

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

November 28, 2007

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

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

*Janet McCulloch	John Daly	*Joyce Johnson	*Andrea Proehl
*Alix Alixopoulos	*Cheryl Dunn, presiding	*Michael Kaufmann	*Mike Starkey
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	Peggy Goebel	Reneé Lo Pilato	*Linda Weiss
*Paula Burks	*Johanna James	*Michael Meese	<i>Vacancy Fall 2007</i>

Also present: AFA Officers & Negotiators: Warren Ruud, Deborah Sweitzer;
AFA Office Staff: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell.

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Final Exams in P.E. Courses. Lara Branen-Ahumada reported that the chair of the P.E., Dance & Athletics department recently sent out an e-mail informing faculty about a new requirement, effective with the Spring 2008 semester, that final exams be held during finals week, rather than during the last week of the course as had been the practice. Lara expressed some concerns and requested clarification. She said that assignments for the spring have already been scheduled and the increased load associated with holding that additional class would cause many adjunct faculty to exceed 60%, which is not permitted. It would mean that they wouldn't be able to teach as many courses in a semester, which would reduce their load and their pay. Deborah Sweitzer explained that there are four different types of assignments (allied, lecture, lab, and non-credit). Each type has a different load factor and a different number of hours of scheduled instruction that constitutes a full-time equivalent load. To calculate the total load for a course, you multiply the hourly load factor by the number of hours the class meets per week by the number of weeks that the class meets during the semester. A full semester-length course is scheduled for 17.5 weeks. Effective Spring 2008, any course that is scheduled for fewer than 17.5 weeks will be considered to be a short course. (Short courses use positive attendance documentation instead of rosters.) Adjunct instructional faculty, whose pay is based on the number of hours of instruction performed, will get paid more for holding that additional class meeting during final exam week. It was pointed out that, whether you're adding one more session to a class or adding a certain number of minutes to every class session, one particular problem may be remedied but certain other problems related to load may be raised.
2. Computation of Sick Leave Hours. Joyce Johnson requested clarification with regard to how the deduction of sick leave hours is calculated. Both Deborah Sweitzer and Johanna James contributed to the following explanation. The assumption is that, regardless of their specific schedules, full-time regular faculty work (and get paid for)

40 hours per week, averaging eight hours a day for five days; therefore, if one is absent in any given work day from all of one's assigned duties (which, in addition to scheduled instructional or allied student contact, includes preparation and assessment, student consultation/office hours, and College Service and Professional Service & Development), then eight hours of sick leave will be deducted. If a regular faculty member is absent for only a portion of his or her assigned duties for that day (e.g., only misses the in-class time for one out of three scheduled classes), then that information should specifically be noted on the *Notice of Absence* form so that only the hours missed would be deducted. The sick leave deduction for adjunct faculty is calculated differently, since the pay for student contact, preparation and assessment, and student consultation/office hours is already incorporated into the hourly pay rates (and adjunct are not paid for College Service and Professional Service & Development); therefore, it is only the number of hours of in-class time missed by the adjunct faculty member that is deducted from sick leave.

MINUTES

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes from the November 14, 2007 Executive Council meeting, which were accepted as written.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. AFA Interests in Process for Transfer to Other Campuses and/or Sites. Deborah Sweitzer introduced the topic by saying that the transfer process between sites within the District was placed on the 2007-08 Sunshine List for negotiations. The AFA Negotiations Team began discussions with the District during the 2006-07 negotiations. She said that, although the District has the right to make assignments, AFA has an interest in how transfers are handled. Once an individual is hired, how are changes made? Can the individual initiate the change or does the District initiate it? Should there be a trial basis, in case things don't work out? AFA has an interest in having a clear, fair and open process, with written guidelines so that everyone knows what the terms of reference are and how those terms might apply to them. Since departments operate throughout the entire district, AFA also has an interest in maintaining the idea of a one-department, one-college district, regardless of how many different sites there are. AFA also has an interest in promoting and maintaining the same curriculum and schedule development protocol district-wide. Faculty members have an affiliation with a department and their colleagues in that department, regardless of where they perform their assignment. Deborah noted that AFA has no problem with sites developing their own structure, as long as the one-college, one-department idea is reflected in that structure. With the same principle in mind, AFA supports the rights of individual departments to develop policies regarding how they assign faculty to other sites.

Cheryl Dunn told the Council that a discussion of this topic would be held at the December 4 meeting of the Petaluma Faculty Forum (PFF), and that she would bring that input back to the next Council meeting. She said that regular faculty who are based in Petaluma strongly identify with the Petaluma campus, generally more so than with their own individual departments. They have no objection to having a rotational process for people who want to come there; however, because there are so few of them,

they feel strongly that having a stable, core group of committed regular faculty members whose main position is in Petaluma is very important.

Lengthy discussion ensued and the following issues were raised: 1) How do you get faculty to volunteer to go to Petaluma when they don't want to? 2) Is the department primary and the location secondary or vice versa? 3) What if the needs of the department in Santa Rosa conflict with the needs in Petaluma? 4) Who should be taking the primary role in developing the schedule of courses in Petaluma — the administration or the departments? 5) Who should Petaluma faculty approach when they have budget needs — their departments or the Petaluma deans? 6) How does the difference in administrative structure (deans by program/discipline versus by location) contribute to the difficulty in sorting through these issues? 7) Did the elimination of Petaluma coordinators, who helped to determine what kinds of courses to offer in the various disciplines, exacerbate the problem? 8) Should department chairs based in Santa Rosa be required to regularly meet with their Petaluma faculty? 9) Should a transfer policy be modeled on the Article 16 Hourly Assignment Procedures, with specific criteria to be met and guidelines to follow? 10) As the District increases the offerings of non-traditional schedules, won't some of these same issues apply (e.g., getting people to volunteer to teach night-time classes when they'd rather teach daytime classes, or weekend instead of weekday classes)? It was agreed that the discussion of this topic would continue at the next Council meeting, when Cheryl will report back with comments from the PFF meeting.

2. Proposition 92. Cheryl Dunn informed the Council that there would be an informational presentation about Prop. 92 on Wednesday, December 12, during the last Council meeting of the fall semester. AFA plans to invite administrators and Board members, as well as faculty from nearby community colleges. Warren Ruud passed along information that he learned at the November Bay Faculty Association meeting. The Prop. 92 campaign is gearing up to get out the vote after the holidays. There will be a big media push during the week of January 14 – 18, and a widespread effort will be made to register students to vote. There have been a number of significant setbacks as some organizations have declared their opposition to the proposition. The California Teachers Association, the San Francisco Democratic Party, the State Taxpayers Association, the Howard Jarvis organization, and the statewide League of Women Voters all have come out against the proposition; however, the San Francisco United Educators, and some locals and individual CTA groups have come out in support. Warren noted that contributing to the campaign is a good investment because, for every dollar that is spent, it would be returned three-fold to the community colleges if the proposition passes. He said that, when polled without any mention of Prop. 92, people say they are in favor of supporting community colleges, but the message needs to get out to as many people as possible if there is any chance of Prop. 92 passing. SRJC Faculty can still send their donations to Candy Shell in the AFA office, who will forward them to the statewide campaign office.
3. College Council Revisions to District Policy and Procedures Manual. Several pages of charts displaying either clerical changes or no changes to Chapters 2, 3 and 4 were circulated for Council review.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President's Report. Janet McCulloch gave brief reports about the following items:
 - Institutional Planning Council (IPC). At the last IPC meeting, committee members reworked a Program and Resource Planning Process (PRPP) document and reexamined the definition and role of IPC.
 - Board of Trustees. The District is still in negotiations to purchase a building across the street from the College on Mendocino Avenue to expand the Culinary program.
 - College Council. Dianne Smith is processing the "housekeeping" changes to the District Policy and Procedures Manual in layers and presenting sections to the Board of Trustees as they are completed.
2. Vice President's (Petaluma) Report. Cheryl Dunn reported that 20 faculty members, both regular and adjunct, attended the Petaluma Faculty Forum annual retreat. They reviewed and discussed what might work and what issues the administration should consider, from the faculty perspective, in terms of moving Petaluma forward as a campus. The Needs Assessment, developed by K.C. Greaney in the Office of Institutional Research, and the Petaluma Educational Plan, which is still in a draft stage, were the two primary items on the retreat agenda. Cheryl noted that Petaluma faculty members are committed to maintaining the collegial, friendly and supportive environment that exists on campus. She also said that everyone is slated to be packed up and ready to move out of his or her old office on the last day of final exams (and looking forward to moving into the new facilities at the beginning of the Spring 2008 semester).
3. Treasurer's Report. The October 2007 Treasurer's Report was distributed for review.
4. Negotiations Report. This report was conducted in closed session.
5. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report was conducted in closed session.

COUNCIL/SENATE/COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). Deborah Sweitzer reported that BAC is reexamining its definition and role. They also discussed Prop. 92 and the District's budget for 2008-09.
2. Calendar Committee. Deborah Sweitzer reported that the transition from the current 177-day calendar to a 176-day calendar would not occur until the 2009-10 academic year (at the earliest).
3. Strategic Enrollment Planning Committee (StEP). Deborah Sweitzer responded to a question about the role of this District-wide committee, which, she said, focuses on ways in which to improve enrollment. The Vice President of Student Services currently serves as chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.