

## **Attendance**

Members: Rebekah Hathaway, Debbie Jensen, Ja'net Danielo, Daniel Gardner, Bruce Greenberg, Michael Binning, Monica Lopez, Anna DeMichele, Teresa Aeryn, Jennifer Palma, Dennis Falcon, Jay Elarcosa, Henrietta Hurtado, Michelle Lou Ellen

E-board: Mariam Youssef, Stephanie Rosenblatt (chair), Terrence Mullins, Kimberly Rosenfeld, Ralph Casas, Lynn Wang

Non-Member: Tim Juntilla

-Discussion about whether or not non-members can attend public meetings

-Stephanie: My recollection is that non-members can't attend.

-Terrence: In the past, non-members have attended public meetings. So we should continue to hold that practice, especially since it makes it easier for all members of Faculty Senate to attend, regardless of their union membership.

-Stephanie: It's for the union to decide what our practice will be, and I'm okay with whatever we decide. But this is a space for union members to discuss and have their voice heard, and things are different post-JANUS.

-Michelle: It can encourage non-members to become members.

-Debbie: The union does work for everyone on campus, whether or not they're members, so they should have access to union meetings.

-Stephanie asked those members present to vote on whether non-members should be allowed to attend the meeting. Everyone agreed except one in opposition.

-Adjustments to the agenda: Start with division rep items, and remove reports on Membership and Schools and Communities First.

-Discussion: the evaluation article

-Ja'net, as English dept chair, discussed with Stephanie to see if they are allowed to talk about the evaluation article in department meetings.

-Different team members have different ideas about what criteria is supposed to be used when labeling performance as Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory/Needs Improvement

-No clear definitions around evaluations, and no clarity around what we are asking part-time faculty for

-Ja'net: I have a large department, so what we have noticed is on many evaluation teams, we aren't standardizing what we ask part-time faculty for. It's not clear what materials should be accessed and which items will be collected, and it's not clear from the evaluation article. I should be able to have that conversation with my department, and I don't need anyone's permission to do that. We're just developing a department standard. Stephanie, Frank and I had this conversation last semester. In September, I put it up for discussion at a department meeting. I didn't mention it at the division meeting because it didn't seem relevant, but it was raised by Angela. I asked if it would be okay for me to discuss with my department and to come back with that info in the division meeting. Specifically, we were interested in standardizing: 1)

criteria around how someone gets an evaluation of Needs Improvement, 2) which items/materials you can ask for, 3) speaking to part-time faculty for clarification, 4) how long you stay in someone's Canvas when evaluating online classes. Later I was notified there was a concern in Senate that I'm updating the evaluation form. I clarified with April, and she said it didn't sound like a problem— it was department norming. However, there continued to be rumors around what I was doing. No one has asked me questions about what actually happened and is instead assuming what happened. I'm here to answer questions.

-Terrence: In the transcript, it seems like you were going to do something in your department that would then be implemented campus-wide.

-Ja'net: I can clarify. We were going to see if it works and then give our feedback to the union. Then, if it's something that wants to be implemented across campus, we are welcome to discuss that. We can share our results and see if it's useful to other departments.

-Tim: I'm disturbed that this went all the way back to May. This should be between the district and the union, in consultation with the Senate. When you talk about standardizing things, you're putting them into writing. You can't have individual departments defining Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Needs Improvement. These aren't things that should be happening at the department level. Getting evaluation wrong will screw over everyone. Changes we make now will probably be with us for a decade. I requested data from HR about how many faculty have received evaluations of Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory/Needs Improvement. There are very few Needs Improvement—the idea that this is happening is a narrative promoted by the English department.

-Stephanie: the conversation about Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory/Needs Improvement are already happening in teams of three as people are doing evaluations... so these kinds of conversations are already happening, just in small groups.

-Kimberly: There's an issue with grievance. Even if you have a department standard, someone can file a grievance and it can get messy. This needs to be a larger campus conversation. I get nervous about the specifics around this criteria.

-Ja'net: At some point, we're all having these conversations about standardizing. Each faculty member has the freedom to go beyond that. Everyone needs to have the opportunity to give their input in that discussion. In terms of putting that stuff in writing, I agree that it gets tricky. But there's no harm in having a conversation that only affects our department. You're worried about something that hasn't happened. If there's a line we cross and it gets inappropriate, then we stop. Right now these terms are not useful, they're not relevant.

-Michelle: My bigger concern is that we standardize this campus-wide and that would be bad. We need some freedom to adjust for personalities. It concerns me that there might be people who are not here for what's best for faculty and students. That conversation should be happening in those teams. It has taken us 17 years to get to this point.

-Tim: This is an English department issue. It's unfortunate that the chair went to the dean and union president without consulting the rest of the department first.

-Terrence: On April 30, 2019, you mentioned that evaluations might come up. I mentioned that Ed Code specifies that you must consult the senate. Then we had our strategic retreat May 31 and I mentioned again you must consult the senate. So why hasn't the senate been consulted? It wasn't brought up at the retreat. It wasn't even discussed with the chief negotiator.

-Stephanie: It's a conversation, not a negotiation. Ja'net can discuss whatever she wants with her department.

-Terrence: The contract is higher than the dept or any union member.

-Stephanie: We have other places where departments decide on a norm—we make all kinds of collegial agreements among professionals. We have academic freedom but departments decide on norms all the time, like agreeing to use a particular textbook for a course.

-Terrence: That is a different situation. You're comparing apples to oranges.

-Stephanie: We need to move on, but we can continue this conversation at Senate, E-board, and Negotiations.

### **Division representatives**

-Question about trainings that are being rolled out—sexual harassment and diversity trainings. What if a part-time faculty is already doing the training on another campus? Does that count?

-Kimberly: Yes, that counts.

-Whats an appropriate way to communicate with the union members in my division?

-Stephanie: You can email them, the contact lists are available.

-Debbie: In talking with my division members, we've gotten into a discussion around the weight of the vote for part-time and full-time faculty. Part-time faculty has gotten many more members, and they now control the vote and it's out of balance. Full-time are outnumbered on every vote, although our workload is different. Can we agendize that for the next public meeting?

-Stephanie: Is it okay if we wait until spring to agendize that?

-Debbie: Yes, and we also need to throw our support behind Kimberly since we have some major negotiation issues coming up soon.

### **President (Stephanie Rosenblatt)**

-Appointing Peter as Election Committee chair

-Peter accepts nomination

Votes on appointment:

Yea: Mariam, Stephanie, Terrence, Kimberly, Lynn

Abstain: Ralph

Peter is appointed chair of the Election Committee.

-Election committee hasn't set another meeting yet, but needs to soon to discuss elections for part-time division representatives.

### **Negotiations (Kimberly Rosenfeld)**

-We sunshined in November, so we're set for January

-Big issue right now is salary. We want more than COLA. COLA is not a raise. I think we need to gear up for a fight. The district is gearing up for tough negotiations.

-CSEA has codified their "me too" clause in their contract, which means whatever we get they get, and so we're basically negotiating for the campus. This complicates things and changes the dynamic.

- This is salary only, we are not doing other negotiations with it
- Funding formula is uncertain
- We need a special units team to handle salary negotiations—proposing Kimberly, Solomon Namala, Mike Farina, and Peter Moloney. All are financial experts and experienced negotiators
- Stephanie: Can you bring this to the E-board meeting on November 25? We also need to know how much it would cost us to do this.
- Kimberly: We need to resolve this before the break.
- Terrence: I want to point out that it's pretty much understood that the district hides money. The people who found that out are Solomon, Mike, and Peter. This is a group that can continue to do good work and discovery on that. The current VP for Business Services is not a certified accountant. It would be awesome for us to have that type of weapon on our side.
- Michelle: I like these people and I think they'll do well. Since we have no control over anyone else's contract, what are we going to do after this? How will this work moving forward now that we're responsible for CSEA? Last time we were notified really late. This is again kind of late to be starting and we don't yet have plans to mobilize the faculty.
- Kimberly: We probably don't sit down to negotiate until early February.
- Michelle: That's my concern—we need to mobilize now.
- Stephanie: I think we should table this until November 25, since many of our E-board members are not here and have not been notified about this ahead of time. We need input from the rest of the board. I have concerns with the budget.
- Ralph: My concern is also with the budget.
- Peter: It will cost us a few thousand in stipends, and millions of dollars are at stake.
- Debbie: I thought we had a lot of money.
- Motion to table until November 25 (proposed by Stephanie, seconded by Mariam)

Votes on the motion:

Yea: Mariam, Stephanie, Ralph, Lynn

Nay: Kimberly, Terrence

Motion carries.

### **Grievances (Michael Binning)**

- Several matters going on right now
- Failure of the district to pay an employee who was improperly placed on the salary schedule. District is refusing back payment.
- Arbitration over the summer about refusal to grant tenure
- Failure of the district to pay part-time for attending division meetings.
- Kimberly and Mike have been working with Adriana to fix issues related to part-time faculty qualifying for the healthcare reimbursement.
- Ralph: Is there anything finalized around office hours for those of us on reduced schedules? ----
- Mike: No, it's been raised but no conclusion has been met.
- Tor: Could you go over the full-time misclassification issue?
- Stephanie: There was a faculty member who wasn't put in the right step and column. She brought the right documentation to correct this, and then the district refused to reimburse her

back pay. She's being treated differently than other faculty who have had back pay for longer amounts of time.

-Teresa: The issue of full-time faculty being misclassified was actually uncovered by Mike Farina.

Adjourn