

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

January 25, 2006

(Approved by Council 2/8/06)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| * Janet McCulloch, <small>presiding</small> | Jim Elrod | * Michael Ludder | * Deborah Sweitzer |
| * Alix Alixopoulos | * Peggy Goebel | * Joel Neuberg | * Doris Tolks |
| * Ted Crowell | * Ann Herbst | * Andrea Proehl | * Linda Weiss |
| John Daly | * Johanna James | * Greg Sheldon | * Lynda Williams |

Also present: Courtenay Anderson, Phil Forester, Michael Kaufmann, Judith Bernstein.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. New AFA Memberships. Judith reported that, in response to the December Fair Share Service Fee Notice mailing, 37 adjunct faculty and 2 regular faculty joined AFA. In addition, several regular faculty members recently joined in response to personal invitations from AFA officers.

MINUTES

There were no additions or corrections to the December 14, 2005 Executive Council meeting minutes, which were accepted as written.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Community College Initiative — Governance, Funding Stabilization, and Student Fee Reduction. Greg briefly described the purpose of the initiative (to make community colleges independent from K-12, which is facing declining enrollment, and to establish a separate governing body and system for calculating growth rates and funding, which would still be subject to Prop 98 provisions). He said that 1 million signatures are needed by April 1 in order to get the initiative on the November ballot and also said that three K-12 union organizations are in support of the initiative. Janet noted that faculty members are not allowed to solicit signatures on campus, while students may.

Various areas of concern about the initiative were identified, including

- a) the growth rates for community colleges would be based on changes in the adult population between 17 to 21 and 22 to 25 years of age, yet a high percentage of SRJC's students are older than 25;
- b) if the initiative were to be approved and the constitution changed, modification of any provisions would require an 80% vote of the legislature, which effectively means it wouldn't get changed;
- c) the proposed system, which establishes a new independent governing board, could potentially lead to the UC model wherein people have been offered money for not performing work — something that can't happen under the current community college system;
- d) the initiative may be unclear on the population of adults that community colleges would be paid to serve, as that population may be redefined based on employment status (growth rates increase if State unemployment rates increase);

- e) it's conceivable that the governor, who may not want community colleges to be separated from K-12, may have issued a tentative budget for next year that looks favorably on community colleges, with the intention of undercutting support for the initiative and making it difficult to acquire the necessary number of signatures. Since AFA and faculty members are being asked to contribute up front to fund this campaign, this matters.

It was suggested that AFA officers contact Rich Hansen, FACCC President, to see what the reasoning was behind the portion of the initiative that ties growth to the two select groups and to see if it's too late to modify it, as that portion may not be beneficial to this district. Courtenay asked Deborah to put all of the aforementioned concerns in writing and he volunteered to bring them up at the upcoming BFA meeting on Monday, January 30.

Janet reiterated that, at the October 2005 California Community College Independents (CCCI) meeting, AFA officers committed to an AFA contribution of \$2,100 (SRJC's share based on number of FTES), towards the cost for paid signature collectors. (CCCI would collect the contributions from its members and would then issue one check.) Janet asked for Council feedback about the proposed contribution, which would come from the AFA PAC. The consensus of the Council was that it could not support the initiative until the fiscal impact on SRJC is clarified: if SRJC's total growth calculation is going to be based on these two select groups (17 - 21 and 22-25), and the median age of our students is 25, meaning that half of SRJC's students are older than 25, the District could end up losing a lot of money. It was suggested that growth would be attached to the whole system, rather than to each individual district, and that SRJC's funding would not be lost unless the whole system loses funding. More information is needed. Discussion will continue at the next Council meeting, pending clarification from FACCC.

2. Assessment of Dues and Fees on Regular Faculty Overload. Council members reviewed a handout that included regular faculty overload gross earnings data for Spring 2005, Fall 2005 and Summer 2005, and they discussed three primary issues:
 - a) whether to assess dues and fees on regular faculty overload during the academic year (fall and spring semesters);
 - b) whether to assess dues and fees on regular faculty hourly assignments during the summer (currently, adjunct faculty pay dues or fees on summer earnings, but regular faculty do not); and
 - c) whether to increase the current dues and fees rate of 0.4% and, if so, by how much.

Discussion followed. One suggestion was to phase-in a dues and fees rate increase to 0.6% over a 3-4 year period of time. Another suggestion that was made, in the interest of equity, was to assess dues and fees on regular faculty summer earnings. An argument in favor of this idea was as follows: Within the academic year, regular faculty have a contract with the District and they cannot be more than 100% in terms of being a faculty member during those 177 days; however, regular faculty don't have that same contract during the summer. Their employment during the summer is subject to different terms — their assignments are treated and paid as adjunct/hourly assignments and, thus, regular faculty summer earnings should be treated the same way that adjunct faculty earnings are treated. Another approach to the summer issue that was suggested was to stop assessing dues and fees on adjunct faculty during the summer and to make up the difference by increasing the overall dues and fees rate on all faculty earnings during the academic year.

Another point of view was that dues and fees should be based on total gross earnings, regardless of full-time or part-time status. About 50% of regular faculty members are performing an overload during the academic year, which is not an insignificant number of faculty or amount of money.

A concern was expressed about the current cap on regular faculty dues during the academic year. It was noted that the organization seems to accept the disparity between regular faculty

members who are placed at D24 and pay more in dues/fees than those who are placed at A10. Why then place a cap on overload assignments? Every dollar that AFA does not collect on exempt (overload) earnings will be a fraction of a percent of an overall dues increase on all faculty, which means that the overall increase will be subsidizing the exemption that some faculty enjoy on their overload earnings. It was also suggested that, in the event that the Council decides to ask the membership for a dues increase, an *AFA Update* should be published to inform faculty about all the work that AFA does for them.

Discussion turned briefly to AFA's expenses. For the past two years, AFA has bargained away District-paid reassigned time in order to pay for adjunct medical benefits — something that the organization feels it no longer can afford to do. The District seems to be open to giving AFA more reassigned time. In addition, the officers have been looking at the amount of money spent on re-assigned time and stipends, and have recognized that the budget needs to be trimmed in those areas. The consensus seemed to be that the dues increase is necessary for the entire organization, whereas the other two issues are issues of equity.

Following the lengthy discussion, a straw vote of the 13 remaining voting Council members was taken on each of the three issues under discussion. The results were as follows: there was broad support (13) for a dues increase (3 in favor of .6%, 7 in favor of a phase-in to .6%). There was broad support (12) for treating all faculty who work during the summer alike. Many (7) were in favor of assessing regular faculty overloads. There was broad support (12) for having three different proposals on the ballot, not linked together: 1) dues increase, 2) regular faculty overload during the academic year, and 3) "summer equity." It was agreed that the officers would bring a proposal to the next Council meeting as an action item.

3. Increase in AFA Dues and Fees. Discussion of this item was included in Discussion Item #2.
4. Letter to FACCC re: Due Process Clause in Ed Code for Adjunct Faculty. This item was postponed until the February 8 Council meeting.
5. CPFA Proposal to Increase Adjunct Load Limit to 80%. This item was postponed until the February 8 Council meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Appointment of Sabbatical Leave Replacement for Cheryl Dunn on AFA PAC Board. By acclamation, the Council unanimously approved a motion to appoint Janet to the AFA PAC Board as a Sabbatical Leave replacement for Cheryl Dunn (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
2. Set Date for Spring 2006 AFA Executive Council Retreat. Following brief discussion about several alternative dates, the Council unanimously settled on Sunday afternoon, March 19 for the Spring 2006 retreat (time and location to be determined). Lunch will be provided.

MAIN REPORTS

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.