

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

August 29, 2007

(Approved by the Executive Council on September 12, 2007)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

*Janet McCulloch, presiding	*John Daly	*Joyce Johnson	*Mike Starkey
*Alix Alixopoulos	*Cheryl Dunn	*Michael Kaufmann	*Linda Weiss
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Peggy Goebel	*Reneé Lo Pilato	Lynda Williams
*Paula Burks	*Johanna James	*Andrea Proehl	<i>Vacancy - Sab Lv F07</i>

Also present: AFA Officers and Negotiations Team Members: Ann Herbst, Warren Ruud, Deborah Sweitzer; AFA Office Staff: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell.

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

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Additional Steps for Hourly Salary Schedules. Lara Branen-Ahumada said that she would like to start bringing to the table some conversation about adding more steps above Step 9 to the hourly assignment salary schedules. Members of the Negotiations Team noted that AFA has raised the issue in the past, and the District response has been negative — they refer to the fact that most community colleges only have four steps; however, that fact doesn't mean that AFA can't persist in trying to negotiate more steps. Adjunct faculty members perform two-thirds of the work done on Step 9 (although it's not clear how many of the adjunct are "emeritus" faculty). Remaining at Step 9 does depress retirement income for adjunct faculty. It was clarified that contract faculty who retire and return to teach as adjuncts maintain their same, original date of hire, unless there is a break in service of more than two semesters.
2. "Enhanced" Enhanced Hourly Salary Schedules? Janet reported that she had a conversation with an adjunct faculty member teaching non-credit classes who had a question about the salary schedules included with the Tentative Agreement. Janet clarified for her that the hourly salary schedules posted on the AFA Web site and distributed to members with the ballot did not reflect any extra pay for those non-credit courses that might qualify for the "special enhanced" funding from the State. Janet noted that AFA should come up with another term besides "enhanced" to identify those special courses in order to avoid confusion between the "enhanced" lecture, lab and non-credit hourly assignment rates that are currently in use and the new special "enhanced" non-credit rates.

MINUTES

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes from the May 9, May 16, May 23, June 28 and August 17, 2007 Executive Council meetings or to the minutes from the May 16, 2007 General Meeting. All were accepted as written.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Appointment of AFA Representatives to District-wide Committees for 2007-08. Following a motion made by Lara Branen-Ahumada and seconded by Joyce Johnson, the Council unanimously approved the following appointments (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions):
 - Budget Advisory: Deborah Sweitzer, Ted Crowell
 - Calendar/Registration: Deborah Sweitzer
 - District Tenure Review & Evaluations: Deborah Sweitzer, Ted Crowell
 - District-wide Fringe Benefits: Janet McCulloch, Johanna James, Paula Burks, John Daly, Steven Oppenheim
 - District Online: Alix Alixopulos
 - Hate-Free Campus: Michael Kaufmann
 - Parking and Transportation: Alix Alixopulos
 - Professional Development: René Lo Pilato, Lynn Harenberg-Miller
 - Professional Growth Increments: Cheryl Dunn
 - Sabbatical Leaves: Xuan Ho
 - Staff Diversity: Joyce Johnson

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Establish Date for Fall 2007 Council Retreat. Deborah Sweitzer said that both AFA and the District will need to “sunshine” issues that they are interested in discussing with each other before negotiations can begin. Both “sunshine” lists are slated to appear on the October Board of Trustees meeting agenda. The Council will need to talk about priorities for negotiations before the October Board meeting — two dates in September were put forward as possibilities for the Fall retreat. Following brief discussion, the Council agreed to hold the Fall 2007 retreat on Sunday, September 30, from 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., at the Vista del Lago Clubhouse in Santa Rosa. Set up will start at 11:30 a.m. and lunch will be served.
2. Location Coordinators. Deborah Sweitzer said that “Location Coordinator” is a classification of employees that doesn’t currently exist officially, even though people are being asked to do that job. AFA’s concern is that people don’t work for free and that if, in fact, there is an expectation of job performance, that the job duties be clearly identified, consistently applied throughout all disciplines and departments, and clearly communicated to all. There has been a habit of referring to a person in Petaluma who performs the function of a Location Coordinator as an “anchor person,” with the expectation that s/he would provide the coordination necessary for department activity between Santa Rosa and Petaluma. Janet McCulloch added that, prior to the budget crisis when a great deal of reassigned time was eliminated, some “anchor” faculty were compensated with reassigned time while others were not. In addition, some adjunct faculty are being asked by both department chairs and Petaluma administrators to take on coordination duties without additional pay. These are working conditions and compensation issues — people are working, they don’t know what their jobs are (the coordination work did not appear in the job description when they were hired), and they don’t get paid for their work. To add to the confusion, it was noted that there

are administrators, whose job is to coordinate facilities and equipment needs at off-campus locations, such as Sonoma and Healdsburg, but they do not interface with departments.

Several years ago Kris Abrahamson put together an overview of coordinators receiving reassigned time. The overview revealed that the majority of paid coordinators are in the Health Sciences department, perhaps due to the fact that having people serve in that capacity is mandated by their accrediting bodies. Deborah also reported that a sub-committee of department chairs has started meeting to talk about the role of coordinators and the role of department chairs. No consensus has been reached yet. Deborah also said that the current formula for department chair reassigned time does not recognize in any way that it may take more time if a chair is dealing with more than one location and/or more than one dean.

Lengthy discussion followed and included these comments: 1) faculty in some departments are being called “advocates” and are being asked to run meetings, and do all of the scheduling and coordination for their discipline, in the spirit of collegiality without getting paid; 2) department chairs are already given release time to do scheduling and coordination, and it’s not supposed to be location specific; 3) extraordinary circumstances, such as when a chair has to evaluate many adjunct faculty in one semester in more than one location, can create additional problems; 4) it’s up to the Petaluma Faculty Forum and the Department Chair Council to work out the job descriptions, not AFA; 5) the current formula for department chair reassigned time is archaic and should be thrown out and revamped; 6) when department chairs have to coordinate with coordinators, it doesn’t subtract from their load, it adds to their load, especially if the coordinator is not particularly competent; 7) in one department, faculty pitch in to help out with certain aspects of the chair’s load, which results in scheduling coordinators, hiring coordinators, course coordinators, on-line coordinators, workload coordinators – these administrative duties should be compensated in some way other than through CS&PS&D; 8) AFA’s challenge is to build a case that the District has to come up with more money, rather than taking money away from chairs, and, in order to build a case, AFA needs more information about what coordinators are doing; and 9) there are plans to hold a meeting of location and program coordinators in the near future.

3. Linkage between Budget Development and Program Review. This item was postponed until the next meeting, when it is anticipated that Kris Abrahamson will be available to make a presentation to the Council on this topic.
4. What Does College Service and Professional Service & Development Mean? Council members reviewed excerpts from Article 17, which includes a definition and some specific examples of College Service and Professional Service & Development (CS&PS&D) activities, but at the same time includes some very vague language. Janet McCulloch noted that, while many full-time faculty members are not putting in their five hours a week, on the opposite end others are encountering difficulty with the task of documenting their numerous professional growth activities.

Deborah Sweitzer added that the principle that was at work when the original faculty job description was formalized was that CS&PS&D activities were intended to be self-determined activities chosen by and at the discretion of the individual. That principle, however, has become somewhat eroded over the years. There is currently no mechanism for recognizing when faculty put in more than five hours a week, and the only mechanism for

commenting on how well someone is doing is in the evaluation process, which many people do not use. When the department chair writes that part of the evaluation, it's completely subjective — there's no objective measure. Most faculty members are opposed to the idea of a "time clock" mentality, so the question becomes how to deal with this issue fairly.

As the Conciliation/ Grievance Officer, Ann Herbst commented that she sees this issue cropping up most often in the evaluation process. She would argue that AFA look at the issue in the framework of making the reporting easier. Ann recommended that those who are putting in more than their five hours a week be rewarded (e.g., members of the Curriculum and Accreditation Committees, and those performing unpaid coordination duties). As AFA representative to the Professional Growth Increments (PGI) Committee, Cheryl Dunn added that one of the biggest sticking points requiring clarification is in the arena of curriculum development – when is it part of the job description and when is it considered to be a PGI activity? Janet noted that AFA has an opportunity to define in the Contract what is over and above normal updating of curriculum. In large departments, the task of updating curriculum every four years gets spread around to many different faculty members. In smaller departments with fewer faculty members, it's disproportionately difficult to revise an entire program to create a major. In response to Janet's call for those interested in serving on a sub-committee that would look at what might be done to better define these activities without forcing people to punch a time-clock and prove every detail, Cheryl Dunn and Lara Branen-Ahumada volunteered. Cheryl will also ask Anne O'Donnell, who serves on the PGI Committee, if she would be interested.

There are currently very limited departmental activity funds to pay adjunct faculty to revise curriculum (that activity does not qualify for funding through the Adjunct Faculty District Activity Fund, since it's specific to an individual department). Deborah Sweitzer recommended that, prior to starting any work, an adjunct could submit a proposal to his or her department chair, stating that the department needs the work to be done, that it's clearly above and beyond what adjunct are paid for, and requesting that the chair seek access to funds from the assistant dean. Janet added that there is a small amount of money available through the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs to pay faculty to develop online courses. There may also be Workforce preparation/VTEA funds available for updating curriculum that is vocational in nature. It was pointed out that, in some departments, adjunct faculty teaching certain courses are often the only ones qualified to revise the curriculum for those courses, and it doesn't work to have regular faculty doing that job. Janet noted that there is a new Dean, Abe Farkas, whose job it is to focus on evaluations, curriculum review and other compliance issues that require reporting to the State.

MAIN REPORTS

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.