

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

August 22, 2012

(Approved by the Executive Council on September 12, 2012)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Julie Thompson, <i>presiding</i>	*Ted Crowell	*Andre Larue	*Margaret Pennington
*Paulette Bell	*Terry Ehret	*Sean Martin	*Audrey Spall
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Deirdre Frontczak	*Bud Metzger	*Mike Starkey
*Shawn Brumbaugh	*Brenda Flyswithhawks	*Terry Mulcaire	*Phyllis Usina
*Paula Burks	*Sharien Hinton	*Nikona Mulkovich	

Officers/Negotiators present: Will Baty, Lynn Harenberg-Miller, Jacqueline McGhee,
Warren Ruud, Jack Wegman

Guests present: Michelle Dowling, Associated Students 2012-13 Student Trustee
Robert Edmonds, Associated Students Executive Vice-President
Anson O'Rourke Sargeant, Associated Students Student At-Large and
Chemistry Club Member

Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. in Maggini Hall, Room #2801, on the Santa Rosa campus.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. PDA Day Schedule and Location. Terry Ehret conveyed a concern about the location of Fall 2012 PDA Day activities—specifically, the lack of options for faculty to participate on the Petaluma campus. She stated that it is more difficult for many adjunct faculty to attend PDA activities than it is for regular faculty, and she requested that, in the interest of creating a sense of community, this issue be taken into consideration in future PDA planning.

PRESENTATION

Advocacy: Governor's Tax Initiative (Associated Students). Michelle Dowling, Robert Edmonds, and Anson O'Rourke Sargeant appeared before the Council to talk about Proposition 30, which is on the November ballot. The A.S. has been working in the community, with faculty, and with student clubs to actively support Prop. 30. They have attended SRJC Board meetings and Board Finance Committee meetings. They are attempting to set up an event on September 19th and, given their belief that advocacy is more effective if students and faculty work together, they are asking for AFA's support. Michelle said that A.S. would like to make the event as big and productive as possible. They are hoping to get people from the community involved in the event, and they intend to schedule a 10- to 15-minute teach-in to educate people about Prop. 30 and Molly Munger's competing initiative—Prop. 38. A.S. would leave time for those who are opposed to Prop. 30 to explain why they don't support it. Now that there is a tentative framework for the September 19th event, students are working with Marty Bennett to arrange for speakers who are active on a statewide level. In response to questions from the Council about the A.S. position on the governor's initiative (Prop. 30) versus Molly Munger's initiative (Prop. 38) and what SRJC would receive if the governor's initiative were to pass, Michelle commented that Vice President of

Business Services Doug Roberts has put together a document showing what the impact of Prop. 30 on SRJC will be. She said that SRJC would receive \$1.2 million added to the budget, if Prop. 30 passes. If it doesn't pass, Michelle said the deficit would be increased from \$3 to 5 million. Robert added that some money would go towards paying off outstanding debt. In terms of the Munger initiative, Michelle said that all the money would go to K-12, so community colleges would not get anything. She added that there is some confusion about the two initiatives, and people are wondering whether they can vote for both. (Note: To read an explanation of what would happen if voters approve both Prop. 30 and Prop. 38, scroll to page 5 of the Legislative Analyst's Office's analysis of Prop. 30 at http://www.lao.ca.gov/ballot/2012/30_11_2012.pdf .) Michelle commented that there is a great deal of political heat surrounding these two initiatives and a great deal of money going into the campaigns. The A.S.'s priority is higher education. Robert mentioned that SEIU is strongly in support of Prop. 30 and opposed to Prop. 32.

Julie Thompson asked that the students forward their draft agenda to AFA, even if it is tentative. The AFA officers have been talking about bringing, with FACCC's help, Wes Chesbro to SRJC for a forum on current legislative issues and, especially, the governor's initiative. One of the tentative dates for that forum is September 19, and Julie said the officers have been wondering about potentially merging resources with the A.S. There may be advantages to having events on two days as opposed to one, but the more AFA knows about what the students are planning, the better. Robert commented that the students are not seeing a lot of forward advocacy, which is part of the reason why they are starting to work at the local level. In response to a question about what recent polls indicate, Michelle said that the governor's initiative is polling at around 50 percent in favor, while Molly Monger's initiative is polling at around 40 percent. FACCC is endorsing Prop 30. (See the "Election Watch" section at <http://www.faccc.org/> for FACCC's endorsements on Prop. 30, 32 and 38 and <http://www.yesonprop30.com/> for information about the yes on Prop. 30 campaign.)

MINUTES

The Council accepted minutes from three meetings as presented: the May 9, 2012 Executive Council Meeting, the May 16, 2012 Special Meeting, and the May 16, 2012 General Membership Meeting. (Approved minutes are posted at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml> .)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Request for Support of Event re: Governor's Tax Initiative. Councilors engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the Associated Students' request for support, as described during their presentation to the Council. In response to a question regarding what, exactly, the students are asking the Council to do, it was suggested that their ultimate goal is to endorse Prop. 30. They want an opportunity to have a public forum, and, after that forum on September 19th, the student government would then make a decision about whether to endorse Prop. 30. Several Councilors expressed an interest in working with the students, and a number of questions were raised, including: (1) What would the Council like to do as a body (e.g., publish something on the AFA Website, send out something to the membership, etc.)? (2) Is there a reason for the Council to wait to endorse Prop. 30 until after the September 19th forum? Is there any downside to acting sooner? (3) Will the speakers provide any more information than the Council already has? (4) Does the Council need more specifics from the students before making any decision on their request for support? (5) Since the passage of Prop. 30 will have a direct impact on the students, should we (members of the Council and the faculty) take a position and encourage students in our classrooms to take a stand as well?

In the subsequent discussion, comments included the following: (1) One way AFA could support the students would be to provide intellectual support and guidance. In one of their previous advocacy efforts, the students' good intentions led to unfortunate and unanticipated results. I would encourage them not to adopt a debate model. (2) It's not clear that the students were asking for financial support. They appeared to be asking AFA to support them with the proposition, because they want to take a proactive step, due to the funds that SRJC

will receive if Prop. 30 passes. Their interests intersect with how the Council sees the issue, too. (3) The Council should direct the AFA PAC to contact the students on behalf of the Council and then discuss the issue. Using PAC funds would be the appropriate way to support the students.

Julie noted that she had some conversations with the students over the summer, and they floated a number of ideas by her that included tabling, distributing literature, and needing money. She said that she would like to bring back to the Council a detailed agenda from the students that includes the names of the speakers they intend to invite. She also suggested that the Council clarify and articulate its position on Prop. 30. If the Council decides to endorse the proposition, then it needs to determine how to publicize that message. It was noted that AFA's standing committee on advocacy has not been active for many years, and Julie suggested that the committee be reactivated.

Warren Ruud informed the Council that he invited Board members to a breakfast meeting with students, SEIU, and AFA as a way to open up communication between the groups. The Board accepted, and a meeting has been scheduled for Friday, August 24. Warren and Julie will represent AFA, Alan Wintermeyer and Hilary IZard will represent SEIU, and Jessica Jones and Robert Edmonds will represent the Associated Students. Warren suggested that the Council consider waiting to reach a decision about endorsing Prop. 30 after Friday's meeting, so as to see if all the constituent groups can come to a position of support on Prop. 30. He also suggested that the most important thing that Councilors could do would be to encourage students to register to vote, and he also recommended inviting the League of Women Voters to speak at a forum about the propositions. The Council engaged in a brief discussion about the requirements of the Brown Act relative to the number of Board members who will be present at the August 24th meeting with AFA, SEIU, and the students.

Julie said that she would reiterate her request to the A.S. leadership that they provide more specifics regarding their plans for activities re: Prop. 30 and, in addition, would communicate the Council's desire to work with them for the good of the College. It was suggested that Julie also recommend to the students that they consider carefully the format they will be using on September 19th as well as the individuals they will be inviting to speak, in order to avoid unintended consequences. Julie then asked whether the Council wished to take a position on Prop. 30. In response to a Councilor's question about AFA expressing its support of Prop. 30 at the meeting with the Board on August 24, Warren clarified that the purpose of the meeting is to open communication between the Board and other constituent groups and to discuss what all of the groups can do to support the College. He said that the biggest item on the table now is Prop. 30, which would be beneficial for AFA's particular interests—salaries, benefits, and working conditions. While support of Prop. 30 is not the purpose of the meeting, Warren said that the initiative is likely to come up in the conversation. Following the discussion, by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved a motion made by Brenda Flyswithawks and seconded by Nikona Mulkovich to add the Council's support of Prop. 30 to the discussion agenda. (See Discussion Item #2.)

2. Executive Council Support of Proposition 30. Following the motion to add this item to the discussion agenda (see Discussion Item #1), by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved a motion made by Brenda Flyswithawks and seconded by Lara Branen-Ahumada to move this item to action. (See Action Item #1.)
3. AFA Standing Committee Appointments for 2012-13. Councilors received a copy of the list of AFA Standing Committees, including vacant seats, prior to the meeting for their review. Julie Thompson commented that she sees a number of different threads woven together in this topic that have implications for one another, but yet are separate issues. This set of issues includes: (1) There are vacant seats on several committees due to the retirement of several Councilors; (2) A few Councilors have expressed concern about the degree of inclusiveness in the process for filling those vacancies; (3) There is an interest in providing people with opportunities to step forward and serve on committees that they're interested in and which

provide professional development experience for them; (4) One of the duties of Councilors is to attend Executive Council meetings. For contract faculty, this is part of college service. For adjunct faculty, there is compensation for attending meetings plus preparation time for reviewing minutes and materials. (5) In addition to participating in meetings, Councilors are expected to serve on a committee for which they're not compensated. (6) Many times, AFA has articulated in *Update* articles "Just do your job, no more no less"—a message that is geared towards conveying AFA's belief that people should be compensated for the work that they do and reminding adjunct faculty members to not allow themselves to be exploited. It is often easy for adjunct faculty to say "yes" to tasks because they're building up their C.V.s, but AFA doesn't encourage people to work for free. At the same time, the expectation described in AFA's founding documents that Councilors serve on a committee is a de facto way of encouraging faculty to work for free. (7) And lastly, the AFA budget is very tight. Julie added that once Councilors commit to serving on a committee, that committee needs them to attend the meetings and participate.

The Council engaged in a lengthy discussion, and comments included the following:

- There is no easy answer. It's a dilemma—making sure people are included, have the opportunity, and are compensated. To serve the compensation principle, we exclude; to serve the other, we fail to compensate. The message to the District is to protect adjunct faculty from exploitation. Is it dishonest to construe work for AFA as different? I'm wondering if that distinction—work done by faculty for the faculty vs. work done by faculty for the District—makes sense to anyone else.
- When I first came on board, adjunct faculty had the opportunity, along with being paid for serving on the Council, to lend their services to a committee in which they might have been interested wherever there was a spot they could help, if they could make the meetings. I never saw it as something I had to be compensated for—it was part of the duty of being a Councilor. Adjunct Councilors are compensated for meetings and reading time and retreats. I personally don't feel a conflict.
- I feel the same way.
- We're employees of the District. We're not employees of the union. We don't want to get exploited by our employers.
- It would be wonderful if we could compensate people for serving on these committees. If and when there is money in the budget, I would like to do that. I don't want to exclude people from serving.
- The idea of college service is to help the District. The idea of our committees is to help AFA.
- For a contract faculty member, committee work counts towards College service and is connected to compensation. Often times, contract faculty members do way more than five hours per week. College service and professional development are compensated. There is no required College service for adjunct faculty.
- Since the Adjunct Faculty District Activities Fund went away, AFA is paying out of its own pocket for adjunct faculty members who serve on College committees.
- If adjunct faculty members are being paid for serving on AFA and committees—if there's money or not—I would want to have a discussion about regular faculty being paid to serve on committees. I'm not sure how equitable it is. When and for how much service do we start paying contract faculty for all the many hours they put in beyond the five hours a week? If we're talking money and equity, it isn't equitable for contract faculty now, just as with adjunct. You see the same adjunct faculty serving as you see the same contract faculty. In terms of inclusiveness, I didn't know the inclusiveness part was so highly attached to the pocketbook. In the spring, the discussion wasn't about economics, it was about being inclusive, that the same people are not consistently serving in the same positions, that we be more equitable, and have diversity in shared governance. That's

where I would like to see the inclusiveness—not about the economics—but about balance in who is serving and how long someone is serving in the same position. Sometimes what happens over the years is that we see the same people serving in certain positions because no one else has stepped forward. It gives the impression that there is an undercurrent agenda going on, when the truth is that no one has stepped up. It's good for this body that Julie is facilitating this discussion.

Sensing a consensus that this issue is not one of adjunct vs. contract faculty and that the Council is in favor of more inclusiveness and openness in the committee appointment process, Julie requested that anyone interested in an open committee seat should send an email to her and/or the chair of the committee by Wednesday, August 29th. In response to a request for clarification about which of the seats is vacant, the charge of each committee, and the meeting times, various officers provided brief descriptions. Julie noted that the Article 16 Committee has a "mountain" of work to be done and could use several more members. (See AFA Policy on Standing Committees at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Policies/standing_committees.pdf .)

4. Fall 2012 Calendar. Julie reviewed the AFA calendar of meetings (Council, Cabinet, negotiations, etc.) and events tentatively scheduled for the Fall 2012 semester. She said that Candy Shell would be sending out a Doodle poll to determine availability for the Fall 2012 retreat, which is tentatively scheduled at Pepperwood Preserve. (Potential dates include one Friday and four different Sundays in October and November). The Council meeting that will be held on the Petaluma campus this semester is tentatively scheduled for October 10, during the same week that the District's Board meeting will be held in Petaluma. The CCCI conference is scheduled for October 11 – 13 in San Diego, and four officers are interested in attending. If additional Councilors would like to attend, the Council by majority vote could approve payment of registration fees. (See the AFA policy on professional conference attendance at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Policies/professional_conf.pdf .) Julie noted that September 10th, 19th, and 26th have been identified as possible dates for an event featuring Assemblymember Wes Chesbro. Brief discussion followed about the venue for the fall retreat, with cost and the availability of wifi being key factors. The retreat typically runs from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and Flex credit is pending. In response to concern about travel time to the preserve, Julie asked Councilors to email any other ideas for alternative venues to AFA staff. She also asked Councilors who are interested in attending the CCCI conference to contact AFA staff by Wednesday, August 29th. (See the AFA calendar at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/calendar.shtml> .)

ACTION ITEMS

1. Executive Council Position on Proposition 30. (See Discussion Items #1 and #2.) Councilors engaged in discussion about the protocol for taking positions on issues related to advocacy. Comments included the following: (1) There is a sufficient understanding of the stakes of this proposition such that the Council should vote now. (2) The Executive Council represents, but is different than, the AFA membership. Is it customary for members of the Council to take advocacy positions without questioning the membership? (3) AFA Officers who represent the Council at CCCI conferences often take positions on legislation. There is precedent there, even though it's a slightly different forum. (4) What do the Bylaws say? Maybe the issue should be divided in two: should the Council take a position of support on Prop. 30, and should the Council take the issue to the membership for a vote? (5) The Council is a representative body, in the same way that Congress is, and members of Congress do not ask the voters before they vote on legislation. (6) A few years ago the Council endorsed candidates for the Board of Trustees election. How was that done? (7) The question at this time is whether the members of the Executive Council support Proposition 30. (8) Years ago, AFA and the students endorsed the bond measure and there was a big campaign, because it was good for the College. This is similar. The Council represents the membership. (9) We have had discussions in our department and, as a Councilor, I feel I represent a lot of people

in endorsing Prop. 30. At the conclusion of the discussion, Julie commented that it is likely that the Council would be called upon to make similar decisions in the future. Subsequently, by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved a motion made by Brenda Flyswithawks and seconded by Nikona Mulkovich stating that AFA supports the Proposition 30 initiative.

MAIN REPORTS

1. Treasurer's Report. Paula Burks reviewed the Treasurer's Report for the second quarter of 2012, which included revenue received and expenses paid through June 30, 2012 (the end of AFA's fiscal year). She pointed out that, due to lower expenses and higher revenues than projected, the 2012-13 fiscal year ended with a positive balance of \$646, instead of a potential deficit of \$32,489 as projected. Paula noted that included in June's expenses were payments for reassigned time for AFA officers and negotiators for Spring 2012; conference and travel expenses for the CCCI Spring 2012 conference; equipment rental costs related to shifting from an older, larger copier to a newer, smaller one, which AFA will own at the end of the current year; and compensation for adjunct faculty service on the Executive Council and District-wide committees (formerly paid through the Adjunct Faculty District Activities Fund). Paula reported that AFA Office Coordinator and Bookkeeper Candy Shell has prepared a conservative estimate for 2012-13, which amounts to between \$22,000 and \$24,000, an increase over last year because there are more adjunct faculty positions on the Council now and meetings are running longer. There was also an AFA PAC expense of \$850 to fund students who went to the "March in March" in Sacramento.
2. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.
3. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.