

ALL FACULTY SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE ASSOCIATION

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

September 25, 2024

(Approved by the Executive Council on October 9, 2024)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

* Anne Donegan, <i>presiding</i>	* Amanda Greene	* Jessie Paisley	Michelle van Aalst
* Ashley Arnold	* Steven Kessler	* Emily Schmidt	* Sarah Whyllly
* Marc Bojanowski	* Dawn Lukas	* Christie Soldate	* Patsy Young
* Bita Bookman	* Siobhan McGregor-Gordon	* Ivan Tircuit	* Tony Martin
Wayne Downey	* Venona Orr	* Carlos Valencia	

Negotiators/Appointed Positions present: K. Frindell Teuscher, Mark Ferguson

Staff members present: Stephanie Simons

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. in Doyle 4520, on the Santa Rosa campus and via Zoom conferencing.

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.
3. **Cabinet Report.** This report and discussion were conducted in Closed Session.

Closed Session adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

OPEN SESSION

Open Session reconvened at 4:02 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. **Disruption to classroom due to excessive construction noise.** A member reported the excessive noise from ongoing construction at Emeritus Hall caused a significant disruption to the classroom environment. The faculty member had to seek alternative accommodations, which negatively impacted the faculty member's workload.
2. **No resolution on "Fire Watch" signs in Emeritus.** A member reported there remain signs advertising a "Fire Watch" in Emeritus Hall. The faculty member requested information regarding the following: What to do if there is a fire? Who to contact if a fire is observed? Who and how will faculty/students be contacted in the event of a fire? What are the hours of operation? The faculty member previously presented this concern on Aug. 28, 2024. There has been no follow up from administration regarding the faculty member's concerns.
3. **Member gratitude.** A member thanked AFA for the outstanding and rigorous way AFA defends and supports the faculty in terms of wages and working conditions.
4. **Block enforced scheduling.** A member presented a concern regarding the effort by two deans on the Petaluma campus to institute block scheduling for Spring 2025. No faculty input was obtained. The M/W courses are 18-week courses, while the T/Th are short courses. The schedule type cannot be implemented in a fair and equitable manner, as some departments only offer 18-week courses. The faculty member requested the assistance of AFA to find a solution to the scheduling experiment.
5. **Grants at SRJC relating to faculty purview.** A member brought to light several instances where faculty input was not sought in the implementation of grant-funded programs, despite the grant-funded programs having enormous implications for faculty. The faculty member hoped AFA would investigate the matter.
6. **Address from the Academic Senate President.** The Academic Senate President requested the Executive Council continue to re-establish partnership with the Senate to create a stronger, unified faculty. The AS hoped AFA will share the burden of identifying issues arising due to respective purview.

MINUTES

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the September 11, 2024 Executive Council meeting (17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (Approved minutes are posted at <http://www.afa-srjc.org/minutes.shtml>).

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Policy Development: Negotiations Process

Anne explained that Siobhan and the Cabinet continue to update all the policies. It is hoped a new policy will be brought every few meetings until the review is complete. The policy presented received grammatical modifications and was reviewed for consistency.

- Discussion was opened.
- A motion was made and seconded to move this item to an action item (15 in favor).

2. Responsibilities as an AFA Representative to District-wide Committees

This item was brought in response to discussions that occurred at the AFA retreat on September 13, 2024. Several examples were provided of common situations and casual conversations where the purview of AFA might be encountered. Anne stated that in those situations and conversations, the "pause button" should be used and the participants should refer the topic to AFA.

- Working Conditions – These are a mandatory subject of bargaining. If there is discussion in a committee about working conditions, the topic should be brought to AFA.
 - ⇒ Example 1: A colleague states they feel bad for students who are always arriving to class late because they can't find parking. The colleague states there are so many empty faculty spots; they think students should be able to park in faculty spots.
 - ⇒ This is a faculty working condition. This person is not making an anti-union statement, but the conversation discusses working conditions. Conversations regarding working conditions can only take place between the AFA and District Negotiations Teams.
- Direct Dealing - applies to anything about working conditions
 - ⇒ Example 3: Special Assignments. There is a grant with funds ear-marked for faculty work. Someone thinks they know the perfect faculty member to do the job, and takes steps toward identifying the candidate.
 - ⇒ This is direct dealing. Any faculty work must be announced by the District by means of a job announcement that must clearly state job duties and compensation. The discussion of these details should not take place in a committee.
- "MUSTs" - Example: Faculty must..., e.g. take a training, meet students outside of office hours
 - ⇒ These are job requirements that must be negotiated.
- What can you do when this happens?
 - Speak up!
 - Bring the concern to an administrator or AFA representative. Deans and administrators are supposed to know these rules.
- Questions and Comments
 - C: A Councilor stated they often caution faculty members to guard themselves against working for free simply because the culture of certain committees may be to volunteer to work after hours for special events.
 - C: Volunteering is not a requirement – it is a choice.
 - C: If volunteering, or free service, is going to be a requirement, it must be negotiated.
 - C: Anne provided an additional example using College Council committee work and the task of updating District policies. She stated that some of the new language in the drafts contradict language in the AFA contract and the spirit of the contract. One board policy regarding accessibility was of particular concern. The policy was regarding the assignment of responsibility to ensure disability resources are provided with equal access. The new District policy made the responsibility shared between faculty, staff, and the District. AFA's Article 17 states faculty are to assist with the process. The semantics of "assist" versus "responsibility" is a red flag that results in direct contradiction of the faculty contract with the District.
 - Q: Is it possible that the change to language in board policy is meant to minimize legal ramifications?
 - ⇒ A: It is very possible.
 - C: Where would the hours for such an increase in responsibility come from?
 - ⇒ A: It would have to be negotiated, or one could use the "X factor" if requested in advance.

C: There were requests to add discussion space to Executive Council meetings to provide updates regarding the policy changes in College Council, and to receive reports from AFA representatives to District-wide committees.

Anne requested that any feedback be emailed to her or the AFA office.

ACTION ITEMS

1. AFA Representatives to District-wide Committees for 2023-24: Fringe Benefits, TIMC

- This Item was moved from a Discussion Item on August 28, 2024.
- The Item was opened for discussion.
- Jessy Paisley previously agreed to join the Fringe Benefits committee.
- There were no volunteers to serve on TIMC or the PDC contract faculty seat. Due to the changes occurring at PDC, it was decided no additional appointment would be made until those changes were implemented.
- Anne suggested that the Council should consider making recommendations from the membership for the remaining TIMC committee seat.
- There being no further discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and approved by unanimous show of hands to confirm the following appointment:
 - Jessy Paisley, Fringe Benefits

2. Policy Development: Negotiations Process

- This Item was moved from a Discussion Item.
- The Item was opened for discussion.
- There was discussion regarding the use of the term "ripple effect." It was decided the term should be remanded to parentheses that follow the language "check for and correct inconsistencies in the Contract resulting from a negotiated item."
- A discussion was had regarding the intent and purpose of the policy.
- Suggestions were made to add direction to and prioritization of the tasks, including assigning tasks to particular members of the Negotiations Team.
 - It was noted that the Negotiations Team needs to work on all tasks simultaneously and with the flexibility to make decisions regarding prioritization and assignment on the fly. The policy is a broad charter.
- A request was made that the direction "write out the agreement" be stricken from the policy.
- There being no further discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and approved by unanimous show of hands to accept the policy, as presented, with the strikethrough of "write out the agreement" and insertion of the language relating to "ripple effect."

OTHER REPORTS

1. President's Report. This report was postponed.

2. FACCC Representative Update. Siobhan reported on the business of FACCC.

- Summer Retreat – held at the end of June 2024.
 - There were several persons from AFA appointed to positions of interest.
 - K. Frindell Teuscher was appointed to Chair the Policy Committee
 - Emily Schmidt was elected as the part-time faculty's Board of Governors representative for the Northern Region, and serves on the Part-Time committee by position.
 - Siobhan was appointed to the Legislative and Budget committee.
 - Executive Director change: Philip Hu was hired to replace Evan Hawkins, who resigned last spring.
 - Two Think Tanks were created:
 - Campaign for Equitable Funding
 - Reviewed data on increase in CC fund balances
 - Reviewed draft of audit request
 - Presented to and received feedback from the FACCC Board of Governors (BoG)
 - Next presentation to the FACCC BoG in November
 - Campaign for Student Agency and Equitable Access.
 - Upcoming Events – members of AFA can participate in the following events. Questions can be emailed to Siobhan McGregor-Gordon or Emily Schmidt.
 - FACCC Virtual Town Hall on 2025 Legislative Priorities
 - Wednesday, October 2, 6:00pm - 7:00 pm
 - A Community College Policy Conversation with Endorsed Candidate Chris Rogers

- Thursday, October 3, 5:00pm – 6:00pm
- Conversation moderated by SRJC, College of the Redwoods, and Mendocino College
- [FACCC Position Paper on California's Community Colleges Funding Models](#). Siobhan provided a summary of the four funding models presented in the position paper.
 - Basic Allocation - A lump sum is given to each District based on size (enrollment). Thresholds are arbitrary. FACCC proposed a new medium threshold between 8,500 and 17,000.
 - FTES Allocation - Bases allocation on the definition of full-time being 15 units. Only 9.23% of CCC students were enrolled in 15+ units in Fall 2022. FACCC proposed that CCC full-time units of instruction be redefined to 9 units.
 - Supplemental Allocation - This allocation model is based on the number of students receiving federal and state financial aid (Pell Grants, California Promise Grants, and AB 540 fee waivers). A negative aspect of this model is that it doesn't take into account the cost of living in the region. In higher cost of living regions, smaller proportions of students qualify for financial aid, thus reducing the monies directed at those institutions and discriminating against students living in high-cost areas. FACCC proposed the Cost-of-Living Metric be integrated into Poverty Index.
 - The Success Allocation - A type of Performance Based Funding in which colleges are rewarded for students' achieving certain milestones. This model does provide additional money for at-risk students, while potentially reducing funding for CCCs that serve low-income students in high cost-of-living areas. FACCC proposed that the Success Allocation model be eliminated, and CCCs proven to employ best practices for student success receive additional funds.
- There was a brief discussion of how the models might best represent the students at SRJC.

Anne thanked the Executive Council and participants before adjourning the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Stephanie Simons.