

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION  
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES**

April 12, 2006

*(Approved by the Executive Council 5/10/06)*

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, Phil Forester, Michael Kaufmann, Bob Rubin, Judith Bernstein.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

**MEMBER CONCERNS**

1. Workload for Lab Instructors. Bob Rubin, regular faculty member in the Life Sciences department for more than 30 years, appeared before the Council on behalf of Chemistry, Biology, Physics, Engineering, Geology and Environmental Science instructors to present a discussion item in hopes that the Council would give it some consideration. (Council members were given a document signed by faculty members from these departments for review.) While expressing appreciation to the Council for the work that they have done on behalf of faculty, and acknowledging the challenges faced by AFA in balancing the various needs of all of the faculty that they represent, Bob said that science department faculty feel that the lab load factor —  $2/3$  of the lecture load factor — is inequitable. He explained that, early in the history of universities, faculty charged with preparing people to teach were given two hours of compensation for every three hours that their graduate students taught for free. Even though this practice is no longer applicable, it has been retained for a long time for a variety of different reasons. With regards to the present context, teaching science labs now involves instruction in technology and a wide variety of instruments. A number of institutions throughout the State have rectified the situation (Solano, Napa and Saddleback now have a 1:1 ratio), and science department faculty members are requesting that AFA address the issue as well.

Janet said that a plan with many specific ideas was generated during the two-year Workload Study that AFA negotiated with the District. In that study, various types of labs were identified — preparation-intensive, assessment-intensive, a combination of both, and “babysitting” labs. AFA developed a compensation plan for lab instructors based upon the type of lab that they teach. Janet said that the Negotiating Team would continue to present that case to the District in the hope that progress could be made in that area as monies become available. Brief discussion followed about the recent increase in lecture and lab class sizes in science courses, and the new Memorandum of Understanding regarding intermediate lecture load.

1. Loading of 770 Courses. Ann relayed a member concern from a department chair who had a question about 770 courses. Outlines for those courses will need to be changed as a result of a new State law, the courses will need to have an instructor of record, and the question is whether or not instruction of that course will be loaded. Ann said that the chair who contacted her was told that the courses are being assigned to instructors without pay. Janet said that a 770 course cannot be run without an instructor and it should be loaded. She recommended that the chair contact either Terri Frongia or herself.

1. Efficiency. Greg asked whether AFA as an organization is planning to address the issue of efficiency, which was brought up at the recent Vice Presidents' Forum. He said that \$1 million a year could be saved if one more student was retained in each class. Adding that SRJC is in a budgetary crisis for the summer, he said that faculty in all departments need to become more creative and enter into the "partnership" with the District, to avoid what has happened at College of Marin (once the enrollment declines, it's almost impossible to recover).

In follow-up discussion, it was noted that AFA is focusing on this issue and that it is tied to workload in the current Tentative Agreement. One recommendation was that AFA take on the role of educating faculty about the choices that they are going to have to help grow the enrollment and about the consequences of not succeeding in this endeavor. Unless faculty come to understand that salary increases and the return of reader money are tied to their efforts, they will be surprised when raises are not a matter of course. Several Council members suggested that there is a resistance amongst faculty to focus on this issue, and many do not understand the need. It was pointed out that the number of high school students entering SRJC is decreasing and, therefore, faculty need to work on retaining the students that we have. Janet noted that the Work Experience department has done an amazing job in the last year of increasing the number of FTES with very little effort. It was also suggested that enrollment growth could come from other sources; for example, 28,000 students have come through non-credit programs in the last three to four years and have transitioned to credit courses.

1. Academic Affairs Reorganization. Michael L. said that several faculty members have approached him with concerns about the reorganization. (See Discussion Item #2.)
1. Moving and Impact on Class Size. Michael L. reported that the Political Science department would be moving from Emeritus Hall to Barnett Hall at some point in the future. Questions about workload issues have been raised, given the possibility that the larger rooms in Barnett might cause an increase in class sizes (from the current maximum of 35 students to 50 or more). He said that the department would like to have reader money in exchange for a workload adjustment, if they are not able to maintain the 35-student maximum per class. Both Janet and Phil noted that the Vice President of Academic Affairs has made it clear that she is interested in reestablishing and regularizing class sizes, for the campus as a whole, based on pedagogy, not on room size. Under the current Contract, simply moving to another building does not mean increased class sizes.
1. SEIU Negotiations via E-Mail. John expressed concern about classified staff conducting negotiations about benefits via e-mail. He said that each bargaining unit should be negotiating separately with the District in closed session, and that it's inappropriate and a breach of confidentiality to discuss negotiations issues outside of that forum. Janet agreed to remind classified/SEIU representatives about these issues at the District-wide Fringe Benefits Committee meeting on Thursday, April 14.

### **MINUTES**

There were no additions or corrections to the March 22, 2006 Executive Council meeting minutes, which were unanimously approved as written.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Composition of AFA Negotiations Team. Discussion of this item had been tabled at the March 22, 2006 Council meeting. Deborah reported that, after reviewing the alternatives, the AFA Negotiations Team recommends a six-person team as the format that would be the most effective. There would be six people with six different sets of responsibilities (no one person would fill more than one position), a minimum of two adjunct faculty members would be required to be on the team, and a minimum of three people would be required to be present at the table in any negotiations session with the District. The team would decide at any given time

which team members would be present at the table, in addition to the three required. Deborah's stated preference was that the person elected to be the Note Taker would understand that that job would be part of his/her responsibility and that s/he would be going to every meeting, unless there was a good reason why s/he couldn't attend. Following the discussion, the Council approved a motion that there be a six-person negotiating team, with at least two adjunct faculty members on the team, and no fewer than three team members present at the table with the District (13 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions).

1. AFA Reassigned Time Proposal for 2006-07. Council members reviewed the officers' proposal. Brief discussion followed about the District's contribution towards AFA reassigned time (projected to be 1.2 FTE, contingent upon receiving sufficient funding from the State) and the impact, if any, if the AFA membership rejects the proposed dues increase (the level of additional reassigned time purchased from the District has been reduced from the prior year). The Council unanimously approved a motion to accept the officers' proposal for reassigned time and stipend as written (14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (See attached.)
1. Reassigned Time Options for AFA Officers and Other Positions. For budgeting purposes and in the interest of keeping costs down, the AFA officers proposed that only adjunct faculty elected or appointed to positions be eligible for stipends, and that any elected or appointed regular faculty be paid through reassigned time. It was suggested that, occasionally, there might be good reasons why a faculty member would want to be paid a certain way and that the preference should be clarified after the election/appointment. The benefits of reassigned time for adjunct faculty (increase in retirement credit and load towards eligibility for medical benefits) were also pointed out. Johanna noted that the officers' proposal for reassigned time and stipends for 2006-07 reflected a monitoring of hours for the various positions and that projected percentages had been adjusted up or down accordingly. In addition, the officers created a new position that reflects the time commitment needed for the AFA representative who would be attending Bay Faculty Association meetings. Following the discussion, the Council approved a motion that reassigned time be granted to regular faculty and adjunct faculty who would not exceed a 60% load when serving as an AFA officer and/or other position, and that stipends be paid to adjunct faculty who would exceed a 60% load when serving as an AFA officer and/or other position (13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention).
1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment re: Dues Increase. The AFA officers recommended that the proposed Constitutional amendment ballot, which would request AFA membership approval of an increase in AFA dues to 0.55% on all earnings, be sent out at the same time as the ballot requesting ratification of the Tentative Agreement. Discussion followed about: 1) the timelines for ballot approval (no differences between the two items); 2) the format of the ballot (if legally permissible, it would be preferable to combine the two on one page with two different attachments); and 3) the information presented in the ballot attachment (showing the changes in the wording — before and after — of that section of the Constitution), providing the rationale (increased costs of running the organization, supporting the Adjunct Medical Benefits Program, and supporting the Community College Initiative) and presenting examples of the effect of the dues increase on an average salary (including also the proposed salary increase). The Council then unanimously approved a motion to send out the proposed AFA Constitutional amendment ballot re: the dues increase at the same time as the Tentative Agreement ballot (14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention).

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. Proposed District Policy and Procedures 3.24: Online Education. Janet reported that College Council is discussing this draft, which Dianne Smith developed from the recommendations of the Online Task Force. Janet said, that, although parts of the document might become Board policy, most of it more appropriately should be negotiated and become part of the Contract. It was pointed out that at least six of the ten faculty members named as members of the Online

Task Force did not participate in the process of drafting the recommendations nor do they endorse them. Council members briefly discussed possible approaches to issues such as class size, office hours, College Service expectations for Regular faculty, and evaluations. Following the discussion, the Negotiations Team was assigned the task of evaluating the document and reporting back to the Council.

2. **Contractual Implications of Academic Affairs Reorganization.** Janet said that the three major areas of concern to AFA are Article 16, FSA's and Department Chairs. Lengthy discussion followed and included these concerns: 1) the process was not inclusive —neither AFA nor the Chairs were consulted; 2) many chairs and coordinators are dissatisfied and concerned about workload issues; 3) the July 1 deadline is problematic — there isn't enough time to identify all of the contractual issues involved, revise the list of FSA's, resolve the department chair and coordinator issues, and resolve the issues that may result from the combination of date of hire lists; 4) there may be problematic load issues facing faculty who have previously taught in separate departments that have now become blended; 5) although Mary Kay Rudolph told the Department Chair Council that she would modify both the timeline and the proposal if chairs could show her how students would be negatively affected, an equally important criteria is the negative impact on faculty workload; 6) many faculty have pedagogical and philosophical concerns about some of the groupings of different departments and programs in new clusters (it was pointed out, however, that these are Senate issues); 7) there may be some positive effects of the reorganization in that there have been some major holes in the administration and things were not being addressed; and 8) the District has the right to reorganize and there are some changes that could be made by July 1; however, it would be better to have a longer term implementation date of July 1, 2007. Following the discussion, Janet agreed to draft a memo as a follow-up to the recent *AFA Update*, for review by the officers and Deborah, letting Mary Kay Rudolph know that, although the Council is appreciative of her efforts, AFA sees many difficulties in implementing this proposal and has grave concerns that need to be resolved — and July 1, 2006 does not leave enough time to resolve all of the issues.
3. **Revision of Bylaws re: Elections Timeline.** Due to time constraints, discussion of this item was postponed until the next Council meeting.

### MAIN REPORTS

1. **President's Report.**
  - **Retirement Event.** Janet announced that, in honor of Phil Forester on the occasion of his retirement, a musical event is being planned for May 19 in Newman Auditorium from 3 to 5 p.m., and she asked Council members to save that date. Both English department faculty and AFA Council members will be asked to participate in the musical presentation.
  - **Adjunct Medical Benefits Presentation.** Janet reported that Michael Kaufmann and four faculty members made a "spot on" presentation regarding adjunct medical benefits to the Board of Trustees at the April 11 meeting.
  - **Board Approves Tentative Agreement.** Janet reported that the Board of Trustees approved the Tentative Agreement at the April 11 meeting. The *AFA Update* announcing the Tentative Agreement has been published and distributed to faculty boxes. Ballots will be sent out after the AFA General Meeting on April 26. They will be due back on May 9<sup>th</sup> and will be counted on May 10<sup>th</sup>.
2. **Conciliation/Grievance Report.** This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.