



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

## AFA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

October 12, 2011

(Approved by the Executive Council on October 26, 2011)

Executive Councilors present (noted by \*):

*Mary Pierce, presiding	*Cheryl Dunn	Reneé Lo Pilato	*Audrey Spall
*Paulette Bell	Terry Ehret	Sean Martin	*Mike Starkey
*Paula Burks	Brenda Flyswitchhawks	*Dan Munton	Julie Thompson
*Ted Crowell	*Karen Frindell Teuscher	*Margaret Pennington	<i>One Adjunct</i>
*Dianne Davis	*Andre Larue	*Warren Ruud	<i>Councilor Vacancy</i>

Officers/Negotiators present: Lynn Harenberg-Miller, Ann Herbst, Jack Wegman

Faculty present: Jo Caulk, Nikona Mulkovich

Guests present: Bryan Ha, FACCC Director of Field & Faculty Advocacy

Andrea York, FACCC Director of Governmental Relations

Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. in the Mahoney Library Reading Room #721 on the Petaluma campus.

### MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Compressed Calendar. Nikona Mulkovich, regular faculty member in the Behavioral Sciences Department at the Petaluma campus, expressed her appreciation to the Council for holding the meeting at the Petaluma campus. She also communicated her support for a compressed calendar and encouraged AFA to move the process along as rapidly as possible, so that the focus of attention could be shifted towards implementation. Among the reasons why she is in support, Nikona mentioned the increased amount of student contact time per class session and the reduced number of weeks in the semester. She noted that the feedback she receives from students indicates that "they're done" weeks before the semester has ended. (Information about the Compressed Calendar Negotiations Task Force is available at [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/senate\\_task\\_force.shtml](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/senate_task_force.shtml) .)
2. FACCC Contract Membership. On behalf of faculty in her department who are current members of [FACCC](#), Dianne Davis requested clarification regarding the amount of dues that SRJC faculty would pay should the AFA membership approve FACCC Contract membership in the vote scheduled for mid-November. The faculty members would like to see the monthly dues amount expressed as a range in dollars rather than as a percentage figure. (The email entitled "An important message on FACCC Contract Membership" that AFA sent out to faculty on 10/12/11 is posted at [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/FACCCdocs/email\\_afa\\_101211.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/FACCCdocs/email_afa_101211.pdf) . Additional information about FACCC contract membership is available at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/FACCC.htm> .)

## **MINUTES**

There being no corrections or additions, the Council accepted the minutes from the September 28, 2011 Executive Council meeting as submitted. (Approved minutes are posted at [www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml).)

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. Task Force for Student Success (TFSS) Report. Mary Pierce introduced [Andrea York](#), FACC Director of Governmental Relations, and [Bryan Ha](#), FACC Director of Field and Faculty Advocacy, both of whom came from Sacramento to speak to the Council about the first two items on the agenda. Andrea briefly described her educational and professional background as well as the scope of her duties with FACC, which includes advocating on behalf of community college faculty on a day-to-day basis in the capitol and beyond with CalSTRS, the Employment Development Department, and the legislature. Andrea proceeded to give the Council extensive and detailed background information about the history of the TFSS, the people and organizations behind the TFSS, the central issues involved, FACC's objections to the recommendations in the report, and the avenues that faculty can use to communicate their concerns.
  - History: Two years ago Senator Carol Liu from Pasadena decided to author a bill with the intention of addressing student success by requiring performance-based standards. One of the prime movers behind the bill, [Nancy Shulock](#), director of the [Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy](#), believes that community colleges are too focused on access and they should be focused on student success. The main sponsors of the bill were the L.A. Area Chamber of Commerce and various think tanks. The bill made it to the Senate floor without any "no" votes. (By starting and ending a public meeting earlier than scheduled, the Senate's Education Committee passed the bill without any input from outside groups.) Despite aggressive lobbying in support of the bill on the part of the L.A. Chamber of Commerce, FACC opposed the bill all the way through the legislative process and "managed to kill the bill three times on the Senate floor." In an effort to avoid having to fight this proposal every year, Chancellor Jack Scott subsequently reached an agreement with Senator Liu to take the bill—which is an action bill, not a study bill—to the Assembly. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office—whose role is to take in feedback from all stakeholders, not to act on its own—was charged with forming a task force to develop a set of recommendations and report back to the legislature by January 2012.
  - TFSS Report: The task force is comprised of 20 members, about 75% of whom are community college administrators. It also includes Senator Liu, representatives from the L.A. Chamber of Commerce and various think tanks, and three faculty members (no CTE or part-time faculty). The report that the task force produced is not a consensus document. The goals as stated in the report include increasing student success; focusing much more attention on support services, especially matriculation (i.e., the goal is for students to matriculate towards a concrete goal, such as a certificate or transfer); increasing the number of full-time students; making students more accountable by requiring them to develop individual plans; and tying BOG fee waivers to the plans. There is no funding linked to these proposals.
  - FACC's Objections:
    - How one tracks and gauges student success is a difficult proposition. A number of variable measures are needed to determine how students have achieved success.
    - Given that the State has cut the community college (CC) budget to the bone, where is the money going to come from to fund these measures other than from cutting other items within the CC budget?
    - Not all students come to community colleges knowing what they want to do.

- FACCC anticipates that the TFSS will present its findings to the legislature and state that, in order to implement these measures, more counselors will be needed; thus, necessitating a change to the 50 percent law, which requires community college districts to spend at least 50 percent of their expenses on classroom instruction (i.e., instructional faculty salaries and benefits). The change would entail including counselors in the calculation of the 50 percent. This move raises the question of how many counselors there should be per any given number of students. Some kind of ratio is needed. Since counselors don't produce FTES, districts will hire those faculty members that do produce FTES, and this will result in pitting counselors against faculty. There is no reason why districts shouldn't hire more counselors; however, under the TFSS recommendations, it could be at the expense of instructional faculty.
- One of the recommendations in the report is to lump together the categorical programs. The legislature created the categorical programs with bi-partisan support, because districts were not otherwise funding those programs. A few years ago, the State made budgeting more flexible within the various categorical programs—with the exception of CTE, EOPS and DSPS. In addition to CTE, EOPS, and DSPS, there are three main clusters of categorical programs: (1) student services; (2) part-time faculty health benefits, office hours, and compensation (equity); and (3) workforce development (CTE, nursing, and apprenticeship). Currently, districts may move funds within each cluster, but not between clusters. This recommendation, if implemented, could cause districts to prioritize student success above all other programs, which, in turn, could result in pitting student groups against each other; taking away funding from part-time health insurance or parity in order to increase funding for office hours; or reducing CTE program offerings. (FACCC's position is that the State should be paying for part-time faculty office hours. What's missing from the TFSS report is a recommendation to hire more full-time faculty.) Due to the high cost of equipment, CTE programs are very expensive to fund, and districts are already disincentivized to support them. At what point does one say that nursing is more important than apprenticeship or than graphic design?
- Faculty Feedback: The task force is going up and down the State to present their report and solicit public feedback. Faculty members have several options for providing input: (1) you can go on the Web, pull up a pdf of the entire report, and put out your own opinion on a blog site where you can also see and respond to everyone else's feedback. (The task force has a professional staff member who is writing the report. She knows Prop 92 inside and out, and is logging the feedback on the blog); (2) On October 29<sup>th</sup> at DeAnza College, the task force will present their report and listen to feedback on part-time faculty issues at the FACCC Part-time Faculty Symposium; you can attend that meeting and convey your concerns; (3) The task force will meet again in November and December before finalizing their recommendations for presentation to the legislature in January 2012. Andrea said that it is critical that faculty engage, and she said that she would confirm the location of the November meeting and report back to the Council.)

After her presentation, Andrea responded to issues and questions that Councilors raised.

- The TFSS report recommends against funding Basic Skills classes more than two levels below the transfer level. This measure would effectively eliminate College Skills credit classes in math and English.

There is a Basic Skills crisis in CC's. If you want to increase student success numbers, you don't serve Basic Skills students. The legislature said that those students should be enrolled in Adult Education classes; however, there are no longer any Adult Education programs. The [Little Hoover Commission](#) said that CC's should either take over Adult Ed or only serve college-ready students. The TFSS is interested in supporting only those students who they know through performance measures will succeed.

Within the report there are some things that everyone can agree on. For example, there is a need for different data measures to measure outcomes through qualitative and quantitative analysis. The TFSS report, however, would open up a doorway

allowing many groups to move forward with their agendas, including those groups that wish to roll back labor law. There is nothing in the report about meeting the 75/25 faculty obligation numbers, and FACCC is seriously concerned about that omission.

- One gets the sense that this effort is on a "steamroller," and it will be hard to stop.  
It's true that it's on a steamroller, and it will be a hard fight. One would hope that the end result would be a couple of legislative measures that would provide for a new data system and, perhaps, some way to have increased funding for professional development of basic skills. There is no plan in the TFSS report to address workforce development and the economy in California, and there are several difficult questions that need to be addressed. What does it mean for a student to be a success? What is the mission of CC's? Who should CC's be serving in a tight economy?
- In one of the earlier versions of the recommendations that Nancy Shulock put forward, fees would be raised and more students would be eligible for PELL grants.  
The task force abandoned that idea. Data is available that shows that every time you increase fees, you lose students. Also, the legislature is heavily under the influence of caucuses advocating for lower fees on behalf of minority groups.
- Have there been discussions at any level about SLOs? SLOs are supposed to be the measure for improving what CCs do for student success. Will SLOs be thrown out the window?  
That's a valid concern. SLOs represent another side to the story, which is accreditation. The report doesn't address the issue of SLOs or accreditation. (Andrea said she would follow up with TFSS member Rich Hansen on this issue and report back.) FACCC has made the suggestion that the State do an audit of the cost of accreditation in California. A great deal of money is being spent, and that money comes out of student resources. Does the process warrant the cost? Could a stakeholder board perform that function? Some stakeholders feel that the accreditation process is improving.
- It appears that legislators are taking recommendations from people who have probably never stepped foot into a classroom.  
Legislators have very powerful political action committees in their districts. In the Senate (the house of origin), you see the bill being passed by those who prefer to let the other house play "bad cop." In the other house they say, "there were no 'no' votes." Term limit reform is sorely needed. Legislators are constantly raising money. Very few are taking the time to look at the recommendations from a policy perspective. One of the proponents of performance-based funding is from Long Beach City College. LBCC's president is very involved with a group called the [Campaign for College Opportunity](#), which wants to roll back regulations, like the 50 percent law and the 75/25 faculty obligation requirement.

Andrea emphasized that FACCC has an open-door policy, and Councilors should not hesitate to contact her, Bryan Ha, or Jonathan Lightman, who works regularly with the Chancellor's office and is attending all the TFSS "road shows." Andrea also encouraged Councilors who have questions or feedback to contact Rich Hansen, FACCC's point person on the task force. Andrea encouraged Councilors to read the article that Rich Hansen has written on the TTFS for the newest FACCC newsletter, and to share it with their colleagues. (She pointed out that the movement for performance-based funding started from the management side of community colleges, and added that the [Community College League](#) has published its own document on the TTFS, which, among other things, calls for deregulation of the 50 percent law.) Andrea commented that "it doesn't matter if you're political, politics have a way of finding you." She said it will take a grassroots movement to stop some of the recommendations from moving forward and that it is extremely important to protect part timers. She also distributed a packet of materials about the TTFS, including a one-page flyer, which she said Councilors might want to use for talking points and also as a hand out for colleagues.

2. FACCC Contract Membership. Mary Pierce updated the Council about the campaign materials that members of the Cabinet have been working on, which are designed to inform SRJC faculty about FACCC and the issue of contract membership prior to the vote in mid-November. Current SRJC members of FACCC have been responding to an initial email from AFA with expressions of support for the idea of contract membership. There is a link to the list of supporters on the home page of the AFA Website under "Hot Topics" (<http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/FACCCfaculty.htm>) as well as a link to frequently asked questions and answers (<http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/FACCCfaqs.htm>).) Mary encouraged Councilors to review the FAQs in order to better educate themselves and their colleagues, and to contact AFA staff if they have any comments or suggestions for improved clarity. She commented that a great deal of effort went into the development of these materials. FACCC staff worked with the AFA Cabinet and staff to distill the information from the FAQs down to a one-page informational flyer that will be distributed to faculty. Mary then introduced FACCC Director of Field and Faculty Advocacy Bryan Ha.

Bryan expressed his appreciation to all those who contributed their efforts to the development of the informational flyer, and he distributed draft copies to the Council. He said that FACCC has six professional staff members, including two full-time lobbyists—Andrea York and Jonathan Lightman—and one assistant, all of whom cater to almost 10,000 community college faculty members statewide. Bryan said that FACCC staff provides detailed attention to its contract member schools and up-to-the-minute information that faculty members are not going to hear elsewhere. Also, FACCC staff is available by phone and email at any time to answer questions and provide information.

In response to the question that was raised earlier during Member Concerns about how the dues rate would change under contract membership, Bryan said that AFA officers and FACCC are continuing negotiations about the rate, and they have not finalized an agreement yet. He pointed out that dues from individual FACCC members are only partially tax deductible, because they go to the 501(c)(3) business side of the organization. On the other hand, the dues from contract member college faculty are fully tax deductible, because they go to the FACCC Educational Institute, which is the 501(c)(6) charitable side of the organization. Individual dues are \$18 per month for full-time faculty and \$5 per month for part-time faculty (both for ten months). Contract member dues are typically 10 percent less, at \$16.20 per month for full-time faculty and \$4.50 per month for part-time faculty. AFA and FACCC have been discussing a percentage rate (not to exceed 0.19%) as an alternative to a fixed dollar amount. Contract member colleges are also eligible to receive certain incentives, such as rebates, after a set number of years of membership.

FACCC is governed by a Board of Governors, which is comprised of 21 faculty members from community colleges throughout the State. When a faculty member from a FACCC contract member college runs for a seat on the FACCC Board, that contract member college is guaranteed a seat even if that candidate loses the election. In that case, FACCC would give that contract member college the option to select a faculty member, not necessarily the candidate who ran, to represent it on the Board.

Currently, FACCC has three contract member colleges, including Santa Monica College, Foothill DeAnza Community College, and Santa Barbara City College. Independent faculty associations (not affiliated with CTA or CFT) represent the faculty at all three of these community colleges. In addition, two other independent community college faculty associations—Contra Costa and Chabot-Las Positas—are seriously considering contract membership. Bryan also said that there is strong support for FACCC at Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College, where approximately 83 percent of the faculty is a FACCC member. The FACCC Board of Governors currently includes representatives from colleges represented by CTA, CFT and independents. Bryan pointed out that FACCC represents every community college faculty member regardless of whether s/he is a member of FACCC or not.

FACCC's membership numbers currently fluctuate between 9,600 and 9,800. Should SRJC faculty vote to become a contract member, the addition of 1,100 to 1,200 members would

make FACCC 10,000+ strong, which increases FACCC's voice and power in representing community college faculty in Sacramento. Bryan stressed the point that legislators do listen and that there is strength in numbers.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Mary urged Councilors to familiarize themselves with the campaign materials; spread the word to their colleagues; post flyers in their departments; place this item on the agenda of their department meetings; and encourage their colleagues to read the materials and vote. Bryan also reminded the Council about the workshop for adjunct faculty that Andrea York will be presenting on Thursday, October 20, from 12 noon to 2:00 p.m.

3. Adjunct Councilor Leave Replacement: Fall 2011. At the September 28, 2011 meeting, the Council approved Lara Branen-Ahumada's request for a leave from the Council for Fall 2011. Lara plans to return to her seat on the Council at the beginning of the Spring 2012 semester. Mary reported that the Cabinet considered the possibilities for a one-semester leave replacement and came up with the following two options: (1) asking Lynn Harenberg-Miller, current member of the Negotiating Team and former adjunct Councilor, to fill the seat, or (2) asking the fourth-place finisher in the recent adjunct Council election to fill the seat. Given that there are only three regularly scheduled meetings remaining before the end of this semester, the Cabinet's recommendation is that the Council appoints Lynn Harenberg-Miller. Lynn expressed her willingness to be appointed to the short-term position. Councilors engaged in brief discussion and communicated their support for the idea of appointing someone who is already up to speed and familiar with all of the issues currently under discussion by the Council. By unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Dan Munton and seconded by Dianne Davis to move this item to action.
4. Goals and Priorities. For those who were not present at the Council's Fall 2011 retreat, Mary Pierce briefly described the group activity and brainstorming sessions that led to the development of a list of goals and priorities that retreat participants considered to be important and worthy of further pursuit by AFA. In their meeting packets, Councilors received a list of the goals that each of the three groups generated, along with a consolidated list of goals presented in ranked order according to the number of stickers that each item received. (Participants were given five red stickers to place next to items that they considered to be both critical and urgent, and three green stickers to place next to items that they considered to be important but not necessarily urgent.) Mary pointed out that the goal of the exercise was to capture new ideas as well as little ideas that sometimes get lost in the pursuit of larger goals. She also suggested that every issue was important to someone and that, just because no one placed a sticker next to an item, it does not mean that that idea should be set aside. The Council engaged in a lengthy discussion, in which they talked about the relative importance of some of the issues to each other, suggested alternative wording for some of the items in order to improve clarity, and considered what the next steps might be in terms of incorporating the list of items into the Council's future discussions. Following are specific suggestions that Councilors made:
  - Do not disregard the item about adjunct hiring preference, which was added after all of the participants had applied all of their stickers. Even though it didn't receive any stickers, it is still an important matter;
  - Regarding the need and urgency for SRJC faculty to become more politically active and vocal in Sacramento: consider separating that item into two parts, since the CCCI half-time advocate might provide different services or perform different actions than FACCC;
  - Investigate whether there is a State law that prohibits community colleges from providing free parking to their faculty. Ask AFA's representative on the Parking Committee to follow up on that issue and report back to the Council;
  - Regarding the idea of promoting the notion of unity within the faculty to the Board and the administration: modify the wording so that it clearly conveys the importance of having the

District regard the faculty as one whole (all faculty), instead of two separate parts (part-time faculty and full-time faculty);

- Create another opportunity for Councilors to re-rank the list (e.g., benefit issues were not ranked as high as they ought to have been relative to other issues, such as free parking);
- Chair and coordinator issues were also not ranked very high, and neither was evaluating resource allocation for like programs at different District sites. (The low rankings could be due to the fact that AFA has started already to focus attention and work on these issues);
- Separate the issues that AFA has started working on from the ones that AFA is not currently addressing;
- Divide the list of goals into ideas that are contractually related and those that are not;
- Send the list out again, with a request that each individual add to the list, if s/he so chooses; re-rank the issues; and select the top five that each individual believes AFA could accomplish this year.

In response to several questions about the process of reaching a decision whether to shift to a compressed calendar, Mary Pierce and Ann Herbst clarified the following: (1) the calendar is a negotiated item; (2) there is currently an active ten-member AFA/District negotiations task force studying the feasibility of a compressed calendar; (3) any recommendation of the task force would represent those items on which the members are able to agree; (4) if the task force issues a recommendation to proceed, AFA would negotiate the details re: implementation; and (5) the negotiations team takes its direction from the Council. At the conclusion of the discussion, Mary thanked Councilors for their suggestions and noted that the Cabinet would work on the next step.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Adjunct Councilor Leave Replacement: Fall 2011. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #3), by unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Dianne Davis and seconded by Paula Burks to approve the appointment of Lynn Harenberg-Miller as a leave replacement for Lara Branen-Ahumada for the remainder of the Fall 2011 semester. Lara will return to her seat on the Council at the beginning of the Spring 2012 semester.

### **MAIN REPORTS**

1. Vice President's Report. Mary Pierce presented brief reports about the following items:
  - [FACCC Workshop for Part-Time Faculty, October 20](#). This workshop will be held in the Staff Dining Room in the Bertolini Student Center, from 12:00 to 2:00 p.m. FACCC's Andrea York will be the presenter, and the focus will be on issues affecting adjunct faculty. Flex credit is pending, and complimentary lunch will be provided. Mary strongly encouraged Councilors to spread the word.
  - [FACCC Part-Time Faculty Symposium: October 29](#). FACCC has partnered with AFA to lower the registration fee for SRJC faculty attending this one-day symposium. To date, no adjunct faculty members have responded to AFA's emailed invitation, which was sent out to all adjunct faculty members with Outlook accounts. Mary urged Councilors to encourage their adjunct colleagues to read the email and to consider attending the symposium.
  - Compressed Calendar Resolution of Support. The chair of the English Department recently forwarded to AFA and the Academic Senate a resolution in favor of shifting to a compressed calendar. English Department faculty began working on the resolution in Spring 2011 and unanimously approved it at a recent department meeting.
2. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.