

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION  
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES**

February 22, 2006

*(Approved by the Executive Council 3/8/06)*

Executive Council members present (noted by \*):

* Janet McCulloch, <i>presiding</i>	* 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, Will Baty, Phil Forester, Linda Frank, Michael Kaufmann, Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell.

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

**MEMBER CONCERNS**

1. Adjunct PDA Workshop and Substitutes. Michael reported that the Adjunct PDA Workshop went well; there was good attendance and discussion. One issue in particular, payment of substitutes, generated a lot of discussion. Many people are not getting paid for the substituting work that they actually perform. He suggested that AFA pursue written clarification, so that chairs are better informed. Janet added that some deans also have incorrect information. Janet and Johanna agreed to take this issue up in their upcoming monthly meeting with Dr. Agrella.
2. Parking. Janet reported that she was contacted by a faculty member in the Trade Technology department, who was distressed about getting ticketed for parking inside the gated area by Lounibos Hall without a permit. She said that AFA is looking into the issue. It is a Council member's understanding that almost all of the faculty and staff in that area regularly purchase parking permits. Janet said that the topic of free parking for faculty also came up at the Adjunct PDA Workshop. She suggested that AFA might consider negotiating free parking at some point in the future (after the construction of the parking garage is complete). Deborah noted that there was a great deal of discussion about parking fees in the early days of AFA. Since students had to pay for parking and faculty had guaranteed spaces, there was mutual agreement that faculty would pay the same as students.
3. Intermediate Lecture Loads. Janet spoke briefly about a proposed pilot project to compensate instructors for teaching intermediate lecture loads. This item will be placed on the next meeting agenda.

**PRESENTATION: NEW LIBRARY**

Will Baty, Dean of Learning Resources and Educational Technology, and Linda Frank, Executive Director of the SRJC Foundation, appeared before the Council to talk about the new library and the Foundation's newly established Frank P. Doyle Library Endowment Fund. The goal is to raise \$2 million, which will be used exclusively to support the purchase of books, journals, periodicals, media and on-line databases. This endowment fund is independent of the State budget process.

Will Baty said that construction is currently three weeks behind schedule, but still under budget. The library, occupying three floors, and the Art Gallery, Tutorial Center, CATE, Academic Computing, and Media Services, will all be housed here. The building was designed with the idea that teaching and learning are the fundamental focus. Green/sustainable materials are being used wherever possible.

Linda Frank said that the Foundation has engaged in a strategic planning process and is a partner in raising funds for a permanent endowment for the library. All contributions will go into the endowment and \$80,000 per year will be used exclusively for the new library. Each year, the needs will be reviewed and funding revised accordingly. The Foundation is in the middle of a business campaign, and they have already received donations from Coddling Enterprises and Exchange Bank. Prospective donors are being given tours. There will be donor wall displays on the second floor for those contributing \$1,000 or more and, for \$10,000, someone can sponsor a room or classroom. Linda distributed Voluntary Payroll Deduction Authorization forms and pledge forms, noting that pledges can also be made via e-mail. She also spoke briefly about the recent news that the Foundation is one of the beneficiaries of the \$9 million Lafferty estate. They have already received \$672 million and will receive another \$100,000 soon, making it the largest donation in the history of the Foundation (established 1969).

A tentative date of March 22 at 3:00 pm was set for a Council tour of the new library. Janet suggested that, in addition to making individual donations on their own, the Council might wish to consider a donation from the organization as a whole.

## MINUTES

There were no additions or corrections to the February 8, 2006 Executive Council meeting minutes, which were unanimously approved as written.

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. CPFA Proposal to Increase Adjunct Load Limit to 80%. Janet summarized the proposal, which would change every reference to a limitation on adjunct load in the Ed Code from 60% to 80%. She also said that the people who are bringing the proposal forward are clear that it's a matter of convenience — they want to work more than 100% and would prefer to work in two districts rather than three. Lengthy Council discussion included the following comments: 1) the proposal would create a two-tier system, a second-class citizenry and another group of disadvantaged people, because the 80% adjuncts would not get benefits or an improved rate of pro-rata pay; 2) there's a potential for abuse in that there would be no incentive in some small programs to ever hire a full-timer, and the 80% adjunct would feel compelled to do unpaid work for the success of their program; also, regular faculty, chairs and deans would have different expectations of 80% adjunct faculty than they do of other adjunct faculty; 3) on the other hand, adjunct faculty, who contribute a great deal to the college community, may never get a full-time job, and they deserve to be able to make a living; 4) 80% adjuncts would also be in a stronger position to fight for pro-rata pay than 60% adjuncts; 5) some adjuncts would have a better opportunity to earn more money, while other adjuncts might lose their assignments — but instead of perpetuating a system that doesn't provide benefits and pays people a lower rate of pay for equal work, we should be fighting for equity and enforcement of the 75/25 ratio; and 6) this proposal may be enormously divisive and could result in people in the adjunct pool fighting against each other for classes. It was suggested that AFA send a letter to CCCI, to FACCCC and to members of the Higher Education Committee in Sacramento. It was also suggested that, prior to sending the letters, AFA should do a survey of adjunct faculty to see how they feel about the proposal. Ultimately, it was agreed that adjunct faculty need to be educated about the issue and that presenting two opposing views in an *AFA Dialogue* would be a good way to start. Michael K. and Alix each agreed to write an article expressing their viewpoints within the next two weeks.

2. Letter to FACCC re: Due Process Clause in Ed Code for Adjunct Faculty. Council members reviewed the draft letter. Discussion included the following comments: 1) the idea of due process for adjunct faculty is important; however, appending the suggested language to a section of the Ed Code is problematic; the additional clause doesn't include the recognition that adjunct faculty, due to the temporary nature of their assignment, can lose their jobs for other reasons (e.g., due to low or no enrollment, or a regular faculty member's need to fulfill his/her 100% load); it might be better to place the language closer to the section that talks about the temporary nature of the assignment; 2) legally, there is no adjunct contract — the District can still dismiss the adjunct faculty member at the end of the semester without any reason (just like any employer in the country can dismiss an employee if s/he doesn't have a contract); if the reason for dismissal is really egregious, students might end up bearing the brunt of someone who shouldn't be teaching; 3) it affects the mood of what a professional teacher does, if adjunct faculty can be terminated at the whim of management; some protection for the adjunct and process that allows for judicial review should be provided. It was suggested that AFA negotiate with the District to insert a due process clause into Article 16. (Although the Ed Code is a law unto itself and "trumps" the Contract, the District would feel pressured to abide by such a clause because they would have agreed to it in negotiations.) If the District agrees, then later on AFA could suggest the language to other districts and to the state level. Other suggestions included recommending to the District that they insert a due process clause for all SRJC employees into Board policy; sending AFA's language to FACCC to use as a model for modifying existing Ed Code language (so that all adjunct faculty across the State could benefit from this protection); or sending a letter to FACCC expressing a broader concern about the lack of a due process clause in the Ed Code. It was agreed that, in the next round of negotiations, the AFA Negotiations Team would seek to negotiate a due process clause into Article 16 that speaks to the above concerns.
3. Increase in AFA Dues and Fees, and/or Assessment of Dues and Fees on Regular Faculty Hourly Assignments. The Council unanimously approved a motion to move this item to the action agenda (11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Increase in AFA Dues and Fees, and/or Assessment of Dues and Fees on Regular Faculty Hourly Assignments. Ann presented the AFA officers' recommendation to increase the dues and fees to 0.55% on all gross faculty earnings (see attached document). The increase to 0.55% would generate close to the targeted amount of \$227,000 (AFA's current annual expenses).

Ann noted that she personally supports this recommendation for two reasons: 1) the Council is in agreement that adjunct and regular faculty should not be treated differently in terms of their summer earnings; and 2) by assessing dues and fees on all faculty earnings, it enables AFA to only increase the rate to 0.55% rather than 0.6%. Deborah pointed out that the last two years have been anomalous budget years for AFA, in that funds have been taken from the operating budget to pay for adjunct medical benefits, and that AFA's operating budget would likely be less than \$227,000 in the future. Janet noted that, after two years of operating in the red, there is a need to replenish AFA's savings account. Following the discussion, the Council approved a motion that dues and fees be increased to 0.55% of all gross faculty earnings (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention). Janet said that the AFA officers would be bringing a recommendation back to the Council regarding timelines and publicity for the constitutional amendment ballot that will be sent to all AFA members.

### MAIN REPORTS

1. President's Report. Janet reported that, at their meeting earlier this afternoon, the Calendar Committee came to a consensus about the following new procedure that will go into effect for the development of the 2007-08 and 2008-09 academic calendars: 1) the Calendar Committee will prepare, at their discretion, as many as three options; 2) they will present these options with recommendations to AFA; 3) AFA will publish the options and explain them to faculty; 4) the AFA Executive Council, the Academic Senate, the Student Senate, the Classified Senate, and College Council will have an opportunity to review and comment on the options; and 5) AFA will gather all of the feedback from all of the constituent groups and will take it to the negotiating table, in accordance with the Contract. Janet noted that the Calendar Committee decided never to repeat this year's PDA schedule (one day in the fall and three days in the spring). There will be two days in the fall and two days in the spring, mandatory days will not be scheduled during the semester, and the Committee is talking about where to put Lincoln's and Washington's birthday holidays. Although Santa Rosa City Schools' plan to change their start date and the placement of Spring Break is on hold, other school districts around Sonoma County are trying to mirror what SRCS was trying to do. In response to Janet's request for feedback regarding the placement of Spring Break, Council members expressed the following preferences: 1) schedule the break at the same time each spring (third week in March was mentioned several times) and separate it from the religious holiday; and 2) schedule a break sometime in October, perhaps after 8 weeks. Janet will discuss the Council's feedback with Diane Traversi, Admissions and Enrollment Supervisor.
2. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.
3. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

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

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.