



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

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

September 26, 2012

(Approved by the Executive Council on October 10, 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, Jacqueline McGhee, Warren Ruud

Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

Faculty present: Abby Bogomolny

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4245, on the Santa Rosa campus. After Member Concerns, a Special Educational Forum with Assemblymember Wes Chesbro began at 3:10 p.m. and ended at 4:05 p.m. At 4:10 p.m., the Executive Council meeting resumed with the approval of the minutes.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Student Access to santarosa.edu Email Accounts. Terry Ehret reported that, although there had been no information on the District's website for a period of time, students may once again be informed that they have access to santarosa.edu email accounts, which will enable them to benefit from certain discount programs, among other things. The IT department is making that information available through bearcubs.edu to students currently enrolled at SRJC and is looking also into making the information available to faculty through the portals.

MINUTES

Following a motion made by Terry Mulcaire and seconded by Bud Metzger, by voice vote, the Council unanimously approved the minutes from the September 12, 2012 Executive Council meeting as submitted (17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (Approved minutes are posted at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml>.)

ACTION ITEMS

1. Resolution re: Propositions 32 and 38. Julie noted that the Council's support of Prop. 30 would be announced in the *AFA Update* to be published the week of October 1, and she asked Councilors whether they wanted to issue endorsements on Props. 32 and 38 at the same time. (For more information, see <http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/propositions/32/> and <http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/propositions/38/>.) A brief discussion followed. It was noted that supporters of Prop. 32 claim that it will take money out of politics, as it would place restrictions on unions and corporations such that they can't use payroll deductions for political donations; however, since corporations do not use employee payroll deductions to fund their political contributions, this restriction would take only union workers' voices out of politics.

Prop. 38 benefits only K-12, not community colleges, and if it passes, "trigger cuts" to community colleges would go into effect. If the voters approve both Propositions 30 and 38, and if Prop. 38 gets just one more vote than Prop. 30, then only Prop. 38 would go into effect.

Following the discussion, by unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Terry Mulcaire and seconded by Sean Martin to publically oppose Propositions 32 and 38 (17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). Following the vote, the Council considered options for and benefits of publicizing the endorsements (e.g., via press releases through local news outlets and radio, submitting an op-ed piece to the local newspaper, and/or setting up tables on campus with informational literature). Councilors also discussed the constraints on the District with regard to political activities (i.e., no District resources may be used for political activities) and whether those same constraints apply to AFA, which is a separate and distinct, non-profit organization with an established political action committee. Julie directed AFA staff to research this issue and report back. She also informed the Council that, along with Warren Ruud, she had met with student leaders, who are developing a "Student Ambassador Program," with a focus on visiting classes with information about registering to vote. Julie also directed the Council's attention to the Sonoma County Office of Education guidelines for political activity—an excerpt of which the Human Resources Department recently emailed to all staff. (To access a complete copy of the guidelines, see <http://www.sclscal.org/node/4765>.) In response to follow-up questions related to Proposition 30, the students, and the Board of Trustees, Julie noted that the student leadership had never provided answers to the Council's questions prior to their event, and she has not yet spoken to the Board.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President's Report. Julie informed the Council that she is serving on a committee that Dr. Chong formed to manage one portion of the \$5 million gift that SRJC received from an anonymous donor. The SRJC Foundation has invested the \$5 million, and interest is going to fund student scholarships. There are three different scholarships for which students will be able to apply. The District is calling one "pot" of money a "Teaching Fellows Program." Dr. Chong spoke about this program in his address to the community at the end of Spring 2012, and he is very interested in getting the work done as quickly as possible so the District can start awarding scholarships as soon as Spring 2013. Financial Aid Director Kris Shear and Scholarship Programs Manager Rachael Cutcher put together a committee, comprised of Julie, as AFA President; Academic Senate President Robin Fautley; and Deans Ty Benoit, Joel Gordon, and Kris Abrahamson. Dr. Chong gave the committee its charge, and the group started meeting over the summer to set up the program, the parameters, the application process, and forms, etc. The committee is currently finalizing the application form for the student scholarships and the faculty mentors. For the spring semester, students may receive up to an \$1,800 award, and they will work with assigned faculty members. In future years, the scholarship will be a year-long award at approximately \$1,800 per semester. The idea is that each student will spend time with a faculty member. For example, students may work with counselors if they're interested in getting into counseling, or with an Art Department instructor in the SRJC Gallery if they're interested in art. The Teaching Fellows Program is designed for any student considering a career in an educational environment. Students could be interested in the K-12 or university level, but mentoring will happen at SRJC with SRJC faculty. One of the concerns that the committee is dealing with, because of the pairing component, is that, if enough faculty members don't step forward, then students would risk losing their scholarships. There is a similar concern about pairing students with adjunct faculty members (e.g., if the adjunct faculty members were to lose their assignments in the second semester, this would compromise students paired with those faculty members). For the first semester of this program (Spring 2013), the District is soliciting applications from contract faculty only; however, Julie said that committee members are interested in figuring out ways to include adjunct faculty in the future. In the discussion that followed, Councilors raised the following concerns, comments, and questions:

- What if there is a particular teacher who wants to mentor a particular student?

Julie's response: There is a question on both the student and faculty application forms that addresses this possibility, although there is no guarantee that the request will be honored. The scholarship is merit-based. The minimum GPA is 3.0, and the student has to have completed 24 units by the end of Fall 2012. The scholarship would begin in Spring 2013. Students don't have to have a major, although there is a question that asks them to state the disciplines in which they're interested in majoring. Students would have to make it through the initial weeding and would be selected on the basis of the rest of the information that they provide. If both parties—both faculty mentor and student mentee—are interested in a particular pairing, the selection committee might think it would be a good idea.

- The same administrators seem to be serving on these District committees and task forces. Why is that? Please convey to the District that feedback from a faculty member.
- What is the incentive for the faculty member?

Julie's response: The mentorship could count towards College service, PGI credit, or Flex credit. (The mentorship would only count in one of those three categories.) The student would not be working a specified number of hours per week. There would be a time commitment on the part of the instructor and a range of hours for faculty involvement (e.g., three hours a week in the library or as a counselor; some regular meetings and time checking in with the students—maybe giving them some additional tasks, such as some tutoring, etc.). One concern is that, since the regular faculty has a 5-hour-a-week obligation, whatever the time commitment is should not exceed that contractual obligation.

- How many students will be part of the first group?

Julie's response: That question is open. The intent is to cast a wide net. Based upon their past experience with scholarship programs, some of the committee members argued for offering up to 25 awards for the spring. Although some might think that number is way too high for a pilot program, students might be inclined to think that, with 25 spots, they would have a chance of being selected and may be more likely to apply. If there were only 10 - 12 scholarships, some students would think they didn't have a chance and wouldn't submit an application. The other concern is to make sure that the District has enough faculty matches.

2. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.
3. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.