

CCFF Public E-Board Meeting
September 17, 2019 11am-12:15pm
LC 155

Attendance

Members: Chris Ingstad, Peter Moloney, Dennis Falcon, Michelle Mohoney, Monica Lopez, Tor Lacy
E-Board: George Jarrett, Ralph Casas, Mariam Youssef, Kimberly Rosenfeld, Lynn Wang, Terrance Mullins, Stephanie Rosenblatt (Chair)

Welcome/introductions

Introducing new faculty, members, officers

Treasurer's report (Ralph Casas)

- Budget includes proposed changes from previous meeting
- Line items that have changed from last year are boxed in budget
- \$3,500 taken from Contract Campaign, \$2,000 reallocated to Legal Fees and \$1,500 to Membership
- Accidental death insurance needs to be removed from line items
- Moving forward, more itemized expenditures for each category will be included
- COPE fund is in separate account, approximately \$38,000
- Ralph will start bring COPE reports to every meeting as well

President (Stephanie Rosenblatt)

- Last election was contested, highlighted flaws in the process. AFT made recommendations on how to improve the process
- Proposal to form a committee to look at AFT's recommendations
- Motion (proposed by Stephanie, seconded by Kimberly): Open nominations for the election committee. Nominations will be open until next E-Board meeting on Monday, September 23

- Amendment (proposed by Terrance, seconded by Kimberly): Those who contested the election (Peter Maloney) and those who are already on the committee (Michelle Mahoney and Anna Fischer) should automatically be on the committee with nominations for the remaining seats.

- Votes for amendment:
Yea: Terrance, Kimberly
Nay: George, Ralph
Abstain: Lynn, Mariam, Stephanie
Amendment doesn't carry.

- Votes for motion:
Yea: George, Lynn, Ralph, Mariam, Terrance, Stephanie
Abstain: Kimberly
Motion carries.

- Stephanie will send out the email calling for nominations, but can't appoint people to the committee.
- Nominations will be available by next E-board meeting, which is Monday, September 23.
- Other committees need people as well. Stephanie will bring a list of them to the next E-board meeting to discuss what to do

Negotiations (Kimberly Rosenfeld)

- Met with the district over several issues
- Just Cause: Article was presented but district wanted time to read it so no conclusion was met. Abeyance for 30 days
- Faculty service areas article, meeting with April today to discuss
- Intellectual property rights, need to oppose policies coming up from the district (around online teaching, specifically)

Grievance (Stephanie Rosenblatt)

- New grievance officer, Mike Binning
- Cynthia Lavariere is now the Student Conduct Coordinator, can't do both because of a conflict of interest
- Majority of grievance are related to just cause/due process, district is not always consistent in how they conduct investigations, especially with part-time faculty, where investigations are often not done if there's a complaint (argument being they're at will employees). Full-time faculty are often not notified they're being investigated. There needs to be a streamlined process and clear consequences around investigations.
- Dennis: Why is it wrong for the district to not notify faculty they are being investigated? That is standard with other kinds of investigations.
- Stephanie: This does not include preliminary inquiries, the issue is centered more about official investigations
- George: This is different than criminal investigations, it's about employee's rights
- Peter: How many grievances does the union deal with in a year? Quantifying might help to remove stigma and allow for solidarity among faculty. Stephanie says high point is 90. In negotiation years its significantly less.
- Dennis: It would help to have workshops/training so that people know what to expect in an investigation and what sort of behaviors/protocols are out of line, and also to promote a culture of solidarity among faculty

Membership (George)

- Membership drive is delayed, working instead on a continuous organizing model, and recruiting people to take part throughout the semester
- Full time members: about 200 (around 85%, there are 269 fulltime faculty)
- Part time members: about 460
- In general, we've had a net gain. Over 50% membership now

COPE (Terrence)

- No report

Faculty senate

-No report, April is not here

Union member items

-None

New business

-Terrance: CCFE constitution/bylaws

-When the E-board finds out that its not in compliance with Constitution/Bylaws/Robert's rules of order, we usually vote to change instead of adjusting to be in compliance

-Motion to stay in compliance with the Constitution/Bylaws/Robert's Rules of Order (proposed by Terrance, seconded by Kimberly)

-Votes for Motion:

Yea: Kimberly, Terrence, Stephanie

Nay: Ralph

Abstain: Mariam, Lynn, George

Motion carries

-Terrance: We need division representatives

-Stephanie: How to recruit division reps? Perhaps dispatching E-board members to the division meetings. It may/may not work to announce at division meetings, since part time faculty typically can't attend

-Motion: Have these elections at the next E-board meeting

-Amendment proposed by Kimberly: Have full-time nominations at next E-Board meeting, and figure out a strategy for recruiting part time reps at that meeting

-Votes for Amendment:

Yea: Terrence, Kimberly, George, Lynn, Stephanie, Mariam

Abstain: Ralph

Amendment carries

-Votes for motion:

Aye: Unanimous

Motion carries

-Stephanie will send out the email to the deans to have this discussed at division meetings

-Discussion: What should the union do to discuss issues brought up by the Shelter in Place incident?

-Stephanie: There were positives and negatives, how should we proceed as a union?
Safety/security is a working condition concern

-Tor: Doors don't lock from the inside in some buildings, but they are supposed to lock automatically after a certain amount of time during a Shelter in Place incident. This should be a relatively easy fix. Also, the incident happened at a passing time for students, which really complicated things. What's the plan if this happens again? There seems to be no clear protocol. What are faculty supposed to do if students are not sheltering? Some were hiding, while others were corralling students. Need clarification of the role for staff.

-Terrance: We need to push that doors can lock manually, without a key, in case instructor is not present.

-Dennis: Staff need to work closely with security and administration, and we need continuous meetings until protocol is properly addressed and updated. What about volunteer building marshals?

-George: Right now, trainings for marshals is minimal and not helpful, it needs to be updated, required, and paid. Another issue-- how do we have security coverage all the time?

-Chris: It wasn't clear what Shelter in Place meant because I just started working here. Different institutions use different language for this kind of incident. The training for this kind of incident was not included in onboarding. Also, a badge/ID might help to identify faculty. Locking mechanisms in doors are necessary

-Peter: We've been talking about getting locks on the doors forever, it's not going anywhere. It's in the contract but not happening. It's obviously just not going to happen simply by asking for it and pointing to the contract. Need to publicly shame admin instead of trying to go through the contract

Kimberly: We have a safety committee, it has three seats. One is empty. They should report to E-Board so we can discuss and support them. Also, who is deciding on training protocol?