

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

February 13, 2019

(Approved by Executive Council on February 27, 2019)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Karen Frindell Teuscher, <i>presiding</i>	*Dianne Davis	*Bud Metzger	Mike Starkey
*Filomena Avila	*Claire Drucker	*Terry Mulcaire	*Erin Sullivan
*Paulette Bell	*Robert Jackson	*Jessica Paisley	*Sarah Whyly
*Shawn Brumbaugh	*Sean Martin	*Margaret Pennington	*Albert Yu
*Ted Crowell	*Molly Matheson	*Karen Stanley	

Negotiators/Appointed Positions present: Mark Ferguson, Warren Ruud, Julie Thompson

Staff members present: Carol Valencia

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. in Lark #2004, 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.
3. **Cabinet Report**. This report and discussion were conducted in Closed Session.

Closed Session adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

OPEN SESSION

Open Session reconvened at 4:00 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS WITHIN AFA'S PURVIEW

1. **AFA Website Q&A Page**. Margaret Pennington suggested that a "Question & Answer" page be created on the AFA website whereby faculty questions could be posted as they are received with the answers added once sent. She also suggested that there be a way for faculty members to add "comments" after the answer is posted. Karen responded that we are in the process of making changes to our website that would allow us to have such a page. The Council will be asked to give feedback on the new format before it is put into place.
2. **Article 16 Department Preference Forms**. Paulette Bell raised a question from an adjunct faculty member who made a request (via the department preference form) to be assigned only online courses. This faculty member was offered only face-to-face courses and asked if departments have a duty to honor the preference forms. Karen responded that the preference forms do not hold any weight and are, in fact, optional. They do not have to be used in the assigning of classes in accordance with Article 16: Hourly Assignments.
3. **Manager Retirement and Article 16 Rights**. Paulette raised a concern from several adjunct faculty members in a department where a "manager" retired and then was placed on the length-of-service list and received assignments as an adjunct faculty member in that department. She asked if this is allowed and explained that the faculty in the department would like the question to be answered in the Minutes.
4. **Answers to Questions Posed to AFA**. Paulette explained that she was contacted by a faculty member who asked for an answer to several questions posed to AFA via the adjunct faculty distribution list by

another faculty member, and did not feel that their request was adequately considered. There was a discussion about AFA's attempt to answer faculty questions via the monthly *For Adjuncts, By Adjuncts* newsletter (see: <http://www.afa-srjc.org/adjuncts.shtml>), the scheduling of open meetings for adjunct faculty to pose questions, and through the offer to meet individually with faculty who have questions. AFA has made a good faith effort to answer the questions posed by faculty members. Karen concluded the discussion by stating that AFA has important work to complete, and we would not be fulfilling our duty to *all* faculty if we allow the agenda of any individual faculty member to derail us from that work.

MINUTES

There being no corrections or additions, the Council approved a motion made and seconded to approve the minutes from the January 23, 2019 Executive Council meeting as submitted (17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

(Approved minutes are posted at <http://www.afa-srjc.org/minutes.shtml> .)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Social Security Option for Adjunct Faculty Members

- Robert Jackson, AFA Budget Analyst presented the following information by way of a PowerPoint presentation to the Council and guests.
- Slide #1: *Why is no Social Security (SS) coverage a problem for adjuncts?*
 - Some adjuncts earned SS from other jobs before beginning their teaching career at SRJC.
 - The Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) will reduce any SS benefits received.
 - The CalSTRS Defined Benefit program is not an option for most adjuncts because of the time it takes to become vested.
- Slide #2: *Case Study #1*
 - An adjunct who works 20 years in a SS-covered job, and then starts a SRJC career that lasts 15 years.
 - What they will have in pension funds after those 35 years of working?
 - The CalSTRS Cash Balance plan has the lowest return.
 - A SS plan would be the 2nd best return.
 - A CalSTRS Defined Benefit would have the best return, but vesting (5 years of full-time service credit) is required.
- Slide #3: *Other Community Colleges with SS Options for Adjunct Faculty*
 - Of the other California Community Colleges, 14 offer SS to their adjunct faculty.
 - Having a new SS option could cost the District an additional \$150,000/year (due to the higher contribution rate of SS compared to the other retirement options).
- Questions & Answers:
 - Q: What about the Fidelity plan that the District offers?
 - A: Only about 5 percent of adjuncts are in the Fidelity plan. Most are in the Cash Balance plan.
 - Q: If only a few faculty members choose the SS option, would the extra cost to the District be minimal?
 - Yes. The only extra cost would be the difference between the employer contributions for the current plan and the SS plan.
 - Comment: In the 2011 survey conducted by AFA (see http://www.afa-srjc.org/Surveys/salary-benes_survey_sp11_results-adjunct.pdf), 52 percent expressed an interest in having a SS option, so that was a majority.
 - Q: Quite a few adjuncts were harmed during the years when the Human Resources department gave erroneous information about retirement options. Is there any "after-the-fact" remedy for these faculty members?
 - A: Our contract grievance process has a time limit that would apply. (See Article [11.04.B.](#)) We don't know if there is some other remedy via the court system.

2. Impacts & Effects of the California Virtual College Online Education Initiative and the Fully Online College

- Erin Sullivan, AFA representative to the District Online Committee, presented the following information to the Council and guests.
- *What is the Course Exchange and how will it work?*
 - Students can take online courses from any college in the Exchange.
 - The “teaching college” receives credit for the FTES.
 - The “home college” receives credit for any earned degree/certificate.
 - Student transcripts will include the name(s) of the teaching college(s) where the units are earned.
 - The Exchange is funded via a grant from the Chancellor’s office.
 - There are 23 pilot colleges and 33 new colleges that have signed onto the Exchange as of May 2018. However, only three colleges are actually piloting the program right now.
 - Students use the *Finish Faster Online* website to find out about and register for courses.
 - The goal is to have all 114 California Community Colleges participating in the Exchange by 2022-23 with 5,000 courses offered (of all types), and a “one-click” application process to make it easy for students to sign up.
 - When students go onto the *Finish Faster Online* website and conduct a search for a course, they will first see courses offered by their home college, then “badged” courses (“badges” are earned by instructors after they participate in a voluntary peer review evaluation process), then all remaining consortium courses.
 - There is also an Online Education Initiative design rubric that colleges are adopting and the statewide Academic Senate is encouraging. There is a target of 20 percent of a college’s courses be aligned with the rubric.
 - The Course Exchange will offer all types of courses while the Fully Online College will be mostly Career Education (CE) courses.
- Questions & Answers:
 - Q: Is there a minimum number of courses that must be completed at the home college?
 - A: There has always been a 12-unit requirement in order for SRJC to issue a degree, and this has not changed.
 - Comment: I support the Exchange but I don’t think that all courses are appropriate for it. Perhaps that should be AFA’s focus of work rather than opposing the whole idea of the Exchange.
 - Comment: We need to recognize the financial motive behind the Exchange. It’s cheaper and the quality is questionable. There are also issues of data mining and the use of Artificial Intelligence to replace instructors.
 - Comment: I have problems with content, pedagogy and the quality of courses. When it talks about “equivalent courses” it focuses on transferability—not quality. There is a conflict between “completion” and “quality.” We have control over what we do at SRJC, but no control over what other colleges put on the Exchange. It is a hollowing out of faculty professionalism.
- SJRC is holding a Town Hall meeting on March 8, from 11:00 am-1:00 pm to discuss whether SRJC should participate in the Exchange. Please come if you are able.

3. **Appointment of the AFA/Senate Co-Representative to the Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee, 2018-19**

- This item was postponed due to time constraints.

4. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEM: Appointment of Executive Council Candidates in Lieu of Election**

- Karen explained that after the solicitation of candidates for the 2019-21 term of office, we have two uncontested elections. There are 5 Contract candidates for 6 seats and 4 Adjunct candidates for 4 seats.
- The AFA Bylaws state that we may appoint (by a two-thirds majority) when an election is uncontested. (See [Bylaws](#) Article II, Section 2.D)
- She asked the Council to consider appointing the full slate of candidates unless someone would like to speak about an individual candidate.
- There being no discussion, a motion was made, seconded and approved by voice vote to move this item to an Action Item (15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Appointment of AFA Representative to the Instructional Technology Group, 2018-19**

- This item was postponed due to time constraints.

2. **Appointment of Executive Council Candidates in Lieu of Election**

- This item was moved from a Discussion Item.
- A motion was made, seconded and approved by hand vote that the following slate of candidates be appointed to the Executive Council for the two-year term 2019-21 (15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions):

Filomena Avila, Counseling	Contract Councilor
Shawn Brumbaugh, Life Sciences	Contract Councilor
Karen Frindell Teuscher, Chemistry	Contract Councilor
Michael Ichikawa, Mathematics	Contract Councilor
Sean Martin, Philosophy	Contract Councilor
Claire Drucker, English	Adjunct Councilor
Deirdre Frontczak, Philosophy	Adjunct Councilor
Margaret Pennington, Economics	Adjunct Councilor
Sarah Whylly, Humanities	Adjunct Councilor

OTHER REPORTS

1. **President's Report.** None.

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

Minutes submitted by Carol Valencia.