

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 28, 2012

(Approved by the Executive Council on December 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
Staff members present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4245, on the Santa Rosa campus.

MEMBER CONCERNS

None

MINUTES

There being no corrections or additions, by unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Paula Burks and seconded by Terry Mulcaire to approve the minutes from the November 14, 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> .)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. College Council Policies (Technology Use, Discipline, Safety). Prior to this meeting, Councilors received recent drafts of several sets of policies and procedures that are currently under revision and moving through the College Council constituent-review process. Julie said that I.T. Director Scott Conrad drafted the Technology Use policy and procedures, and Environmental Health & Safety Director Doug Kuula is working on revisions to the Illness and Injury Prevention policy and procedures. In the spring, both Scott and Doug will be attending AFA meetings to present their latest drafts and solicit feedback from the Council. Julie also encouraged Councilors to attend the December 5th meeting of the Academic Senate to hear Scott's 10-minute presentation to senators. In drafting the proposed Technology Use policy, Scott Conrad reviewed the work of a Senate sub-committee on this topic. He also looked at a number of other community college policies. Requesting that Councilors make their questions and concerns as specific as possible, Julie opened the floor to discussion.
 - Computer and Communications Technology Use (formerly 6.9, will be 2.13 and 2.13P)
 - The language seems to reflect the subset of people who have expressed discontent with their email boxes getting cluttered with discussions on topics that they have no interest in. The language that is used in the policy is going to be interpreted broadly. It seems to reflect an instinct to restrict, and that is of concern. (Julie noted that we should ask Scott if that is, indeed, the intent.)

- “Broadcast messages must be relevant to the majority of the recipients on the distribution list.” How is someone going to know whether something is relevant or not? Later on in the procedures, there is language about online forums. The forums are intended to facilitate continuation of the discussion at another site for those folks who don’t see the relevance, but it doesn’t mean that there isn’t relevance.
- Regarding the background and context: About a year ago, after Scott Conrad was hired, he met with several officers and members of the Academic Senate. At that time, everyone’s biggest complaint was that their emails boxes were filling up with things that they didn’t care about, and the question was put to him, “How do we manage our emails?” The thinking was that everyone doesn’t have to see off-topic emails, there was no hidden agenda to restrict access to the District’s email system. The discussion opened the doorway for Scott, who wanted to improve the system, to craft this set of procedures.
- Related to the issue of faculty using the District’s email system for political advocacy, there’s a recent article about a faculty member discovering just how much the district was monitoring employees’ use of their email system—yet, it wasn’t coded in policy. Everybody uses email all the time. When the District decides to step in and monitor the usage, that is a concern.
- It seems that there is an intention to limit messages that are sent out to DL.STAFF.ALL, but the way the policy is worded, the limit is spilling over to smaller distribution lists. It makes more sense to limit the idea of broadcasts in the “broad” sense.
- In the section on adjunct faculty, there’s a reference to their remaining in the email system based on terms provided by the contract between the District and the union. There’s no specific reference, and one should be included in the appendix. (Julie commented that she believes this language is Scott’s acknowledgement that something will be worked out between AFA and the District, and that she would verify with Scott that the specific reference would be included in the appendix.)
- There are some references to discipline and due process in these procedures and, also, in the other two policies that AFA is reviewing. Maybe there should be a Contract reference for discipline and due process, in addition to the Contract reference that deals with adjunct faculty keeping their email accounts.
- Related to the “Account Termination” section on page 5, it’s an adjunct issue to get clarity about how long adjunct faculty can maintain their email accounts if they lose their assignments. For contract faculty, allowing only one week of access after termination doesn’t seem long enough. There are a number of full-time faculty who are involved in college activities, and they wouldn’t know about them if they weren’t getting email messages. Someone who is involved in training the next person who will take her place will need more time than a week. The cut-off seems like a guillotine.
- “Employee resignation” needs to be separated from “contract faculty cessation.” Contract faculty might continue in some other capacity. Upon retirement, contract faculty become adjunct, and then they’d be covered by the section on adjunct faculty.
- The language doesn’t address the faculty member who for other reasons may not be continuing as adjunct, but wants to get Arts & Lectures announcements, for example. How many retirees are there this year? It doesn’t seem like there are that many that the District couldn’t ask them individually if they wanted to continue their email accounts.
- One week is hardly enough time for someone to transfer to their own email account or deal with student complaints about grades or requests for letters of recommendation.
- There should be some reference to Article 9 (Academic Freedom). Email is part of our academic lives. Academic freedom protects my right to say things even if people don’t want to hear it.
- The same issues apply to online forums.

- Re: the interface with social media pages, like Facebook: When you sign up for Facebook, if you give them the College email address, there may be a problem.
 - In the section on "District Email," it says that "Access to these systems is a privilege," but faculty are required to use the District email system.
 - Like access to blackboards, email is part of the faculty's academic equipment.
 - Who is the immediate supervisor? Is it the department chair? If so, the chair is being put in an odd position due to his or her responsibilities.
 - In one place, the term "negligent" is used. What is the intention of that language? In the private sector, if people click on a link in a spam, they're escorted out the door. If I make a mistake—if I inadvertently forward spam to someone—would I be fired? Does that constitute "negligence"?
 - It's a full-time job to manage our email Inboxes—especially for faculty who teach online. It's a maintenance problem.
 - It's a faculty member's professional responsibility to read the DL.STAFF.FAC.ALL email discussions. The online forums are a way to have the collegial discourse and continue those conversations. I think the forums are an answer.
 - The problem is the size limitation. If the District goes to Gmail next year, that will eliminate this problem.
 - Discipline (Policy 2.0): This policy was written by Vice President of Academic Affairs Mary Kay Rudolph and has been run by the District's legal counsel. AFA does not yet have any language in the Contract regarding progressive discipline; however, the classified staff/SEIU does have language in its contract with the District. It was pointed out that the Human Resources Department conducts classes in progressive discipline. A few councilors commented that the proposed language in this draft might not work for faculty. It was suggested that, if the author were to make the term "discipline" more encompassing or strike the word "progressive," the language might work.
 - Illness & Injury Prevention Program Procedures (6.8.2P). Discussion about this set of procedures was postponed to a future meeting.
2. Pay Parity for Adjunct Faculty: Task Force to Draft Resolution? Julie noted that the idea for crafting a resolution regarding AFA's commitment to pay parity for adjunct faculty was an outgrowth of a discussion at the November 14th Council meeting regarding the Adjunct Issues Committee's list of concerns. Vice President for Santa Rosa Mike Starkey reported that the Cabinet had discussed the idea of aligning pay parity with Rank 10 and putting forward a resolution that would include all faculty issues, even though some issues would affect part-time faculty and others would affect full-time faculty. Julie expanded on that suggestion, noting that, rather than creating one resolution for one item, the end result of this alternate approach would be a resolution about AFA's goals and values for the entire faculty. Some of the line items would be applicable to all, some to part-time, and some to full-time. Julie invited the Council to engage in discussion to see if there is interest in putting together a workgroup to craft language for this kind of resolution. Councilors' comments and suggestions included the following:
- The idea of parity is terribly important, but you can't speak about parity until you first make adjustments among the various salary schedules (for example, lab and lecture).
 - As a college, we're going to have to make decisions about where the money is going first, after years of pay cuts and freezes. Rather than choosing between things that could go on the list, the Council could prioritize. For example, the Council could say that lab/lecture parity is a higher priority. Or, the resolution could just state that here are AFA's values, and they're not prioritized. Once we prioritize, then one issue has an advantage over another.
 - The District needs to be reminded about what AFA's goals and values are in general.

- Although Rank 10 is about contract salary placement, it's important to remember that, because the salary schedules are linked, when Rank 10 is reached—all boats rise.
- Would this resolution be the AFA Executive Council making a statement about values, or would the membership be making the statement?
- As the Council has done in the past, we could approve a resolution and post it on AFA's home page as a way to call attention to it and let the membership know that we are taking a position as an organization on issues affecting both part-time and full-time faculty. (See AFA's *20th Anniversary Resolution of Independence* at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/AFA_res_independence.pdf and AFA's resolution encouraging departments to consider in-house applicants during the hiring process for new contract faculty positions at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/AFA_res_hiring-adj.pdf.)
- This process seems backwards. There is still a lot of work to be done in creating a sense of a unified faculty who share common values and who are working together on mutually agreed-upon values. If this body drafts a resolution without participation of the membership, I don't think it will serve the purpose it's supposed to serve. It would be better to have a forum or solicit interest from the membership via email.
- The faculty elects Councilors, and we should be talking to our constituents, our departments, and our committee members. What we glean from those conversations should be informing our Council conversations, and we should provide opportunities for faculty to weigh in. I'm wondering about getting a conversation started, crafting a resolution and encouraging people to use *Dialogue* to write to us.
- We were elected by the faculty to present the discussion to them and invite them to participate, as opposed to inviting them to craft it themselves. It would not work for the Council to craft it, publish it, and not allow the faculty any input. A more organized way to go would be to put together a draft of ideas to begin the conversation.
- Inclusiveness is important, but we don't want to be so inclusive that we hamstring ourselves so that we can't get our work done.
- A good plan would be to start crafting the resolution, and then share it and ask for input. Some education has to be done explaining pay parity, since not everyone knows about it. As people participate, the Council comes from an informed place.
- This discussion reflects the classic tension between participatory democracy and representative democracy.
- Maybe the task force could develop a *Dialogue* piece that describes what parity means and why AFA has an interest in it, and then we could invite faculty to a meeting. The ultimate document needn't be developed by people in this room.
- AFA needs to educate people and provide some context and history, in terms of where we are relative to other colleges in the system and why we're here. We could easily link to articles that are archived on the website. A lot of issues have to do with pay—hourly parity, lab/lecture parity, Rank 10. We're also in the worst budget crisis in many years. Maybe we're talking about crafting a resolution that starts a conversation about what AFA is working towards and what our values are.
- All of these items pertain to when and if money comes back. It's not something we're fighting for at this moment in time, because it can't happen. Rank 10 benefits adjunct faculty. The linked schedules were a stroke of brilliance. If money starts coming back, we should be looking at where that money is going to go. There's a remote possibility that categorical funding will come back for parity pay and adjunct office hours. If it does come back, it should go to adjunct faculty.
- The resolution should link to our fundamental values as an organization, so it's perceived as an all faculty issue.

Following the discussion, Lara Branen-Ahumada, Terry Ehret, Deirdre Frontzcak, and Margaret Pennington indicated their interest in working on the language for the resolution.

Julie made the point that the resolution is not deadline-driven and doesn't need to get done before the end of the semester. She asked that others let her know if they are interested in participating in the task force, and then the group will figure out the best time to meet.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Appointment of Two Regular Councilor Leave Replacements for Spring 2013. Julie noted that Dianne Davis, regular faculty member in the Disability Resources Department on sabbatical leave this semester, would be returning to her Council seat in the spring. On behalf of Dianne and the entire Council, Julie thanked Sharien Hinton, also from the Disability Resources Department, for taking on the steep learning curve and continuing to represent the interests of DRD/allied faculty on the Council in Dianne's absence. Julie also mentioned that she and Sharien had discussed the possibility of her running in the Spring 2013 election for a two-year-term seat on the Council. The other two regular Councilor leave replacements for Fall 2012 have been Shawn Brumbaugh, Life Sciences, who has been serving in Karen Frindell Teuscher's seat, and Phyllis Usina, Learning Resources on the Petaluma campus, who has been serving in Mary Pierce's seat. Julie said that Karen and Mary will not be returning to the Council in Spring 2013, and the Cabinet's recommendation to the Council is to appoint Shawn and Phyllis to those two vacant seats. By unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made by Brenda Flyswithawks and seconded by Sean Martin to appoint Shawn Brumbaugh, as the leave replacement for Karen Frindell Teuscher, and Phyllis Usina, as the leave replacement for Mary Pierce, for the Spring 2013 semester (18 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). The Council joined Julie in a round of applause to thank all three faculty members for their service on the Council this semester.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President's Report. Julie presented brief reports on the following items:
 - FACCC Advocacy Conference. This annual conference will be held in Sacramento on the first Sunday and Monday in March 2013. FACCC presents workshops on Sunday, and faculty and students meet with legislators on Monday. As it gets closer to those dates, FACCC will be adding more detailed information to their website. (Some information is already available at http://www.faccc.org/ap_2013_TEMP.asp .) Julie asked Councilors to consider attending one or both days of the conference, and she set January 31, 2013 as the deadline for them to express their interest via email to AFA staff. (AFA's Professional Conference Attendance Policy is posted at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Policies/professional_conf.pdf .)
 - Leadership Planning: Bring a Colleague to an AFA Meeting. In an effort to plan for the future, the Academic Senate is encouraging each senator to bring a faculty member to a Senate meeting as a visitor. In a similar vein, given that the learning curve for being an AFA Councilor is steep and some faculty members are talking about retiring from AFA in the not-too-distant future, Julie encouraged Councilors to seek out colleagues who are interested in what AFA does and bring them to a Council meeting.
 - Strategic Planning. Workgroups are being formed and Dr. Chong is contacting proposed co-chairs (one each from faculty and management). Each one of the six groups will focus on a different issue (for example, evaluating the process, creating the vision/mission, goals and objectives, communications, etc.).
 - Parcel Tax. In their monthly meeting with Dr. Chong, Julie and Conciliation/Grievance Officer Jacqueline McGhee learned that the District is now thinking of asking the voters to approve a parcel tax measure in 2014, rather than in 2013, as previously considered. The new thinking is that the fact that Democrats now have majorities in both houses of state government, and this presents an opportunity for the legislature to change the voting requirement for bills that have to do with taxation by lowering the threshold from the currently required 2/3 supermajority to 55 percent, thereby making it easier to pass parcel taxes. Such a change would increase the likelihood of a successful parcel tax. Also, if the District were to go out for a parcel tax in 2013, it would have to finance a special election, which would cost about \$500,000.

- Additions to the Schedule of Classes

- Summer 2013: According to Vice President of Academic Affairs Mary Kay Rudolph, the District plans to roll over the number of FTEF (65-70) from Summer 2012. The District has designated Summer 2013 as the "summer of student success." VPAA Rudolph has charged department chairs with developing summer schedules that focus on student success (e.g., Basic Skills classes, classes that are part of a sequence, classes needed for transfer, etc.). The District will be distributing classes unequally from department to department. It was noted that the creation of the schedule is outside of AFA's purview, and the District has the right of assignment.

Several Councilors spoke to the fact that the District gave departments the option to decide on a department-by-department basis whether they wanted to reduce their Summer 2012 schedule so as to preserve more offerings for the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 schedules or maintain a full summer schedule. Julie noted that the concerns and parameters around summer scheduling are different than those that affect the regular school year. Deciding where to put resources, which often requires balancing the needs of students (for example, CSU and UC students who want to take classes at SRJC when they're home for the summer) and the needs of faculty, who count on the income from summer school, is a challenge. Warren also pointed out that students in certain departments, such as Health Sciences, count on being able to complete programs and certificates over the summer. In 2011, the District originally intended to cut the summer schedule by 80 percent. AFA strongly advocated against that idea, and the District eventually ended up reducing the schedule by only 20 percent.

- Spring 2013. There have been a few additions to the Spring 2013 schedule (five classes). Every class that is added to the schedule will be paid for out of the District's pocket, because SRJC will not receive any money from Prop 30 this academic year.
- 2013-14 Academic Year. The District is planning to increase the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 schedules by 7 percent to as much as 10 percent. A 7 percent increase represents a cost of \$1.8 million. VPAA Rudolph said that there would be approximately an additional 255 sections per semester in the next academic year. The State's workload number has not been changed, and the District's funding number hasn't been changed. The District is planning to go on "stability" next year (2013-14).

The Council engaged in brief discussion about how the State funding mechanism works and the factors that might impact a district's decision to reduce or increase the size of the schedule of classes. Publications Coordinator Terry Mulcaire noted that there would be an article in the next *AFA Update* regarding the information that the District is providing to AFA about its budget post-Prop 30 and how it plans to manage enrollment. It was pointed out that restrictions on repeatability from the Chancellor's office would be going into effect in Fall 2013—the same time that the District will be trying to increase enrollment.

- Meeting with the Board. On November 30, along with leaders from SEIU/Classified Staff and Associated Students, as well as Dr. Chong, Julie and Warren will be attending a (second) breakfast meeting with members of the Board of Trustees to discuss issues of common concern. Julie plans to report back at the Council meeting on December 12.
2. Treasurer's Report: October 2012. Secretary/Treasurer Paula Burks directed the Council's attention to several items that affected the bottom line for the month of October, including: (1) Contract faculty dues from October 31 paychecks dues were not deposited until November, which reduced the amount of October's revenue; (2) Two months of FACCC contract membership dues (for October and November) were paid in October; and (3) Travel and registration expenses for the CCCI Fall 2012 conference in southern California, which required additional costs for airline flights, were paid in October.
 3. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report and discussion were conducted in closed session.
 4. Negotiations Report. This report and discussion were conducted in closed session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.