

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING MINUTES

December 10, 2014

(Approved by Executive Council on February 11, 2015)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Julie Thompson, <i>presiding</i>	*Terry Ehret	*Sean Martin	*MJ Papa
*Filomena Avila	*Karen Frindell Teuscher	Jacqueline McGhee	*Margaret Pennington
Paulette Bell	*Deirdre Frontczak	*Bud Metzger	*George Sellu
*Denise Beeson	*Michelle Hughes Markovics	*Terry Mulcaire	*Karen Stanley
*Paula Burks	*Andre LaRue	* Matt Murray	

Officers/Negotiators/Appointed Positions present: Ted Crowell, Dianne Davis, Mark Ferguson, Warren Ruud

Staff members present: Candy Shell, Carol Valencia

Faculty members present (Santa Rosa): Carmen Castillo, Joe Fassler, Robin Fautley, Eric Thompson, Alicia Virtue

Faculty members present (Petaluma): Molly Matheson, Erin Sullivan

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4245, on the Santa Rosa campus with video-conferencing to Room 726, on the Petaluma Campus.

PRESENTATIONS

- Perspective on Building with Bond Funds: Process, Transparency, and Faculty Involvement** (*Will Baty, Interim Dean III Learning Resources & Educational Technology and primary planner and consultant on the major Frank P. Doyle project*)
 - Will began his presentation by explaining that he will focus on answering the question of how faculty members can be part of the Bond planning process.
 - For comparison, he summarized the level of faculty member involvement on the last Bond. **With Measure A:**
 - Much of the planning was done in advance of the Bond's passage, and that planning was administration-driven.
 - Criticism was made that instruction did not drive the decisions.
 - There was faculty member involvement on several special projects:
 - Petaluma Campus, Phase II—How the faculty offices were designed, with all department offices in one space, came from faculty input/research.
 - Doyle Library—Planning process on the building design used focus groups (with 38 faculty members). Faculty members were active with significant input.
 - Some of the projects had little/no faculty input (e.g. the parking garage).
 - There were other "unexpected consequences":
 - The College bought steel futures for Doyle Library to lock in current (lower) prices. This practice resulted in much lower construction costs.
 - The Culinary Center project was not high on the original priority list. The District was renting downtown space for its culinary courses when a rat infestation was discovered. As a result, the District decided it needed to build its own building sooner than expected. This decision had the consequence of postponing the construction of other buildings higher on the priority list.

- It's important to remember that nothing is set in stone because unexpected things happen over the life of the Bond.
- He is confident that the process for Measure H will be different. He has several reasons for this optimism:
 - Dr. Chong is committed to an open, transparent, faculty member-driven process and has been on record about this repeatedly.
 - So far, the process has already been more open.
 - There is a published list of projects on the [Measure H website](#) with cost estimates. This list was used to calculate the amount of the proposed bond.
- At this stage, there are several Measure H high-priority projects:
 - New STEM building
 - New Barnett replacement building
- The first thing that will be done in the Bond implementation will be the master planning process. A planning firm will be selected, and this will be an important decision with faculty member (and campus-wide) involvement. This decision will use focus groups and follow-through. Dr. Chong is looking for "consensus" in decision-making, but the involvement will be "input" for the Board and will not determine the final say.
- Will sees several specific projects in which faculty members can be involved:
 - New STEM Building—Faculty can be involved in the process of hiring an architect and looking at the portfolios/track records of candidates. Faculty members can also join the "planning group" (comprised of both faculty members and administrators).
 - Burbank Auditorium remodel
 - Infrastructure/Technology/Health & Safety
 - Decisions will be made regarding computers throughout the campus (the number, type, and location).
 - There are many standing Faculty Committees (Senate and other) already in existence with faculty member representation.
 - There will be decisions regarding ADA upgrades and access; there is an existing committee for this.
- There will be a yearly budget as we go forward because not all the Bond money is available immediately; money is invested and sold throughout the 10 years of the Bond.
- Will asked the Council and faculty members present, "Where do you want to put your energy in this process?" He suggested that AFA and others make sure that the faculty representatives to Committees report back on the decision-making process and progress. These are the ways that faculty can have a greater positive influence.
- Will added that faculty members should be ready with their ideas so they can make things happen. He believes there is a valuable role for faculty members to play.
- Questions & Answers:
 - When will we see the first funding?
 - I don't know. They will hire the master planning firm first. We are probably at least a year away.
 - How will the District contract the jobs out; how will labor be employed?
 - One option is to adopt Project Labor Agreements (PLAs), but there are other options available. Faculty members can lobby for PLAs, but the Board will make the decision. The Board has chosen Prevailing Wage Contracts in the past, but there are no legal restrictions on the Board in this regard.
 - Can you provide further clarification on that?
 - Public projects can be "previous wage" or "multi-prime contracting," where the contractor owns the building until it's finished. That's what was used with Doyle Library. That way the contractor assumes risks along with the College and has a vested interest in the on-time/on-budget completion of the project. They are not held to "lowest bid." Lowest bid is a misnomer anyway because a "lowest bid" contractor can issue multiple "change orders," which then increase the cost. That's how it was done with the Race Building, and there were numerous problems. The College had to sue the contractor to get it all corrected. Everything is on hold right now because of the changes in the Board of Trustees. Dr. Chong says his door is always open, so anyone can propose his/her ideas to him.

- Has the Bond Oversight Committee been chosen?
 - No, not yet. That committee looks at only the past actions, not the future ones.
- The [Measure H webpage](#) was projected onto the screen. The following was highlighted:
 - The Capital Projects sheet includes the proposed projects, with a dollar amount for each one; these are not real numbers but are only estimates. The Bond will not pay for all the projects on this list.
 - The Accreditation process this spring will also have a role in what gets done.
 - We do not know when the projects will start.

2. **The 2014 Tentative Agreement in Action: Q&As** (*Warren Ruud, AFA Chief Negotiator*)

Warren projected the 2014 Tentative Agreement (TA) Summary

(http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_May2014.pdf) and

pointed out the following items:

- Articles 3 through 7 were “clean ups.” Changes were also made to bring them up to date.
- Articles 10 (Benefits) and 26 (Salary Schedules) are negotiated every year.
- Articles 13 (Chairs & Coordinators) and 32 (Workload) addressed problems that have come up year after year. Now all faculty positions have defined job duties and compensation.
- After the TA passed, we are being vigilant in making sure that representatives of the District understand and comply with the new provisions.
- There are some issues with implementation of the TA this year:
 - Article 13 (Coordinator Reassigned Time)—AFA wants fair compensation for the work done by coordinators. The District gave 5 percent reassigned time to all coordinators (equivalent to 32.265 hours/semester) no matter the workload. We are working with the District on determining what is “fair compensation.” Some of this might have to be worked out via Grievances.
 - Article 32 (Augmented Lab Compensation)—These new provisions have not been implemented yet. We are waiting for the Senate process to be completed and are hoping for a list in the spring. There is also the question of whether the District believes it has money available to implement it.
 - Article 32 (Work Experience)—Title 5 requirements were put into effect. There were some ripple effects with like load, etc. as a result of the new provisions.
 - Article 32 (Maximum Class Size Limits)—Limits are now supposed to be determined by “pedagogical principles”; those limits must also be fiscally feasible. The class sizes are supposed to be uniform for all sections of each course. AFA believes that the process of determining class sizes should have been “bottom up,” but instead a “top down” process was used—that is, from historical enrollment data, the District chose the largest enrollment for a section of a course as the specified enrollment for all sections of that course. We hope to get this fixed. Several issues were brought up by the Council: class size discrepancies between sections taught by contract faculty and those taught by adjunct faculty; the class size committee looking at “categories of classes” rather than determining sizes course by course. Warren explained that AFA believes that faculty should be the ones to apply the “pedagogical principles” while the District should determine the “financial feasibility.”
 - Article 32 (Extended Lecture)—We have talked about these new provisions many times before. These new provisions are mostly worked out with the District, and the remaining provisions will be applied this spring.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Carol Valencia.