

Citrus College Faculty Association

February 16, 2005

Officers:

Joseph Harvey, President
Terry Miles, Vice President
Jack Wood, Past President

Jim Lancaster, Treasurer
John Fincher, Secretary
Dave Brown, Chief Negotiator

Representatives:

Art	(np)	Dyane Duffy	Business/CIS	(np)	Robert Smolin
Biology	(np)	Greg Johansen	Counseling/DSP&S		Robin
Cosmetology		Carri Lurette	McBurney		
Foreign Languages		Ana Afzali	Health Occupations		Claudia Pohl
Language Arts	(np)	Connie Tucker	Transportation Tech		James
Mathematics		Steve Odrich	Lancaster		
Music	(np)	Bob Slack	Physical Education	(np)	Steve Hartman
Physical Science		Jim McClain	Public Service	(np)	Darrell Carr
Social Science	(np)	Rudolph	Learning Assistance		Barbara
Saldana			Rugeley		
Behavioral Science	(np)	Ken Guttman			

(np) = Not Present

At Large Representatives:

Vince Mercurio
Keleigh Lanphear (np)
Ralph Tippins (np)

Members and Guests:

Ray Barney
Roberta Eisel
Jo Morrison
Levi Richard

Jean Howard
Justina Rivadeneyra

AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE MARCH 16, 2005 CCFA MEETING

1. Approval of the minutes for February 16, 2005 CCFA meeting
2. Election issues and proposals
3. Candidate Forum
4. Mediation Results
5. Open business

Draft Minutes of the February 16, 2005 CCFA meeting

CCFA President Joe Harvey called the meeting to order at 2:03pm. He indicated that we should start with the approval of the minutes of the January 19, 2005 meeting. Minutes were approved without changes.

Joe then moved to discuss upcoming elections and yielded to VP Terry Miles.

Terry described the upcoming process for elections and included the calendar of events. He also announced the election committee which includes John Fincher, Jim Lancaster, Bruce Solheim, Adrianna Glenn. The candidates' forum and open nominations would be on March 16. Polls will open March 31, polls will close April 7 and results announced on April 11. He also mentioned proposed changes to the constitution that could possibly be included on the ballot. Those changes included the office of Vice President to become President-elect then past president as done with the Faculty Senate.

Joe mentioned that the two-year plan had no objections when it was approved but his opinion has changed and he would be in favor of a change to the VP-Pres – President – Past President format.

Anna Afzali wanted to have this modification to be included for the upcoming elections.

John Fincher contended that the modifications could have retro-active language that, in the event of passage, the incoming officers would automatically inherit the new language. He pointed out that current civic elections for office have simultaneous votes for propositions and constitutional amendments. There was discussion among members about this and it was agreed that the candidates would have to be made aware of this possibility. Anna made a motion to have the ballot language include the retro-active provisions. Barbara Rugeley seconded. Motion passed.

Jim Lancaster discussed a proposed change to the Treasurer position. Currently the office runs a fiscal year from the first of September to the end of August. In the event of a change in treasurers, there is an overlap period of time in which the new treasurer would have to approve and file reports created by the outgoing treasurer. Currently the office runs from July 1 through the end of June. He recommended a change so that the outgoing treasurer would be responsible for filing the reports that s/he would have created. The outgoing Treasurer would assume the non-voting title of "Past Treasurer" during this overlap reporting period. He also suggested another officer be assigned secondary check writing privileges. John Fincher proposed that this position modification be included in the next ballot election for membership consideration. Anna Afzali seconded. Motion passed.

Barbara Rugeley moved that a second signatory be either the Secretary or the VP. Anna Afzali seconded. It was agreed that all three (Treasurer, VP and Secretary) would be on the check signing card and with two signatures being required. Motion passed.

Joe discussed re-assign time issues. He exhausted his .5 re-assign time and Jim Williams refused to re-issue any new time. Additionally, discussion on counseling re-assign time for negotiations occurred. Joe mentioned the high probability of filing a grievance on this issue.

Mediation

The next mediation meeting is scheduled for March 7. Joe re-iterated his belief that the district can afford more than has been offered. He outlined the last offer: 2004 – 0%, 2005 – 2.5%, 2006 – 1%, 2007 – 100% load implementation. Joe retraced the chain of events to this point.

Ray Barney explained the process as to fact finding and contract imposition. He prefers an agreement to be reached through mediation.

Anna asked questions concerning the mediator and contract imposition. Ray affirmed the districts ability to impose a contract.

Dave Brown explained that Jean Malone would not go back to the table unless we dropped the department language issue.

Joe mentioned how the steering committee was concerned about Prop. 98 mid-year budget cuts. Joe re-iterated how we still made \$500,000 during the worst of the budget crisis of two years' ago.

Roberta Eisel said that the district should not tell our leadership to "sell" a contract offer. Joe agreed.

Jim McClain said that the load has a price tag that has limited us to a 2.5% pay raise. He argued that the survey commissioned one year and a half ago does not represent current conditions nor current faculty attitudes toward our collective desires for a contract. He moved that the executive board should re-ask the membership whether we should pursue the load or take a raise equal with the cost of the load. The motion was seconded.

Dave Brown opened discussion by pointing out that the last offer by the district deferred load to the end of the contract in order to allow the raises that were offered. This was due to the districts stance that a raise and load would not occur in any one year. John Fincher pointed out that even if we drop load for a raise that there is no guarantee that the current offer of 2.5% would be increased to 2.6% or greater from this board. He also pointed out that if this shift were to occur at this point, that it would further delay any kind of resolution on this matter. Anna argued that all faculty had a chance to voice their opinion on this. She pointed out that maybe only 30% responded and that was their choice and no-one else's. She pointed out that if things have changed, that is the natural occurrence of negotiations. Joe pointed out that the priorities we offered were ours and not the districts. Joe stated that he didn't think he should back off of the load issue just because the district put an unfair price on it. Terry Miles wanted clarification on the question. Jim responded by saying that the district has put a \$250,000 price tag on the load and that the faculty should be queried as to whether they would prefer the load or a larger raise. Dave mentioned that he didn't think a survey would be either invalid or a bad idea. He believed, however, that trying to negotiate this at this time would be unsuccessful. He reminded everyone that voting on the contract is a survey and that the last vote the contract went down handily. Jim Lancaster argued that the union should represent a minority of people just as much as a majority. Barbara Rugeley wanted to suggest that if the body wanted to eliminate load in pursuit of a larger raise, that those faculty voting in favor of it would be doing so on the backs of faculty with 22 hr teaching loads or greater. Joe re-iterated his belief that he didn't think that if the faculty wanted to ask for this change that it could even be done at this stage. John Fincher called for the vote. Four voted in favor, seven against, one abstention. The motion failed.

Jim McClain thanked Joe for listening to the issue, insuring that it got debated and voted on.

Joe said that whatever type of contract comes out of the mediation meeting on March 7 would be presented to the faculty for a vote. He also discussed the proposed changes in Social Security offset rules that were being discussed in Washington DC. He said that it looks like those changes probably won't be taking effect.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.