

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

June 15, 2009

(Approved by the Executive Council on July 8, 2009)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

*Warren Ruud, <i>presiding</i>	Cheryl Dunn	*Michael Ludder	Greg Sheldon
*Alix Alixopulos	Lynn Harenberg-Miller	*Sean Martin	Audrey Spall
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Johanna James	*Michael Meese	*Mike Starkey
*Paula Burks	*Michael Kaufmann	*Dan Munton	*Julie Thompson
*John Daly	*Reneé Lo Pilato	*Andrea Proehl	

Officers/Negotiators present: Ted Crowell, Ann Herbst

Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

Faculty present: Approximately 60-80

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m sharp.

MEMBER CONCERNS

Faculty members interested in addressing the Council were asked to sign in and were subsequently called upon to speak in the order in which their names appeared on the sign-up sheet. Warren Ruud requested that faculty members wishing their comments to be available publicly should email their comments to afa@santarosa.edu . All such comments will be shared with the Executive Council and the District, and they will be posted on the AFA Web site so that they are available to faculty members who were not able to attend this meeting. He asked that any faculty member preferring that his/her name not be posted alongside written comments should indicate that preference in his/her email. (Note: These written Member Concern comments are posted at www.santarosa.edu/afa/Budget_Crisis.shtml .)

MINUTES

Acceptance of the minutes from the April 22, 2009 Executive Council meeting was postponed.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President's Report. Warren Ruud provided a framework of facts and figures surrounding the issues related to the budget crisis.
 - At the beginning of 2009, an 18-month projection revealed a \$42 billion statewide budget deficit. Since that time, the figure has grown to \$56 billion. In early April, AFA sent out a college-wide email, informing faculty about the budget crisis and the potential for fall 2009 class cancellations. On May 13, AFA held a General Membership meeting, invited faculty to hear a status report on negotiations, and provided an opportunity for questions and feedback. On May 14, the governor issued the "May Revise" of the state budget, which included an additional \$8 billion increase in the deficit. The deficit was

exacerbated (to the tune of \$6 billion) by the failure of the governor's propositions in the last special election. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) is projecting another \$3 billion on top of that. AFA will be posting on our Web site at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Budget_Crisis.shtml a link to a sheet published by the Community College League of California (CCLC), which presents the details of the current state budget and the proposed changes included in the May Revise.

- In response to the growing deficit, three categorical funds have suffered significant cuts in the May Revise: 1) Statewide Part-time Faculty Compensation, which supplements hourly salaries, went from \$50.4 million down to \$23.6 million; 2) Statewide Part-time Faculty Medical Benefits went from \$1 million down to \$0.458 million; and 3) Statewide Part-time Faculty Office Hours went from \$7.2 million down to \$3.3 million. (Some of the SRJC enhanced hourly schedules receive slightly more from this line item than others). Funding for Physical Education classes is slated to be reduced to the non-credit apportionment rate instead of the credit apportionment rate. The allowance for growth was reduced from 3% down to 0%, which explains why the District can no longer afford to offer a section simply because it is filled with students. The CCLC is advocating for community colleges and some of the final cuts could be less, but it appears they will most likely end up being close to the figures in the May Revise.
- The cost to the District of the SRJC Part-time Faculty Medical Benefits Program has grown to over \$0.5 million. Although the Board of Trustees has said that they are interested in providing this program, they have also said that they have no interest in paying for it. For the last two years, program expenses have been paid for through the forfeiture of regular faculty sabbaticals from 2003-04. Every year, the cost of the program has been growing faster than COLA and faster than the cost of regular faculty medical benefits, and AFA has had to negotiate ways to pay for it on a year-by-year basis. When the program began, the state was to pick up 50% of the premiums; however, they neglected to index the figure plus the initial allocation of \$1 million quickly became insufficient to cover the total number of community college faculty across the state who enrolled in the program. For various reasons, the insurance carriers request at least a 50% contribution from the employee for premiums, so that ratio is difficult to modify. No changes will be needed to maintain the program for fall 2009; however, serious decisions will need to be made if the program is to be continued beyond spring 2010.
- There will be many more serious issues that AFA and faculty will have to face in the future. One of those issues relates to student fees. The LAO is recommending a fee increase from \$20 to \$60 per unit, which could have a devastating effect on enrollment. In 2003, when fees were increased from \$20 to \$26 per unit, there was a 9% reduction in full-time equivalent students (FTES) across the system.
- According to the state Education Code and the Contract, the District has the right to cancel classes and to schedule contract faculty assignments the way they see fit. The arena that is open to negotiations with AFA is how hourly assignments are to be handled.
- In response to the projected deficit, the District is looking to cut 113 full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) positions out of the hourly assignments that had been scheduled for fall 2009. Warren presented a chart provided by Computing Services that included a breakdown of faculty load data from fall 2008. There were 1,134 adjunct faculty and 119 contract faculty who performed hourly assignments, for a total of 1,253. Of those who

performed hourly assignments in fall 2008, 90.5% were adjunct faculty and 9.5% were contract faculty. The total number of FTEF with hourly assignments was 400.3, and the breakdown was 370.6 FTE adjunct faculty (92.6%) and 29.6 (7.4%) FTE contract faculty. The total number of adjunct faculty (head count) who had loads less than 40% was 657, representing 52.4% of the 1,253 faculty total, and 126.6 FTEF (31.6% of the total FTEF). A total of 477 adjunct faculty had loads between 40 and 67%, representing 38.1% of the 1,253 faculty total, and 244 FTEF (61% of the total number of FTEF positions). The 119 contract faculty members who performed hourly assignments in fall 2008 represent 29.6 FTEF (7.4% of the total number of FTEF positions). The average hourly wage for adjunct faculty is about \$10-12 less than contract faculty performing overloads. Warren said that AFA is committed to preserving the livelihood of people in Unit A and the problem is how to develop a mechanism to allow the load to shift to the people who need it the most. He said that eliminating overloads would be one way for the District to start carving out the 113 FTEF; however, it would barely address the problem. The immediate issue facing the District is how to protect students and programs. The schedule has to be built so that students are allowed to register for classes on June 29. Warren acknowledged that everyone has a different set of anecdotal evidence, and cited his own department as an example: of roughly 20 adjunct faculty members, seven of the adjunct faculty are CalSTRS retirees, and two are employed elsewhere full-time.

- Warren said that he has spoken to the District about the possibility of faculty salary take backs in lieu of schedule reduction. The District has identified a need to reduce expenditures in the overall budget by \$7.2 million. Even so, the proposed budget would bring the balance in the reserves down to \$4.7 million, which is less than the State-required 5% of budget. The District has budgeted a \$5.2 million “instructional” reduction, which would be equivalent to an 8-9% decrease in faculty salary. Faculty salaries account for roughly \$60 million out of roughly a total \$110 million budget. The District is looking at a \$2 million reduction in the “non-instructional” side of the budget. SEIU and management are engaged in negotiations and the direction of those discussions is not known at this time. If an across-the-board salary cut were to be agreed upon for all SRJC employees, it would have to include the deficit from the non-instructional side of the budget and would still take an approximate 8-9% cut in salaries to make up the total \$7.2 million deficit.
- According to the State Chancellor’s Office data posted for Fall 2008, SRJC regular faculty salaries by average are 14th in the state, adjunct faculty salaries are 9th in the state, and administrator salaries are at 66th in the state. Even if all parties agreed, it would be very difficult to make salary cuts happen in the next 13 days, as there are complicated matters (such as CalSTRS and CalPERS retirement issues) that would need to be addressed first.
- In referring to the distribution of adjunct faculty loads again, Warren drew the inference that an adjunct with a load of at least 40% was more likely to depend upon her/his load as the primary and sole source of livelihood than an adjunct with less than 40%. To illustrate his point, he said that the average annual salary for someone in the 0 – 9% group was roughly \$3,000, and that this amount was most likely insufficient as a sole source of livelihood. There was a great deal of discussion about this inference, as many in the audience disagreed based on individual experiences. Some spoke of spouses being laid off, which put more pressure on their adjunct income. Many said that their job at SRJC

was their primary source of income, that they wanted but were unable to get higher loads in their departments, and therefore had to either subsist on this income or find other work to supplement it. Some talked about the difficulty of maintaining eligibility for the medical benefits program, which is their only access to health benefits. Others pointed out that the inference was about the entire group of adjuncts, not each separate individual, and that many who had disagreed were misinterpreting the inference.

- Several suggestions were put forward by members: 1) that AFA consider proposing progressive across-the-board cuts, where — like an income tax schedule — those who make higher salaries take higher cuts; 2) that AFA conduct a survey to help determine the number of adjunct faculty for whom their SRJC income is primary or secondary; 3) that AFA ask for more detail and a breakdown of where the \$2 million in non-instructional budget cuts would come from; and 4) that AFA should reject the District’s offer to accept \$5.2 million in cuts, by not ratifying the contract or concluding negotiations.
 - Warren reiterated that the District has the right to make the cuts, and that the question on the table is how can AFA insure that the remaining classes are equitably assigned. He said that means testing is not possible and probably not legal. The District needs to put the best instructor in the classroom. It has always been AFA’s position that like-load patterns should be preserved, and the MOU re: spring 2009 cancellations serves as a good model for making sure that the principles of Article 16 are applied equitably to any cancellations for fall 2009. This concluded the open portion of the meeting.
2. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session. Following a motion made by Michael Meese and seconded by Lara Branen-Ahumada, the Council voted unanimously to move out of closed session (14 in favor, 0 opposed). Following a motion made by Johanna James and seconded by Michael Meese, the Council voted unanimously to move the Article 16 Memorandum of Understanding to an action item (14 in favor, 0 opposed).

ACTION ITEMS

1. Article 16 Memorandum of Understanding. Following discussion in closed session during the Negotiations Report, and a motion made by Michael Meese, and seconded by Sean Martin, the Council unanimously approved a motion to adopt the Article 16 Memorandum of Understanding as presented, with the exception of the language that begins with “Guiding Principles” and ends with “discipline” (14 in favor, 0 opposed).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.