



*AFA is working for you.
The strength of faculty working together.*

AFA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

October 27, 2010

(Approved by Executive Council on November 10, 2010)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Warren Ruud, <i>presiding</i>	John Daly	*Lynn Harenberg-Miller	*Audrey Spall
*Alix Alixopoulos	*Dianne Davis	*Reneé Lo Pilato	Mike Starkey
*Paulette Bell	*Cheryl Dunn	*Michael Ludder	*Julie Thompson
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Brenda Flyswithawks	*Sean Martin	*Jack Wegman
*Paula Burks	*Karen Frindell Teuscher	*Dan Munton	

Faculty present: Breck Withers

Officers/Negotiators present: Ann Herbst

Staff present: Judith Bernstein

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. in Room #602 in the Richard Call Building on the Petaluma campus.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Monitoring the District's Reserves. Breck Withers recommended that AFA ensure that both the organization and the faculty know what the balances are in the District's reserve accounts, since certain items contained in the August 2010 agreement are tied to the balance in the reserves. He noted that the District has more than one reserve fund—some are required by the State and some are by definition restricted by the District. He suggested that some of the balances could be manipulated by the District—either intentionally or unintentionally. Since the 2010 agreement mentioned a percentage figure, Breck said the balance in each reserve fund would be a moving target. Breck cautioned AFA to make sure that the balances in the other reserve accounts aren't increasing at the same time.
2. Faculty Efficiency Ratios. Breck Withers stated that many faculty members have been taking additional students into their classes. Given that the data regarding larger class sizes is quantifiable, he suggested that AFA find out what the numbers are. When the District points to the increasing cost of health benefits during negotiations, AFA should use faculty efficiency ratios as a counter-argument.
3. Moratorium on Hiring. Breck Withers drew attention to the District's recent hiring announcements for classified and management positions. He said that some of these positions are new and some are replacements. He suggested that the District rethink these positions. Either all of them should be considered interim or AFA should ask for a moratorium on hiring until the District has completed its reengineering process. Although hiring is not technically within the purview of AFA, Breck suggested that AFA use the issue of hiring as a negotiating point, especially given that the District is continually asking AFA to educate the faculty about health care costs.

4. Reengineering and Faculty. On behalf of a colleague, Reneé Lo Pilato brought forward some concerns about the reengineering process and its effect on faculty. The faculty member commented on the noticeable lack of support services (administrative assistance, custodial support, support for phones and computers, etc.), and noted that everyone seems to be stretched thin. What is the status of the reengineering process? How does it affect faculty? How will the new building be staffed and cleaned? Does AFA have any say in urging the District to develop a plan to support the faculty so that they can be the most efficient they can be? In response, Warren said that some of these issues tie into the accreditation report, which was a wakeup call for the District. He also mentioned that some discussions took place during the October 25 meeting of the Institutional Planning Council that indicated to him that the District is finally beginning to recognize the true long-term cost of ownership.
5. Department Chair Reassigned Time Formula. On behalf of a colleague, Karen Frindell-Teuscher requested clarification about the status of negotiations regarding the department chair formula. The faculty member suggested that, if there were plans to change the formula through the negotiations process, it would be a good idea for AFA to let the faculty know. Warren confirmed that the District chose to open Article 13: Department Chairs for negotiations this year. He said that, during the closed session negotiations report, the Chief Negotiator would provide a status report on the matter and would clarify what information could be shared with the faculty.
6. Faculty Staffing Process. Karen Frindell-Teuscher brought forward a concern about a perceived lack of shared governance in a particular department's faculty staffing process. She reported that faculty members believe that their dean is overstepping boundaries in sending recommendations forward to the District's Faculty Staffing Committee without prior consultation with the department's own staffing committee or the department's adjunct faculty members. The department faculty does not agree with the recommendations or the prioritization of positions that the dean will be forwarding to the District committee. Karen said that deans are scheduled to present their recommendations to the District Faculty Staffing Committee on November 4. In response, Warren clarified that AFA does not have any standing in the hiring process and that this issue falls under the purview of the Academic Senate. He recommended that the concerned faculty members request that the Academic Senate representative for their cluster take the issue to the Senate. Council members who also serve on the Academic Senate suggested that the concerned faculty members consider (1) reviewing the District's policy and procedures on faculty staffing to confirm the process to be used when there are dissenting opinions within a department; and (2) sending an email to the Senate's executive committee to alert them to the concern prior to bringing it forward during the open forum portion of the next Senate meeting. Warren also noted that there is a direct link between the Senate and the District-wide Faculty Staffing Committee as the Senate has an appointee who serves on that committee.

MINUTES

There being no corrections or additions to the minutes from the October 13, 2010 Executive Council meeting, they were accepted as submitted. (Approved minutes are posted on the AFA Web site at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml>.)

ACTION ITEMS

1. Compressed Calendar Negotiations Sub-Committee Appointments. Warren Ruud reminded the Council that the District and AFA had agreed to form an official sub-committee of negotiations to discuss the compressed calendar. This negotiations sub-committee would be separate from and in addition to the standing AFA/Academic Senate

Compressed Calendar Task Force (CCTF). The new sub-committee would be composed of five faculty members and five administrators. Warren said that, at this point in time, the officers are not ready to recommend appointments to this sub-committee without conferring first with the Academic Senate President. He said that the joint AFA/Senate CCTF is continuing to make progress and has a field trip scheduled for Friday, November 4. Given that there is no urgency for the appointments and the Council voiced no objection, action on this item was postponed until the next Council meeting. (CCTF's Website is at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/senate_home.shtml .)

2. AFA Resolution re: Superintendent/President Search. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #1), by unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Dan Munton and seconded by Sean Martin to adopt the resolution entitled "Resolution for Inclusion of Four Faculty Members and for AFA Representation on the Screening and Interviewing Committee for the Superintendent/President" as written with the exception of minor wordsmithing. Following the adoption of the resolution, the Council engaged in a discussion about the potential timing and sequence of actions relative to informing the faculty and communicating with the Board about the matter. At the conclusion of the discussion, Warren said that the officers would continue to discuss the issue and keep the Council informed via email.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Superintendent/President Search. Warren Ruud distributed copies of a draft resolution that Brenda Flyswithhawks developed, entitled "Resolution for Inclusion of Four Faculty Members and for AFA Representation on the Screening and Interviewing Committee for the Superintendent/President." He presented a brief overview of recent communications between AFA and the Senate and between AFA and the Board of Trustees regarding the number of faculty representatives on the Superintendent/President screening and interviewing committee. Warren noted that Board of Trustees President Rick Call's most recent email to AFA and the Senate reaffirmed the Board's intention to limit faculty representation on the committee to two positions. Warren said that he and Academic Senate Vice President Robin Fautley (temporarily acting in the absence of Senate President Terry Shell) have extended several invitations to Mr. Call to meet with them and the Board's sub-committee; however, those invitations have yet to be accepted. Warren commented that the Board announced at the October 19 meeting that they had reached a decision about the composition of the committee, but they didn't announce the composition itself at that time, saying that they would reveal it later in an email. Since the October 19 Board meeting, members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate put together a draft resolution, which they have not yet sent to the Board, urging the Board to increase the number of faculty representatives on the committee. Warren noted that Brenda has been serving as a liaison between the Senate and AFA on this matter, and he thanked her for her efforts preparing the draft resolution.

Council members offered up some minor editing suggestions and, subsequently, engaged in an extensive discussion, making the following points:

- Twenty years ago when the District hired Dr. Agrella, AFA was only in its second year of existence and there were three faculty members on the hiring committee. At that time, the committee included two classified and only one student. If the District thought it was important enough 20 years ago to have two more faculty members than students and one more than classified, it is even more important today.
- Since that time, the number of students on the committee has been increased from one to two. What was the rationale for increasing the number of students?
- There are two people representing 75 managers, two people representing six board members, two people representing 10-12 positions in student government and, yet,

there are only two people representing 1,400 faculty members. The representation on the committee is out of balance.

- Of all the constituent groups considered for representation on the committee, only the Classified Senate and AFA were omitted. The Classified Senate has no official standing within the District. The classified bargaining unit (SEIU) has more standing than AFA, presumably because classified have no other representation, whereas the faculty Academic Senate does have official standing. By tradition, however, the District has considered AFA to be a part of shared governance.
- The Senate and AFA leadership are in total agreement that there need to be four faculty members on the committee and that AFA deserves representation.
- November 1st is the deadline for administrators to express interest in serving on the committee; the next meeting of the Board is on November 9th; and the first meeting of the committee is scheduled for November 19th.
- AFA and the Senate ought to publish their resolutions in an email to DL.STAFF.FAC.ALL;
- AFA ought to encourage faculty members to attend the next Board meeting and to contact Board members.
- One of the most difficult challenges for a new manager, including a new Superintendent/President, is the initial “buy-in” period, as s/he adapts to SRJC’s unique culture. Without sufficient faculty representation on the committee, that buy-in period will be made that much more difficult.
- Rejecting the faculty’s request would not be a good way to start off a transition or a good way to send a sitting president out the door.
- The composition of the committee ought to reflect the symmetric relationship between SRJC’s “legacy of excellence” and the faculty’s contribution to that legacy. Limiting the number of faculty representatives to two is not symmetric. While students and classified also contribute to the legacy of excellence, the faculty has the primary role.
- In terms of trying to define the appropriate number of faculty to sit on the committee that will hire the next president, if you change the numbers, you are saying something about the status of the faculty relative to everyone else on the committee. Given two from SEIU, two from management, two students, and two from faculty, how will these other groups view AFA’s position?
- The faculty has a legitimate right to have a representative on the committee who will look out for the interests of AFA and negotiations.
- More important even than the number of faculty representatives on the committee is the fact that, if there is not a strong AFA presence at the table, there will be no representation of the issues that AFA is concerned about. Those issues are separate and distinct from Senate issues.
- AFA needs to establish a new precedent and effect a change in the structure of the committee, so that AFA has a voice in hiring administrators in the future. AFA is the body that represents the faculty and, therefore, needs to be represented on the committee. Just because history has been one way doesn’t mean that things can’t change.
- Circumstances have made AFA a major partner in helping to solve the District’s problems (e.g., in terms of SLOs and salary concessions).
- Faculty salaries are the biggest expense in the District’s budget — more than everything else combined. Faculty representation on the committee ought to reflect that fact.
- If the Board agrees to increase the number of faculty representatives to four, it would be important to have part-time faculty representation.
- AFA’s request to increase faculty representation on the committee is tied to the mission of the college, which is focused on student learning and teaching, not on

having an efficient administration or an effective disbursement of funds. That focus is what distinguishes the institution.

- SRJC needs to have a president who understands what teaching is about and that is one of the most important reasons why there needs to be a strong faculty presence on the committee.

Following the discussion, by unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Dan Munton and seconded by Paula Burks to move this item to action. (See Action Item #2.)

OFFICER & AFA REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

1. AFA Council Composition Team (ACCT). ACCT members Lara Branen-Ahumada and Brenda Flyswitchhawks presented a brief report. ACCT members are in the process of gathering data from the ten community colleges around the State that have independent faculty associations representing both regular and adjunct faculty. One member of ACCT will consolidate all of the information into a spreadsheet for review and discussion. Each of the other five team members is responsible for contacting two colleges with a standard set of questions that the team developed. Team members are finding that there is no uniformity in how the independent faculty unions are organized. (It was also suggested that the same holds true for affiliated unions.) No one organization has the same exact model as AFA. Team members are running into some challenges (e.g., after multiple contacts, no responses are forthcoming or staff at the various colleges do not know the answers to the questions that are being asked of them). Warren noted that AFA Councilors and negotiators who will be attending the CCCI conference in Pasadena on November 4–6 might be able to collect some of the needed information. The next ACCT meeting is scheduled for November 8. (The ACCT Website can be found at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/ACCT.shtml>.)

MAIN REPORTS

1. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.
2. President's Report. Warren Ruud reported the following:
 - Institutional Planning Council (IPC). IPC members discussed issues related to facilities at the October 25, 2010 meeting. Warren will forward to the Council an electronic copy of the matrix that was distributed to IPC members.
 - Bay Faculty Association (BFA). FACCC presented a budget workshop at the October 25, 2010 BFA meeting. One of the presenters mentioned that, on November 8, the Board of Governors of the California Community College System would be issuing its determination as to whether or not there is adequate program-based funding to enforce the legal obligation of community college districts to make progress towards reaching the goal of having 75 percent of hours of credit instruction taught by full-time faculty. No one at the BFA meeting thought it likely that the Board would determine that there is adequate program improvement funding this year. Warren stated it was announced at the Budget Advisory meeting that the District's faculty obligation number would be 302.5.
 - Board of Trustees. At the October 19, 2010 meeting, the Board approved a change to the District's IRC 125 Plan—a consequence of the new federal health care reform act. AFA is seeking clarification about the change, which will eliminate over-the-counter medications as qualifying expenses for reimbursement under the plan.