

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes (4/6 12:10PM) in 451A

In attendance: President, Pieter de Haan, Vice-president, Hannah Chauvet, Josh Boatright, chuck Wollenberg, Vladeta Djukich, Barbara Des Rochers, Siraj Omar, Joe Doyle, Katherine Kocel, Juana Alicia Araiza, Stephanie Sanders-Badt

- 1. Call to order:** the meeting was called to order by President Pieter de Haan at 12:10 pm.
- 2. Approval of Minutes:** approval of minutes from March 23rd meeting were tabled.
- 3. Accreditation visit:** ACCJC team will be here on April 12th; they will visit the library. There was a lengthy discussion regarding accreditation which resulted in the following:
 - a. BCC and Laney were initially fully accredited, and Merritt and COA were initially put on warning status; but because there were significant issues at the district, all 4 colleges are effectively on probation.
 - b. According to Pieter, reporting from DAS, the District has been busy seeing to the many issues related to them by ACCJC;
 - c. It was suggested that we investigate what would be involved (and if feasible) to have the colleges SEPARATE from the district for accreditation purposes. In other words, each college earns its accreditation and does not suffer if the district does not meet the standards.
- 4. Esteem Bromfield:** student ambassador and student trustee. He reported on the idea of PSAs broadcast in the classrooms...a discussion ensued; the final outcome was the suggestion that Measure A money be used to install message boards in the building which would meet the purpose of the PSAs for students.
- 5. PFT Report on chair release time:** please refer to attached email strand
- 6. Chancellor Search:** We agreed with the Merritt resolution in broad terms but with the changes below:
 - a. Item 1: Delete the head hunter issues
 - b. Items 2 and 3. Stand
 - c. Add that all four colleges have equal representation on the search committee.
 - d. The Board pays for site visits
 - e. Start the process in August not spring.No vote on this resolution was casted during the meeting.
- 7. BCC-FAS e-mail policy:** all parties present decided this is a non-issue.
- 8. Other:** none
- 9. Adjournment:** the meeting was adjourned at 1:17 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Sanders-Badt
Academic Senate Secretary

From: Richard Greenspan <rgreenspan@peralta.edu>

Date: April 3, 2011 5:13:40 PM PDT

To: David Morales <dmorales@peralta.edu>, Jon Drinnon <jdrinnon@peralta.edu>

Cc: COA-FAS <COA-FAS@peralta.edu>, BCC-FAS <BCC-FAS@peralta.edu>, Laney-FAS <Laney-FAS@peralta.edu>, Merritt-FAS <Merritt-FAS@peralta.edu>

Subject: RE: Department Chair release time for 2011-12

Just for the record, the district also "ran the numbers" using FTEF per college and FTES per college, to see how -- or if -- it would change the Dept Chair allocation to each colleges. If the one- and two- unit sections were skewing the distribution, it would have turned up. But those calculations didn't change any college allocation by more than .1 for 2011-12.;

The original reason for choosing sections as the key variable was the amount of dept chair work involved in matching each section with an instructor and a room, regardless of class size. Certainly, anyone who thinks the allocation calculation process needs to be changed is free to bring their concerns to a campus PFT meeting or to a general membership meeting. But if the net difference would only be .1 (or less) per college, no matter how the calculation is done, I'm not sure it's where we want to concentrate our energy this coming year.

From: David Morales [dmorales@peralta.edu]

Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2011 10:21 AM

To: Jon Drinnon

Cc: COA-FAS; BCC-FAS; Laney-FAS; Merritt-FAS

Subject: Re: Department Chair release time for 2011-12

We weren't forced to cut more sections, but more FTEF, which then translates to sections. We were way above the target FTEF number required for last Fall, so the reduction is in comparison to that deficiency. Actually, we are being asked to produce more FTES than BCC and COA by 50 this Fall. So we have a slightly larger allocation given us.

And that is what makes the chair release time calculated by sections ignorant if not meaningless. There are no calculations where number of sections play a role, not productivity, FON, even the new budget proposal or the reductions currently being made. They target FTEF, be it contract and/or adjunct, and then courses must fit the amount allocated for instruction. The district doesn't care if it means canceling one five-unit science class or five one-unit classes in five different disciplines. When they give a section number to reduce it is for reference for those who don't know how to interpret the budget number; they are approximating the number of three-unit lecture classes, but the freedom to make specific choices is left to the colleges.

So, Merritt, which had more FTEF (instructors in classrooms) last year than both COA and BCC, and will have more this coming year as well as determined by the district office, will have less chair time release allocated to manage these details than BCC, because we offer less one and two-unit sections, and we offer more science courses with labs than they do.

Time to have the union revisit these allocations from a 2011 perspective, not a 1990 one.

On Apr 3, 2011, at 9:12 AM, Jon Drinnon wrote:

Thanks for the clarification. I actually did realize that. But the real question to me (obviously "academic" at this point) is why Merritt was forced to cut so many more class sections than BCC. That is why we have reduced chair release time because that is what the release time is based upon, and that is why the whole thing is NOT fair.

(I am aware of the fact that this has nothing to do with the PFT.)

Jon

Jon Drinnon

Merritt College

From: Mark Greenside

Sent: Sunday, April 03, 2011 8:36 AM

To: David Morales; Richard Greenspan

Cc: COA-FAS; BCC-FAS; Laney-FAS; Merritt-FAS

Subject: RE: Department Chair release time for 2011-12

Two things are at play: one is the recent extension in which the chair release time dropped by 50% for 2011-12. The other factor is the formula for distribution of released time. The formula is based on the number of sections offered by each college. The formula is revisited yearly, I believe--but this year (2010-11) was a pass. The formula was not used this year so everyone stayed with the same numbers. The formula is being used for 2011-12 and Merritt has dropped relative to BCC. That's where the numbers come from. No secret. Last year, Tom Branca asked the PFT for a hold harmless for this year--so Merritt would not be cut. We did that. The hold harmless year is over and the formula is back in effect.

Hope this clarifies matters.

Mark

From: David Morales [dmorales@peralta.edu]

Sent: Saturday, April 02, 2011 9:53 PM

To: Richard Greenspan

Cc: COA-FAS; BCC-FAS; Laney-FAS; Merritt-FAS

Subject: Re: Department Chair release time for 2011-12

I'm confused as Merritt's allocation as in 10 -11 was 3.2. So why is it now 1.4 (which implies a 2.8 total)? How did BCC jump ahead of Merritt on this one? Sounds like some personal agenda is at play.

Please explain as I would expect our union negotiators to be transparent. Your language "about the same amount" is suspicious and anything but transparent, which is both disingenuous and disappointing. Please respond to all of us so we know how best to proceed.

David Morales

Merritt College.

On Apr 2, 2011, at 7:54 PM, Richard Greenspan wrote:

Our contract extension for 2011-12 includes a "give back" of 50% of Dept Chair release time for that academic year.

According to our Dept Chair article, each college's allocation of Dept Chair time is calculated based on total sections the previous year. That is, the section count during 2010-11 determines college release time for 2011-12.

Since the District-wide allocation is down 50%, each college is down about that same amount.

Here are college Dept Chair release allocations for 2011-12:

Alameda 1.4 FTEF

BCC 1.6 FTEF

Laney 3.3 FTEF

Merritt 1.4 FTEF

TOTAL 7.7 FTEF

Section D of the attached article covers the process for allocating the department chair release time at each college.

It might be as simple as chopping last year's time in half, but it doesn't have to do that. As long as the process in the contract is followed, each college can allocate its Dept Chair time for 2011-12 as it wishes.

Two important notes:

1. The minimum allocation for a single faculty member for 2011-12 has been lowered from .1 FTES to .05 FTES
2. This procedure only covers contractually negotiated release time with the PFT. A college can use its own discretionary funds as it chooses, including using those funds for additional department chair release time.

If faculty have any questions about the allocation or the process of distributing 2011-12 Dept Chair release time, feel free to contact me, your PFT chapter co-chairs, or the union office.

Rick Greenspan, Chief Negotiator, PFT

<Department Chair article from PFT contract.pdf>