

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

March 24, 2010

(Approved by Executive Council on April 14, 2010)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

*Ann Herbst, <i>presiding</i>	Dianne Davis	*Michael Kaufmann	Andrea Proehl
*Alix Alixopoulos	*Cheryl Dunn	*Reneé Lo Pilato	*Audrey Spall
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Brenda Flyswithawks	*Michael Ludder	*Mike Starkey
*Paula Burks	*Karen Frindell	*Sean Martin	*Julie Thompson
John Daly	*Lynn Harenberg-Miller	*Dan Munton	

Officers/Negotiators present: Ted Crowell, Janet McCulloch

Councilor-elect present: Jack Wegman (2010-12)

Other faculty present: Annie Banks, Jo Caulk, Yolanda Delgado, Michael Drayton, Terry Ehret, Michael Eurgubian, Cristobal Leon Estrada, Mikele Martinisi, Susan Murany, Catherine Sagan, John Tully, Marsa Tully, Cheryl White, Chris Womack

Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. in Room PC602 in the Richard Call Building on the Petaluma Campus.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. President's Re-Engineering Advisory Group (PRAG). Michael Eurgubian, regular faculty in the Mathematics Department who is representing AFA on the President's Re-Engineering Advisory Group (formerly known as the Multi-site Task Force Resource Allocation Group), informed the Council that the PRAG has met one time with a facilitator, who will be assisting the group with their organizational and decision-making processes. Michael said that he would be making regular reports to the Council and would regularly solicit their input and convey it back to the PRAG. All of the PRAG meetings are to be held on the Santa Rosa campus; however, they will be broadcast to Petaluma when Michael (the sole committee member based on the Petaluma Campus) is unable to attend the meeting in Santa Rosa.
2. Adjunct Faculty Petition. John Tully, adjunct faculty member in the ESL department for the past 20 years, stated that he was delegated by a caucus of adjunct faculty members to appear before the Council and present them with a petition. John read from a prepared statement, which he provided to AFA staff along with the petition and a list of signatures. The petition included a list of grievances, including that AFA has failed to seek equitable treatment for adjunct faculty. It stated that there is currently an imbalance on the AFA Executive Council due to the fact that, of the 19 members, 13 represent full-time faculty and only six represent adjunct faculty, even though the adjunct Councilors represent 1,000 adjunct faculty members who teach 50% of the classes. The caucus is requesting that (1) the AFA Constitution be amended to give equal representation on the Council to full-time and part-time faculty; (2) an AFA general meeting be called for April 14, 2010; and (3) the caucus' proposed constitutional amendments be put forth to AFA members for a vote. John Tully said that the April 14th date is not negotiable and that the caucus would understand any attempt on the part of the Council to schedule the meeting later to be the equivalent of a "no" vote.

MINUTES

Ann Herbst suggested that the summary of Sean Martin's report on the District Tenure Review and Evaluations Committee — the last item in the draft minutes of the March 10, 2010 meeting — was not clear and may have conveyed something different than what Sean intended. Having consulted with DTREC Co-chair Janet McCulloch, who was present at the meeting to which Sean was referring, Ann clarified two items in the report: (1) According to Article 14: Evaluations, the chair is not responsible for observing classroom instruction once an adjunct faculty member has passed his or her probationary period. Accordingly, DTREC denied a request to allow the department chair to be the primary evaluator of adjunct faculty; and (2) Rather than quoting a specific percentage figure relative to the number of faculty who are up to date on their evaluations, it would be more accurate to state that "a significant number" of faculty are NOT up to date on their evaluations. There being no other corrections or additions, the minutes from the March 10, 2010 Executive Council meeting were accepted with the above-mentioned corrections.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposed Revision of AFA Budget for 2009-10. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #1), by unanimous voice vote the Council approved a motion made by Cheryl Dunn and seconded by Dan Munton to transfer \$2,000 from the Publications Stipend Fund line item in the 2009-10 budget to the Professional Expenses: Legal line item.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Proposed Revision of AFA Budget for 2009-10. Ann Herbst stated that the officers concur with the recommendation of the secretary/treasurer and the bookkeeper that the 2009-10 budget be adjusted to reflect a \$2,000 increase in the Professional Fees: Legal line item and a corresponding decrease in the Publications Stipend Fund line item. Increased legal expenses include attorney fees and consulting fees related to transitioning a faculty member to CalSTRS long-term disability retirement. The reduction in the Publications Stipend line item would still leave enough funds to pay seven \$200 stipends to authors of articles accepted for publication in the *AFA Dialogue* during the remainder of this fiscal year. By unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Cheryl Dunn and seconded by Dan Munton to move this item to an action item at this meeting.
2. Composition of AFA Executive Council. Ann Herbst noted that the adjunct Councilors requested that this item be placed on the agenda. The Council engaged in a lengthy discussion about the suggestion put forth by the adjunct Councilors and the adjunct caucus to change the composition of the Council such that there would be an equal number of adjunct and regular faculty representatives. It was noted that representation on the Council was originally based on the ratio between the number of courses taught by full-time faculty and the number of courses taught by part-time faculty, and that that ratio has changed over time. Councilors and other faculty members in attendance at the meeting took turns expressing their opinions on the matter.

Those in support of increasing the number of part-time representatives on the Council to equal the same number of full-time representatives offered the following points:

- A great deal of unfair treatment of adjunct faculty has happened because of the makeup of the Council — two-thirds of the Council represent full-time faculty and only one-third represents part-time faculty.
- For many years, the ratio of classes taught by full-timers vs. part-timers has been close to 50/50, yet the composition of the Council has not changed to reflect that ratio and full-time Councilors still outnumber part-time Councilors by more than 2:1.
- Full-timers and part-timers will need each other in the future. It's hard to imagine part-timers stepping up to support full-timers given what has happened during the last year.

- In two days, 82 part-time and full-time instructors signed the petition. Many more than 82 feel a great deal of frustration and anger about the pay cuts that the adjunct faculty has taken, and those sentiments are not going away. Many full-time faculty members are supportive of the petition.
- Based on the number of adjunct faculty employed by the District, some part-timers have advocated for two-thirds part-time representatives and one-third full-time representatives; however, one group should not dominate the other. It should not be the tyranny of the minority or the tyranny of the majority. The principle should be 50/50.
- If the faculty wants solidarity, there needs to be equal representation on the Council, despite fluctuations in the ratio.
- Having a balanced Council and an adjunct officer is important. The adjunct Councilors and caucus have been talking amongst themselves and are looking forward to receiving feedback from the regular Councilors on this issue, which was raised last semester by the adjunct Councilors but not addressed.
- The union has an opportunity to mitigate some of the unjust aspects of the Ed Code. For example, protection of adjunct load is just now being legislated into the Ed Code, whereas AFA negotiated those protections many years ago.
- AFA is a bargaining unit that represents all the members of the unit and it is a legal entity that is separate from the District and different than the Academic Senate. The petition proposes that there be an equal number of seats at the table and that all faculty members vote on who sits at the table. This proposal would provide accountability in the sense that those elected would represent everybody, not only full-timers or only part-timers.
- Even though the full-time faculty has more responsibilities, the College would fall apart if not for the adjunct faculty, who hold up more than their fair share of the bargain. The College's reputation comes from all of the faculty, not just those who have more responsibilities. If we are an "all faculty" association, we should get rid of the full-time/part-time distinction — otherwise, we'll fail.
- In the classroom, the responsibility to the students is the same, regardless of whether one is full-time or part-time. College service, which includes the full-timers' responsibilities to the institution that part-timers do not have, is not part of the equation when calculating the ratio of full-time to part-time instruction and, for that reason, FTEF works well as a basis of representation.
- The decision to cut salaries for one group by .5% and the other group by 6-7% caused a division between the two groups. Everyone should have taken the same percentage cut.

Other points of view were expressed, as follows:

- The responsibility for the institution is something that the Ed Code gives to the regular faculty. The adjunct faculty is not responsible for running the institution. Full-timers' and part-timer's jobs are not equal.
- The Ed Code language reflects the realities of the continuity of full-time faculty over time. There will be issues that arise that are inherently relevant to full-timers that are not necessarily as relevant to part-timers.
- There are many different categories of part-timers — ranging from those who rely solely on their SRJC income for their livelihood to those who are employed elsewhere full-time and only teach a class occasionally. Not all part-timers are doing the same kind of work.
- The call for a change in the basis of representation should be divorced from the specific decisions that the Council has made.
- The questions that ought to be asked are: What is the appropriate methodology by which representation should be determined? How shall we create a world that is fair and just, subject to the different job responsibilities?
- Why should representation be based on FTEF? Why not base it on the amount that is contributed by the different groups? According to the most recent AFA Treasurer's Report, the regular faculty contributes two-thirds of the organization's income, while the adjunct faculty contributes one-third.

- The biggest challenge facing the institution is to change the way it looks at full-timers and part-timers by viewing all faculty as the same. If a decision is made to change the composition of the Council, it ought to remove the division between “us and them,” “ours and yours,” full-time and part-time. If the number of Council representatives is balanced, and the contract is balanced, then the contract that the institution makes with faculty must be the same for full-timers and part-timers. That would solve many of the problems the institution faces related to committee service.

Some Councilors did not endorse any particular action, but rather argued that the issue of representation merited serious attention and consideration. Some stated that they needed more time to consider the issues, but expressed support for holding the general meeting, looking at all the proposals, and holding a broader discussion of the issues.

Lara Branen-Ahumada stated that she would be bringing an alternative proposal to the Council for consideration. She said that the only way to get to 50/50 immediately without increasing the overall number of Councilors would be to have two fewer regular Council seats. Since those two regular seats could not be eliminated until their terms run out at the beginning of the Fall 2011 semester, Lara suggested that the Council consider adding two more adjunct seats now. As a first step, the addition of those two adjunct seats would create a 60/40 split on the Council and would move the Council closer to the 50/50 FTEF ratio. Lara noted that the Constitution and Bylaws would need to be amended, but those changes could be accomplished without changing the overall total number of Councilors.

Ann Herbst noted that there are currently two AFA meetings scheduled in April (one on the 14th and one on the 28th) and that a general meeting had already been scheduled for April 28. The adjunct caucus has requested that a general meeting be held on April 14 for a discussion and vote on the issues raised in the petition. Ann said that the officers would make a decision about the date of the general meeting at the next Cabinet meeting. She also pointed out that the proposals for amendments called for in the petition were general in nature. In accordance with the amendment process outlined in the AFA Constitution, Ann requested that the adjunct caucus submit specific language for their proposed changes to the AFA Constitution and Bylaws in writing to the AFA office one week prior to the April 14th meeting, so that their proposals could be included in the Council’s meeting packet for review prior to that meeting.

Ann also pointed out that, although no adjunct faculty members were elected to officer positions for 2010-11, current AFA policy states that if there are no adjunct officers on the cabinet, the Council shall, if possible, appoint an adjunct faculty member to attend cabinet meetings. Although the existence of that mechanism does not address all of the concerns expressed by the adjunct caucus, there does not need to be a constitutional amendment to have an adjunct faculty member on the cabinet.

2. Composition of AFA Cabinet. Due to time constraints, discussion of this item was postponed until the next Council meeting.
3. Spring 2010 AFA Negotiations Retreat. Ann Herbst informed the Council that the topics of discussion on the agenda for the March 27, 2010 retreat would be Article 16: Hourly Assignments, health insurance options, and, if time allows, Article 17: Job Descriptions.

MAIN REPORTS

1. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.