

**Time: 12:05 pm**  
**Place: Room 1803**

**E-Board Members: D. Fouquet, J. Drouin, K. Grace, P. Molina, S. Lee, N. Abrao, N. Pinio**

**Faculty present: 18**

The meeting was called to order by **CLPFA President D. Fouquet**

The agenda has been published and sent to all Chabot College Faculty

**Agenda:**

**1. Negotiations update**

**Dave** briefly reported on the discussions presently taking place between the **FA** and the **District**. He said they have been meeting regularly and there were some issues currently “on the table.” They include:

- a. **Non-credit:** **Dave** reported that the negotiations focusing on **non-credit** classes were being examined for the short- and long-term implications. Important matters for the colleges to decide include the extent to which existing basic-skills classes should be converted to Career Develop College Preparation (CDCP) Non-Credit. (Under the new funding formula, **CDCP** will be funded **100 cents on the dollar**, whereas credit classes will be funded at **60 cents on the dollar**, *actually lower than the standard noncredit rate!* The base funding rate in **2017-18** was about \$5300 per **FTES**. There are a few additional considerations regarding offering **non-credit**: For instance, those who teach **non-credit** do not need to have an **MA/MS** in order to teach. Also, the **non-credit classes** will not count towards a degree.

Several faculty members attending this meeting asked about the impact of the Student Centered Funding Formula (**SCFF**) on the basis of **Financial Aid** recipients. **Dave** highlighted how the Supplemental Allocation portion of the SCFF will fund colleges on the basis of a headcount of students receiving financial aid. This includes a count of **Pell grants** (which may be used in part, for room and board) and California **Promise Grants** (formerly known as **BOG** waivers), as well as AB 540 fee waivers for undocumented immigrants.

An **MOU on Non-Credit** was signed in **April, 2018** before the funding formula was instituted. The **FA** wants to revisit this MOU, mainly with regard to compensation rates, and the specified limit on how much Non-credit a full-time faculty member can teach as part of his/her load. (Some of the faculty in attendance felt very strongly that the **FA** negotiators should work to get rid of that limit). It was reiterated that for mirrored sections (where a credit class is cross-listed with a non-credit version of the same class), whenever a class section includes students taking the class for credit, the faculty member teaching the class *must* be credit-qualified (*i.e.* have a **MA/MS**). When a non-credit or CDCP class is offered without cross-listing to a credit course, the minimum qualification of the faculty member is generally a **BA/BS**.

- b. **Article 2 (salary deductions)** is being negotiated.
- c. **OEI (Online Education Initiative)** **Dave** explained that this is a format in which course work offered online is standardized statewide. A community college student residing anywhere in California can take an approved class online, via the OEI Exchange. The main purpose of this initiative is to provide additional options for students who are unable to get into a course, because it is filled. **Las Positas College** has aggressively pursued establishing a presence on the OEI Exchange. There are **twenty-four colleges** in the **OEI**

pilot and **33** additional colleges have been accepted into the **2018** cohort, including **Las Positas College**. **Chabot College** has not yet applied. About half the colleges in CA have joined. In order to get a class onto the exchange, there are a number of “hoops” to jump through. **Dave** thinks the rubrics for the courses show good educational practice, though **J. Drouin** remarked that the rubrics were quite different from how many faculty members would set up the class. The **FA** is currently negotiating an MOU that will initially impact **Las Positas College**; the negotiations are focusing on what compensation will be available for getting a class approved for the OEI Exchange, and for preparing faculty members to review courses for adherence to the OEI Rubric. In addition, the FA is seeking to ensure that the course evaluations for OEI Rubric compliance are kept rigorously separate from peer performance evaluations. The **FA** wants to make sure to have the ability to come back to the table if new ideas come forth.

**Comments:** A faculty member said that it was important to have the right to “opt in/opt out” statement. Another faculty member was concerned about the fact that **Enrollment Management** might not have been a part of this process, and wondered if participation (regarding seniority) might be part of it. Discussion centered on whether there needed to be a rotational set-up included. (This would depend on how many would be qualified to teach in the **OEI**.) Another faculty member wondered if there would be a requirement to offer a certain number of these **OEI** courses. **Dave** said that it will be important to identify the proper distribution between face-to-face and online courses. Concerns were also voiced about what would happen if the classes “filled” or “didn’t fill.” There was no answer for this question. Under the SCFF, the administration may assess that the college receives funding for off-campus **OEI** students at **60 cents** on the **dollar**, considering that the student’s home District gets the student’s completion points. But such a phenomenon will also work in reverse: When a **Chabot or LPC student** takes a course on the **OEI** exchange, the college offering the class will get the FTES credit, while our **District** will get any completion points generated by that student.

A question was asked about whether changes relating to online instruction were being discussed. **Dave** said that the **FA** hasn’t made any openers yet, and we don’t know what the **District** will offer. **J. Drouin** added that in order for a student to be able to access **OEI** courses, all the classes the student was hoping to enroll in had to be filled. Another question was asked about what would happen if the discipline didn’t allow that course to be given online. **Dave** said that he had received an email about equity issues involving **administrators** who might try to “squeeze” faculty around overload. Another faculty member requested that the **FA** look at the whole overload issue. Some of the particular concerns had to do with parity and large lecture schedules, **pathways**, and **OEI**. A strong request for negotiating incentives for meeting goals, and delivering on the numbers. **Dave** said that incentives for **OEI** are currently being negotiated (a draft has been developed). He added that we’ll also try to “indemnify” the incentive funding, so it can continue to support faculty work after the initial funding source is depleted.

- d. **Dave** reviewed the **Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF)** and its impact on our budget. He said there will be a few years of budget “instability” while the District is funded on the “hold harmless” provision. What makes things difficult is that we won’t know what our ongoing budget situation is, for a year or two at least. (*Note: handouts describing the SCFF were set out, for those who do not have them.*)

The impact of the **SCFF** on the **DEMC** and **Article 26** (Enrollment Management): It is recognized that the **District** needs to spend the next year or two, figuring out how to increase the number of certificates and degrees, as well as the number of students who access **Financial Aid**. A new **Funding Formula Committee** has been formed to study these issues, and report to the **PBC**. The infusion of **dollars** resulting from the summer rollback (**Summer 2018 FTES** back to Fiscal Year **2017-18**) rollback will be helpful, but

needs to be treated as **one-time dollars** until both colleges are able to determine, reliably, what funding they can sustain under the SCFF. He recommends that part of the money be put in a reserve as a “hedge” against unexpected problems, such as a recession. At the same time, we need to avoid negative impacts on students. We need to make the **funding formula** work for us. The incentive is stability at a higher level.

- e. **Other issues: Some faculty** expressed concerns about the fact that **coordinators** do not always have reassigned time and this poses hardship for them when they are expected to do a lot of work in addition to their regular assignments. Several thought that release time was very important. The matter of being paid for **F hours** for reassigned time was believed by some to be unsatisfactory pay, and insufficient (in terms of CAH) to allow a faculty member to teach fewer classes for load. This could be a key driver for many faculty, as they consider whether to accept F-Hours to do the work of preparing new courses and certificates that drive better funding under the SCFF.
- f. **CCCI meeting: Dave** reported on his attendance at a recent state-wide meeting in Southern California. **David Bella-Hawkins** is the lobbyist advocating for **CCCI** (The **Independent Faculty Unions**.) He briefly discussed **AB 1858, AB 2012, and AB 3101** as well as a couple of bills that did not pass.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 pm.**

**Nancy (Cowan) Pinio**

**Recording Secretary**