



Council of Representatives

Meeting Minutes

August 28, 2008, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
Room # 5402, Cuesta College

Attendance according to the sign-in page:

Academic Skills/DSPS

(None)

Biological Sciences

Ron Ruppert
Mike Holmes

Business Education

Marilyne Cleeves
Jack Sullivan

Counseling/Health Center

Dana Gough
Julie Smith

**Engineering and
Technology**

(None)

English

June Beck
Dennis Baeyen
Matthew Fleming

Fine Arts

Doug Highland
Michael Burns

Human Development

Margie Perez-Sesser

**Languages and
Communication**

Beth-Ann Dumas
Tony Rector-Cavagnaro
John Arno

Library Services

Kevin Bontenbal

Mathematics

Barbara McGee

Nursing / Allied Health

Mary Ann Ambrose

Performing Arts

(None)

Physical Education

Mike Napoli (a)

Physical Sciences

Debra Stakes

Social Sciences

Kathryn Logan
Peter Dill
Mark Weber

**Student Life and Leadership
& Health Center**

(None)

CCFT Executive Board

Allison Merzon – President
Mark Tomes – Sec.-Treas.
Victor Krulikowski –
Co-Grievance Officer
Peggy Wright –
Co-Grievance Officer

Visitors

Shannon Wilson (CFT
Field Representative)

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

I. Meeting Procedures

Allison Merzon welcomed the Council and Executive Board. The attendees introduced themselves.

Mark Tomes began a discussion of Council meeting procedures by stating that he did not think it was appropriate for Executive Board (EB) members to make motions and vote at the Council meetings. It was clarified that EB liaisons, as Council members, should be able to vote. Tomes also described a “standard” method of making motions, making friendly amendments, etc. It was noted that Robert’s Rules of Order

are very cumbersome. Shannon Wilson said that she will send to Tomes an abbreviated version of Robert's Rules of Order, who will pass it on to Council and EB members.

After discussion, the following votes occurred:

- 1) Tomes will be the official recorder of notes and minutes for the Council of Representatives (Rector-Cavagnaro/Cleeves) – passed unanimously.
- 2) The Council of Representatives will use the traditional motion-making, friendly amendment, majority rule process to conduct its business (Dill/McGee) – passed unanimously.
- 3) The Executive Board will be allowed to make motions but not to vote (Dill-McGee) – failed (one Aye, all else No).
- 4) Executive Board members, except Council of Representative liaisons to the EB, will not make motions or vote (Dill/Beck) – passed unanimously.

II. **Council of Representatives Job Description**

Merzon began a discussion of her handout by stating that the Union Labor Institute training that she attended was promoting a change in union philosophy that empowers more members, much like the job steward model of earlier days, in which stewards at job sites are the primary contact with members for union information, providing resources, handling minor grievances, etc. To that end, she drafted a job description for the Council members, noting that it was only a draft and open for full discussion, including dismissal.

Points made against parts of the draft job description included:

Council members do not have time to be a “division-level problem solver.”

Council members should not be shepherding grievances.

A faculty member might not want to discuss confidential, sensitive information to a colleague that they see every day.

Information about common complaints across the district or specific problems that need to be addressed might not be heard by Grievance Officers and the EB.

Could Council representatives be held liable for providing wrong information or advice? If Council reps are given more responsibilities than they have now, it will be difficult to get members to be division reps

The contract is written in legalese; it is difficult to understand, and so we should refer faculty members to the Grievance Officers.

Points made for parts of the draft job description included:

Some contract and other questions are routine and can be answered easily.

All faculty members should know the contract, especially Council members.

The draft job description lends itself to learning more details of the contract.

Having Council members field questions could stop grievances from progressing.

A faculty member could still choose to talk first to a Grievance Officer; it would be an option.

A Council member could still choose to not field a particular question and ask the faculty member to go to the Grievance Officers, it would be an option.

A faculty member might not feel comfortable talking to the Grievance Officers.

It could relieve some burden on the Grievance Officers, who tend to be overworked.

Most questions from faculty members would not be grievance-type, but basic information-type questions.

Fleming made the suggestion to “not clean house all at once,” to implement parts of the draft job description first and implement “dealing with the contract” later.

A motion was made (Dill/Ambrose) to accept from the draft job description all of the bulleted items under Union's Division-Level Representative and Communicator, only the third bulleted item from the section The Union's Division-Level Problem Solver, and all of the bulleted items from the section The Union Builder. The motion passed, with one No vote.

III. **Negotiations Survey**

Questions regarding the draft Negotiations Survey included

- whether a separate survey should go to part-time faculty and full-time faculty
- whether it would be on-line or not (Wilson and Cleaves noted that the AFT and CCFT websites, respectively, have survey-building tools)
- whether the survey should be given to non-members
- if there is a method to determine member status with an on-line survey, and who will compile the survey results.

June Beck noted that a separate survey, not including contract re-opener questions, is going to part-time faculty members soon.

Other comments:

- it helps to have a live discussion (as opposed to an on-line survey) to generate ideas
- it is possible to make separate part-time, full-time, and general surveys
- sending the initial survey to non-members will generate interest in becoming a member, will be more inclusive, and will generate more ideas
- we should give more validity to members than non-members, so be sure to separate out the two groups
- only CCFT members will vote on the final reopeners (through their Council rep)
- the Council reps should not be sending the survey to non-members

A motion was made (Rector-Cavagnaro/Ambrose) to send the survey to CCFT members only. It was noted that the number of Council representatives are based on the division's FTEF, i.e., all faculty in the division, not just members. The motion failed, 5 yeas – 16 nays.

Another motion was made (Ruppert/Ambrose) to define the process as such: Tomes will send the survey to the Council representatives, who would in turn send it electronically (email) to all faculty members in their division. The faculty will complete the survey and return it by September 10 to their division rep(s), who will collate the results. Union member status will be added to the survey. The motion was passed unanimously.

IV. **Communication Tools**

Merzon asked the Council for its thoughts on the district's proposal to eliminate the faculty email listservs and, instead, have groups communicate through myCuesta. Wilson noted that the listservs are district property and can shut them down at any time.

It was noted that being able to broadcast messages quickly and easily, such as through listservs, is a valuable tool, and that many faculty members will not go to a place to see what messages are there waiting for them. There should be no illusion of confidentiality on a listserv or on myCuesta; the district can "tap in" at any time. Also, it might be possible for only the Presidents and Secretaries of CCFT and the Academic Senate to post messages on the listservs.

It was noted that myCuesta groups can be maintained by the union, but can be "misused" just as listservs can. Wilson told the group that some messages currently posted on the listservs are damaging to the union, but others noted that past negotiations have not necessarily been hurt by comments on the listservs.

There were questions about whether the myCuesta group email abilities parallel the listserv abilities and whether the reply and reply all buttons can be disabled. It was noted that faculty members just need to learn the new tool (myCuesta groups).

There appeared to be consensus to request from the district to begin using myCuesta groups while leaving the listservs intact, to not dismantle the listservs until we are "happy" with the myCuesta groups, and to research whether the Presidents and Secretaries of CCFT and the Academic Senate could be the only ones to post messages on the listservs

V. **Division Concerns**

Human Development: is there still a chance to get PERS insurance? Merzon reported that it is too late for this year, but it still is an issue for next year.

Social Sciences: some faculty members are asking CCFT to abolish the Code of Conduct. Merzon will place this issue on the next Council meeting agenda.

English: the district should not be deciding when a substitute instructor will be allowed to take over for an absent instructor; that is a curricular issue and up to the faculty. Likewise, it is not fair to ask a part-time instructor to take part in a workload exchange.

Nursing: the lead faculty member in small departments (where there is no coordinator or chair) should have their stipends increased.

Physical Education: Merzon spoke to the issue of changing the Grievance Officer. She stated that the CCFT President has the right to appoint committee chairs at any time; that she was respecting the IGC process by not appointing someone earlier; that she met with Ed Conklin first; that she consulted with AFT Legal Counsel, Teresa Idris, and with Shannon Wilson, both of whom assured her that she was within her rights to change the Grievance Officer; that CCFT has a precedent of appointing co-chairs of the Grievance Committee; that building a good team relationship between the President and the Grievance Officers is vital; and that it is important that the President-Grievance Officer team have buy-in with her platform and vision for CCFT. She distributed copies of Idris' letter stating Merzon's right to appoint the Grievance Officer.

Counseling: the question of whether a different process for appointing chairs was being used. It was noted that the Constitution and Bylaws do not state when the appointments will take place.

Fleming asked that any outstanding grievance should be agendized so the affected people can hear the outcome. Merzon reported that all outstanding grievances are being addressed and the faculty members involved are being kept abreast of what is happening with their issues.

Fleming also reported (to much applause) that revised faculty evaluation forms are now posted on the Cuesta College Human Resources web site. The Cuesta College Vice President and Dean evaluation forms parallel the faculty forms. Send any necessary changes to the forms to Fleming. Merzon thanked Fleming for his persistence and hard work on the evaluation forms.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Mark Tomes, Secretary-Treasurer.