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **1. AFA PAC Contributions**

Having been moved from a Discussion Item, a motion was made and seconded to allocate an additional campaign contribution of \$500 each from the AFA PAC account to Board of Trustees candidates Jordan Burns and Dorothy Battenfeld (14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

### **OTHER REPORTS**

#### **1. President's Report.** Julie reported briefly on the following items:

- Watch your email for a Doodle poll for scheduling the Council retreat for Spring 2015.
- Remember the fall Council retreat is Sunday, November 2.
- The AFA Adjunct Issues Workshop is today from 5:30-7:00 p.m., next door in Doyle #4246. All are welcome. Matt has created a schedule of presentations, so check in with him.
- We're in the process of getting the Doyle room #4245 and #4246 microphone issues taken care of. AFA is assisting with the cost to install an on/off switch.
- Tuesday, October 14, at 7:00 p.m. in the Bertolini Student Center, please join the League of Women Voters for a SRJC Trustee Candidates Forum. More information is available at <http://www.lwvsonoma.org/Forums.html>.
- Board of Trustees candidate Jordan Burns has an event tomorrow night. Please check your email for details and bring your checkbooks.

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

Minutes submitted by Candy Shell.