

## **EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

April 27, 2016

*(Approved by Executive Council on May 11, 2016)*

Executive Councilors present (noted by \*):

*Sean Martin, <i>presiding</i>	*Jeanette Ben Farhat	*Robert Jackson	*Margaret Pennington
*Debbie Albers	*Shawn Brumbaugh	*Molly Matheson	*Karen Stanley
*Filomena Avila	*Terry Ehret	*MJ Papa	*Michelle Van Aalst
*Denise Beeson	*Deirdre Frontczak	*Terry Mulcaire	*Albert Yu
*Paulette Bell	*Michelle Hughes Markovics	Dwayne Mulder	

Negotiators/Appointed Positions present: Will Baty, Marc Bojanowski, Ted Crowell, Mark Ferguson, Julie Thompson, Warren Ruud

Staff members present: Candy Shell, Carol Valencia

Guest Present: Galen George, Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory (EEOA) Committee Member

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4245, on the Santa Rosa campus.

### **CLOSED SESSION REPORTS**

1. **Negotiations Report.** This report and discussion were conducted in Closed Session.
2. **Conciliation/Grievance Report.** This report and discussion were conducted in Closed Session.

Closed Session adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

### **OPEN SESSION**

Open Session reconvened at 4:03 p.m.

#### **MEMBER CONCERNS WITHIN AFA'S PURVIEW**

1. Terry Ehret brought up an issue on behalf of Councilor-Elect Bud Metzger. Referring to an article in the Spring 2016 California Part-Time Faculty Association (CPFA) journal [recently distributed to all faculty members] regarding parity, Bud suggested that this information should be shared with our faculty members.
2. Terry explained that her department has Petaluma courses labeled "Transfer Track," but does not provide faculty members with information about what this means for faculty who take those assignments. She suggested that it would be helpful to have information about transfer track courses available for faculty members. (Ref: [https://www.santarosa.edu/petaluma/transfertrack/.](https://www.santarosa.edu/petaluma/transfertrack/))
3. Filomena Avila reiterated a prior concern about the inequity in class cancellations between the Petaluma and Santa Rosa campuses.
4. Filomena raised a concern about the District's efforts to attract dual enrollment students that are resulting in the hiring of high school teachers as SRJC faculty without load and SRJC faculty pay.
5. Michelle Hughes Markovics read a concern from a faculty member about the SRJC family leave program that requires faculty members to exhaust their sick leave. This member believes we should have fully paid family leave.
6. Michelle also read a concern from a faculty member about the progress on lab and lecture equity implementation. Many faculty members are asking whether/when this will be implemented. Sean responded that it is definitely on AFA's list of priorities as we negotiate with the District this spring.

7. Deirdre Frontczak reported that she was asked by FACCC whether AFA would like to weigh in on a FACCC endorsement of Assemblymember Marc Levine. The FACCC board will make a decision on May 6. Please give any input you have to Deirdre or the AFA office before that date.

### MINUTES

With a correction to the location of the meeting from the Santa Rosa campus to the Petaluma campus, by unanimous voice vote, the Council approved a motion made and seconded to approve the minutes from the April 13, 2016 Executive Council meeting as submitted (16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). (Approved minutes are posted at <http://santarosa.edu/afa/minutes.shtml> .)

### PRESENTATIONS

1. **District EEO Plan** (*Galen George, regular faculty member in the Department of Chemistry and Physics and EEOA Committee Member*)
  - Galen explained that the Committee was charged with developing and implementing an EEO plan. The current plan is "bare-bones" with only State-mandated information included; it was approved in 2014 and will expire in June 2017.
  - The Committee has not made significant progress on the re-write this year due to a lack of a quorum for over half of their meetings. The Committee is optimistic that they will be able to get the plan written over the next year. The Committee has looked at 12 to 15 other plans to get ideas. They are trying to come up with something that fits us as a college.
  - Questions & Answers:
    - Q: What are the future issues?
    - A: Component 10 of the plan says we need to make sure our applicant pool is diverse. A major issue is that, although the College has diversity data for students, we do not have any data on the diversity of our applicant pools, and the data will not be forthcoming from the Chancellor's office (as originally thought). There are people on the Committee who are arguing for the idea that faculty diversity should mirror that of the student population.
    - Q: Is the Committee aware that the diversity of applicants in different fields of study varies greatly?
    - A: The committee is coming around to understanding this. Our goal is to eliminate bias in our hiring committees—not to have the exact same diversity in every department.
    - Q: Although we have a compliance representative overseeing the interviews by departments, there is no such oversight of the higher-level interviews with the Vice Presidents and President—how can we ensure there is no bias in those interviews? One idea is to have a silent observer present at those meetings (perhaps a member of the hiring committee).
    - A: There is nothing in the legislation that addresses that issue.
    - Q: The issue in our department is the ability of diverse faculty members to afford to live in this area. We need competitive pay to attract diverse applicants. Will that issue be addressed in the plan?
    - A: Component 13 could address this issue—possibly with subsidized housing or something else that would help attract and retain people.
    - Q: Is there any provision in the plan that addresses people who are being hired for grant programs not using the regular hiring process? What will happen to those faculty members when the grants go away?
    - A: Those situations do not fit under the plan because the faculty members are not hired through regular hiring committees.
2. **Budget Update** (*Will Baty, regular faculty member in the Learning Resources Department and AFA Budget Analyst*)
  - Will summarized the context for the current District budget problems. The District is saying that in 2012 the State forced SRJC to make significant cuts to its schedule; however, this is not true. The District projected that Proposition 30 (a sales and income tax increase initiative with provisions to benefit California Community College enrollment growth funding) would not pass and instead chose to make cuts and go on "stability funding," and this one decision is the root cause of our

problems today. Going on stability creates a cycle that is difficult to break. We are seeing an enrollment decline as a result.

- Districts with declining enrollment do not receive growth funding, but they maintain base enrollment funding for the first year they experience a decrease. This is called “stability funding,” and it is intended to smooth out funding changes caused by a temporary enrollment drop. (Reference: *EdSource*, a not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization established in California in 1977.)
- Now in 2016 the District is saying that we must cut the schedule again because we haven’t had the expected enrollment growth. There is no contingency plan to address the possibility that there will be more enrollment decreases. The problem is that the District is not using any evidence to make its decisions—they are just guessing about what will happen in the future.
- The purpose of stability funding is to soften the impact of a decline in enrollment and allow districts to buy time so that in the future a district can grow enrollment and/or reduce its expenses. It will not work in our case because our enrollment planning is broken. We do not really plan—we just do what we’ve always done and expect a different result.
- Because the District has flexibility while on stability regarding when to declare the loss of FTES, in the short term, the District will receive its original (high) funding level while offering fewer classes. The question we should ask is, “Where is that extra money going?” The District is using going on and off stability as a strategy in order to put extra money into “reserves” to make them look good on paper.
- Some Districts have used stability funding to better their finances. Foothill-DeAnza College is an example of how to use stability effectively. They said that being a smaller college means fewer managers and fewer classified employees and cut their expenses accordingly. The fundamental assumption of stability funding is that you integrate enrollment management and fiscal planning. That is what our leaders are not doing.
- Even though there are externalities regarding the budget that we can’t control (e.g. non-repeatability, earmarked funds coming from the State, etc.), there are many internal decisions that we can control. SRJC continues to “blame the State” for its problems instead of owning them and working to find solutions. Our only enrollment strategy has been to treat course offerings like a “faucet”—turn it on, turn it off. Many studies show that this practice leads to further drops in enrollment.
- Some decisions in the forefront that the College needs to address now are:
  - Stability funding
  - Enrollment Management Strategy
  - Educational and Enrollment Planning for the Petaluma campus
  - Building of a new Southwest facility/campus
- Will is writing a new Dialogue article regarding the budget that will come out soon.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. **Appointment of AFA Adjunct Rep to BAC for 2016-17**
  - Sean explained that we have two nominees for this appointment. There being no further nominees, a motion was made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote to move this item to an Action Item (15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
2. **Appointment of AFA Rep to EEOA for Fall 2016 plus co-appointment for 2016-17**
  - Sean explained that we have one nominee for this appointment. There being no further nominees, a motion was made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote to move this item to an Action Item (15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions). We do not have any nominations for the Senate/AFA co-appointment at this time; we will place this item on a future Council Agenda.
3. **Appointment of two AFA Reps to Fringe Benefits Committee for 2016-17**
  - Sean explained that we have no nominees at this time. We will put this item on the next Council Agenda.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Appointment of AFA Adjunct Rep to BAC for 2016-17**
  - This item was moved from a Discussion Item. Paper ballots were issued to the Council and counted by Michelle Van Aalst and Candy Shell. The Council appointed Bud Metzger.

**2. Appointment of AFA Rep to EEOA for Fall 2016**

- This item was moved from a Discussion Item. A motion was made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote to appoint Jeanette Ben Farhat (15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

**OTHER REPORTS**

**1. Treasurer's Report – March 2016.** Michelle Van Aalst reported as follows:

- The *Conference & Travel* expense was for pre-paid registration fees for the recent Spring CCCI Conference, in Sacramento.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Carol Valencia.