

Objections to the draft (academic senate proposal for procedures relating to transfer of faculty with FSA) - This is from the Kinesiology department.

- 1. We know of no discussions in Negotiations related to defining “systematic under-load.” Who established the definitions?
- 1.a. Our department cannot operate without adjuncts because of the many “specialized class” we offer that “REQUIRE” special training and requirements. Additionally, we have 3 full time head coaches (who are part time) in athletics who must teach “specialized” classes. How do the ATHLETIC assignments given to Adjunct Head Coaches fit into this requirement? A full-time underloaded faculty member may not even know how to keep score in a tennis match, but would that individual still be expected to take that varsity sport class(es) as load? The same can be said for Martial Arts. Is the solution to not offer Martial Arts courses or cancel certain sport teams?
- 1.b. Online course assignments can only take place when the instructor has an approved shell, so the option to assign an individual online courses may be limited. The CBA also states that with certain locations (e.g., the prison), the faculty member must agree to the assignment.
- 2. Program Impact Report: This would appear to be delve into some fairly obscure and potentially lengthy topics as it lists “all affected programs,” “long-term planning for that faculty member,” “potential effect on the program,” etc. For context, KINE faculty encountered underload in for the fall 2017 semester in August 2017. We are now trying to complete the spring 2018 schedule at the end of September 2017. That is a very short turnaround time (actually unrealistic) to compile the Program Impact Report and nothing in this document mentions a timeline. Now, the **REAL IMPORTANT COMPONET** here, the under-loaded faculty member may not be the individual with the FSA. Case in point, me (Kevin Marks). I was not under-loaded in fall 2017, other(s) in his department was/were under-loaded. According to this process, only under-loaded faculty may be considered.
- 3. Minimum Qualifications for all faculty positions are currently checked by HR. Why this responsibility is now passed on to the Faculty Senate President for **select individuals**? Again, this has already been completed by HR and chancellor’s office in terms of minimum quals. Anything else is “adding” more requirements to the FSA individual and this is discriminating against this person. This would be holding the FSA faculty member at a higher standard.
- 4. b. Do hiring committees for adjuncts that now consist of discipline faculty provide peer-consultation (sounds very much like a type of peer-review) to all new adjunct hires, including assignment to a faculty mentor?
- 4. c. Do members of hiring committees anywhere else in SCC provide recommendations as to what courses an individual can/may teach? This would appear to be part of administrative right of assignment.
- 4. d. Does flexibility exist in the limitation “not to exceed one academic year” and if not, why?

- 4. d. 1) What is the \$ limit on development and how is the faculty development for this individual different than faculty development associated with funds controlled by the faculty senate? These same faculty development funds actually went to support individuals on sabbaticals to secure the FSA that have now been brought into question.
- 4. d. 2) What is the \$ amount range for the stipend and how is that determined?