

CCFF Executive Board Meeting
December 3, 2019 7:00-9:00
Via Zoom

Attendance

Members: Henrietta Hurtado, Angela Hoppe-Nagao, Debbi Jensen

E-Board: Mariam Youssef, Stephanie Rosenblatt (chair), Lynn Wang, Bobbi-Lee Smart, George Jarrett, Kimberly Rosenfeld, Ralph Casas, Terrence Mullins, Veronica Miranda

Adoption of agenda

Grievance (Stephanie Rosenblatt)

-Maria Gurrola: Waiting on arbitration decision

-George, Henrietta, and Bobbi-Lee can come to the board meeting on December 11 or December 15 to show support

-Bobbi-Lee and George can help by calling/texting other union members about the board meeting

-Shelter in Place incident on September 6, issue of compensation for part-time faculty who stayed on with their classes

-District's proposal: pay everyone who was teaching a class when the incidence started \$60. Send out an email saying faculty are disaster service workers and we shouldn't count on being paid again.

-Options: agree with district's request, or go back and renegotiate.

-Stephanie: Can I go back to Mike and tell him we're not comfortable with the statement and we need some regulated language?

-E-board votes unanimously to go back to the district.

President (Stephanie Rosenblatt)

-There is a part-time faculty member who asked to end their membership and payroll deduction. They're also a COPE member. They can't cancel membership/deduction until the window, but we need to decide if they can cancel their COPE deduction immediately.

-Terrence: If it wasn't a problem before, then we should be doing the same thing. We should also update the COPE form so that people can opt out, and not just opt in.

-DEEOAC: Lance Keyser was doing it but doesn't want to do it anymore. We need to send out a call for nominees.

-George: When does the committee meet?

-Stephanie: I can send that out.

-Board is fine with sending out the call for nominees.

-Discussion of evaluation article at Faculty Senate

-Stephanie: It would be good for the Senate to hear from Union leadership, and I can answer questions about that situation too.

-Bobbi-Lee: What was the discussion in the Senate?

-Stephanie: At the end of the spring semester I was at a meeting with the chair of the English department and the dean of the LA and the chair asked if she can talk about evaluations at department meetings. There were issues in the English department around evaluations— conflict amongst the teams about the terms Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory/Needs Improvement, as well as what kinds of materials you would ask part-time faculty for. People got upset because they thought she was changing the evaluation article. It came to the Senate. I don't want to blow up our relationship with the Senate, so I'd like to hear your thoughts.

-George: I want to second that. The most important thing is to strengthen the relationship between the Union and the Senate, and a resolution from the Senate would have the opposite effect. Also, there's nothing wrong with faculty talking about how to interpret the evaluation article properly. As far as the things in the resolution, I think we agree that the union interprets those things in consultation with the Senate. I want us to think about how we can best proceed to make sure the Union and Senate are on the same page.

-Angela: To further clarify, some of the concerns come from history. There have been times in the past that the evaluation process has been abused. Evaluations should be faculty-driven, and although there were good intentions it should have been brought back to leadership and April. The bigger concern was what was revealed in the transcripts, which were that the English department was going to be defining categories.

-Stephanie: It happened in May, when I was operating as the sole grievance officer, but now that I understand the sensitivity, I would have brought it back. At the time I didn't know it was such a landmine.

-Kimberly: I think the contract is clearer on this than people give it credit for. There are issues being brought up about whether or not to standardize materials brought by part-time faculty. That's in the contract—it's in the hands of the team. There is more guidance than I think people realize. Once we start talking about standardizing, that's when people get nervous.

-Ralph: Was it multiple conversations?

-Stephanie: No, it was just one conversation with the chair and dean. When I'm in Senate next Tuesday, does the E-board want to make an official statement? Or do we want to hear what the Senate wants to say and respond?

-George: I think a response would be in order, oriented towards affirming our commitment to working tougher. Incorporating Kimberly's comments will be helpful, that there are guidelines but freedom for the team, and that we're not trying to change the evaluation article. Most important would be to reaffirm the relationship between the Union and Senate.

-Ralph: I agree with George and Kimberly. We need to, as an E-board, respond to make it clear that we are going to work with the Faculty Senate.

-Angela: I don't know if everyone has read the resolution, but it doesn't say anything about the Senate not wanting to work with the Union, but. Rather affirming the protocol around the evaluation. Opposing the resolution would send the wrong message.

-Kimberly: I don't think we should be recommending how senators vote.

-George: I have problems with language in the resolution. There are erroneous assumptions. It's redundant and unnecessary to say that the Senate expects the Union president to act a certain

way. It's more a political resolution and is not helpful. I've never seen a senate resolution like this, other than a vote of no confidence in the president.

-Ralph: I've been on the Senate since 2000, and it was very clear that no resolutions should be done to attack a colleague unless it's a vote of no confidence. From a union perspective, we don't even need to address it except to say that we agree to follow the evaluation guidelines.

-Stephanie: Can anyone write a resolution saying those things that we can bring to Senate?

-George: I can collaborate with someone else who has worked in the Senate.

-Ralph: I can work with George.

-Timeline for part-time division representative elections

-Bobbi-Lee: We decided last week we would send out the email calling for nominations early this week, and the deadline for nominations is Friday. If we have more than one nomination in any divisions then we will have the election early next week.

-Stephanie: Are you going to run it through Election Buddy?

-Bobbi-Lee: We'll decide after we see the nominees.

Negotiations (Stephanie Rosenblatt)

-Kimberly has resigned as lead negotiator at the end of this semester.

-Next steps for designating a new lead negotiator—in the past the negotiations team brought their nominee to the board, and the board votes. The board is okay with following this protocol.

-Kimberly: We've had issues with part-time faculty being denied healthcare reimbursements if not at the 40% course load. The District was going in and counting hours, and we were hoping to get them looking at units instead. We're working on an MOU to make sure this doesn't happen again.

-Early retiree healthcare: We have a full-time faculty member who wants to take an early retirement, looked into it with the District and has not heard back in 7 months. What the district realized is that PERS won't allow for a tiered system based on retirement date. It's causing problems because even the district wants to brainstorm solutions.

-Minutes: What level of detail should we use?

-Kimberly: I'm okay with the way Mariam's doing it. There are a few things that need to be corrected, but in general they're okay. My main concern is the delay in getting them approved. We should consider a workflow that will allow that to happen more regularly.

-Stephanie: I'm on the side of more minimal, just actions. But whatever everyone is happy with is fine with me. I have concerns with putting in strategy, but we can deal with that as we approve minutes.

-Bobbi-Lee: I like having a little more detail because it gives context to some things, but it doesn't need to be every single thing.

-George: Last time we voted on this it was in favor of less detail. You want to think about who is going to read this, some things are better left out. Notes can be reduced to main principles without the conversation. If we go into closed session or discuss negotiation strategy, that shouldn't be included.

-Stephanie: So are we okay with this level of detail but we can redact items that give too much strategy or details on grievances?

-Kimberly: As we read them and approve them, we can have that discussion. If there's anything particularly sensitive, we can talk about whether to strike those things.

-Terrence: I'm not sure why it's so complicated. Anything in closed session is not in the minutes. If we're talking about grievance or negotiation strategy we should be in closed session. But we shouldn't have a transcript. It should be simplified so you can get a sense of the discussion that took place, but we don't need every single thing that everyone said.

-Continuation of discussion of evaluation article and Senate resolution

-Stephanie: The quote from me in the resolution is inaccurate.

-George: It seems like this is being used as an opportunity to censure the Union president. I agree that evaluation protocol should be taken seriously, but it's an unusual and unfortunate move that's going to weaken the position of the Union and the Faculty Senate. It's politicizing something that shouldn't be politicized.

-Terrence: The purpose of a resolution is to lay out the facts of what happened. If you want to say I'm politicizing it, that's fine. My intention is making sure that this never happens again.

-Stephanie: Ja'net never came to me about "normalization," like the fifth whereas says. I also never told her she was allowed to modify the evaluation process. Angela's comments helped to contextualize; I didn't understand how sensitive this issue was.

-Ralph: Resolutions from Faculty Senate are not supposed to be finger pointing at colleagues.

-Terrence: Moving forward, just bring these issues to the E-board. If this issue was brought to the E-board, it would have deflated.

-Stephanie: This happened the first week of the summer and I wasn't aware of the sensitivity of the issue. In the future I would bring it to the E-board.

-Terrence: The English department is mostly part-time faculty. The discussion you were sanctioning would have been had by full-time faculty and part-time faculty wouldn't have a say although it directly affects them.

-Approval of minutes from September 23, 2019

-Motion to approve the minutes (proposed by Bobbi-Lee, seconded by George)

Votes on the motion:

Yea: Unanimous

Motion carries.

-Move to adjourn (proposed by Ralph, seconded by Bobbi-Lee)

Votes on the motion:

Yea: Unanimous

Motion carries.

Adjourn