

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

October 28, 2009

(Approved by the Executive Council on November 25, 2009)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

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

Officers/negotiators present: Ted Crowell, Ann Herbst, Janet McCulloch

Faculty present: Ashley Arnold, Renata Breth, Greg Granderson, Linda Hemenway, Deborah Kirklin, Molly Matheson, Mark Nelson, Karen Stanley, Phyllis Usina, Fred Utter, Breck Withers.

Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 2:38 p.m.

MEMBER CONCERNS

1. Federal COBRA Subsidy. As a follow-up to a member concern raised at the 10/14/09 Council meeting, Michael Ludder requested that AFA send out a College-wide announcement regarding adjunct faculty eligibility for the 65% federal subsidy of COBRA premiums for those who have lost all or part of their loads and their health insurance coverage through the Adjunct Faculty Medical Benefits Program. Warren Ruud said that he and Janet McCulloch would be meeting next week with Louise Burke in the Human Resources Department to discuss this issue and that most likely both the District and AFA would issue announcements clarifying eligibility and procedures. Warren also reported that 73 adjunct faculty members with assignment priority lost all of their Fall 2009 assignments. The figures for Spring 2010 are not yet available.
2. Social Security Option for Cash Balance Participants. Michael Ludder reported that he recently contacted local CalSTRS and Sonoma County Office of Education (SCOE) staff to find out more information about the recently enacted legislation that allows CalSTRS Cash Balance Plan participants to opt into Social Security should their district provide the latter as a retirement plan option; however, neither CalSTRS nor SCOE was aware of this option. AFA staff reported receiving a recent call from the CalSTRS regional counselor regarding this issue. Warren Ruud also noted that AFA is in the process of coordinating with Andrea York, legislative director for the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) to set up a presentation for adjunct faculty regarding Social Security and State Disability Insurance.
3. AFA Referendum. Several faculty members in attendance expressed their concerns about the referendum. Warren Ruud and Janet McCulloch responded to the concerns. Cheryl Dunn explained the lengthy development and review process that AFA engaged in, which resulted in the final questions and background pieces for each initiative. A summary follows.
 - Member Concern: The wording is biased and the questions could have been phrased more neutrally. Why is the faculty being asked to take permanent steps for an economic situation that's temporary? Older faculty will be retiring soon and will be replaced by younger faculty lower on the salary schedules with fewer health problems. There's a possibility of getting federal stimulus money, and Congress is trying to do something about health care.

AFA Response: Districts across the state are moving in the direction of premium cost-sharing. There won't be any COLA for the next four or five years. Medical costs are going up on the magnitude of 16 - 20% every year. The gap between costs and revenue needs to be closed somehow in the immediate future. There is less money on the table every year — some will have to be partitioned off to benefits and salary and some to programs. The question that AFA is asking regular faculty is, “How much do you value fully funded premiums?” If faculty want to continue to have fully funded medical premiums, there is no doubt that there will be consequences in the form of less money somewhere else. Not pointing out these consequences would skew the question.

- Member Concern: What amount of dollars does the District need to cut for the next contract year? Other than the information about the Adjunct Medical Benefits Program (AMBP), no specifics are given. Does AFA plan to present more information?

AFA Response: Since the beginning of the State budget crisis, AFA has sent out at least 17 lengthy emails to faculty and hosted three budget presentations. According to Vice President of Business Services Doug Roberts, the current (conservative) estimate of the budget shortfall is \$8 million, and it is expected that in January there will be another \$4 – 5 million in cuts. The District's general reserves are very low. Categorical programs have taken severe cuts, and most likely won't be restored until 2012 or 2013. The federal stimulus money, which is not necessarily directed at the categorical programs, has been reduced from \$140 million to \$35 million statewide. There is a \$1.1 million hole in the hourly salary schedules. The longer AFA postpones the decision regarding where reductions will be made, the larger the hit will be to those people who are still working. If the regular faculty votes no on the questions related to salary reductions, adjunct faculty could be looking at a 5 – 7% pay cut. For the questions that deal with redirection of salary to fund the Adjunct Faculty Medical Benefits Program or to mitigate cuts to the enhanced hourly schedules, faculty members can look up what the impact on their salaries would be on the AFA Website. The two questions related to the regular faculty Early Retirement Option and retiree stipends are not slated for an immediate decision, as an actuarial study will need to be performed to determine costs before any changes are negotiated. AFA is interested in holding onto as much as possible in terms of salary and benefits and is trying to balance the needs of all faculty. At the same time, AFA is committed to interest-based bargaining principles, and, therefore, a positional stance in negotiations is not an option.

- Member Concern: Several regular faculty members expressed support for ways to help mitigate the reduction in hourly schedules. At the same time, they expressed discomfort taking a 3 – 5% pay cut when some of their adjunct faculty colleagues have well-paying full-time jobs outside of SRJC. One faculty member remarked that for the 1,000 adjunct faculty members who work at SRJC, there are 1,000 different stories, ranging from those who are the sole support of their families to those who are retired from full-time jobs and have returned to teach one class.

AFA Response: Means testing is not possible.

- Member Comment: Thank you for putting this referendum together. I like the overview and hope that we can concentrate on the spirit of what the proposals are designed to do, which is to provide money in the places where it does the most good, helping the people who are in the most need (e.g., adjunct faculty who can't get medical insurance elsewhere).
- Member Concern: Could something like Bridging the Doyle Scholarship be set up, where faculty could put money into the Foundation to support programs?

AFA Response: The most recent Tentative Agreement included an MOU that provides faculty with the option for a voluntary deduction from their paychecks to be directed towards any instructional program of their choosing. AFA has sent out several announcements about this option. A form is posted on AFA's Website at: www.santarosa.edu/afa/Forms/voluntary_reduction.pdf .

- Member Comment: The faculty has already given up 0.565% of salary, which was not directed to any specific area. If everyone shared equally in the salary cuts and in maintaining the AMPB, it would mean a 3.5% cut for all — 1% for each group to maintain the AMBP, and 2.5% for each group to address the categorical program reductions in the enhanced hourly salary schedules. The alternative could be a 0% reduction for regular faculty and a 7% reduction in salary for adjunct faculty.

- Member Concern: The possibility of another furlough day has been mentioned. Could all or part of the PDA days be furloughed?

AFA Response: The problem with furloughing PDA and Flex days is that they are funded by the State, so it is not as efficient to target those days as it would be to target other days, such as New Faculty Orientation Day and Commencement Day. SRJC is still the only college in the State where the regular faculty has taken a pay reduction because of the budget crisis. The majority of districts are taking money off of the adjunct salary schedules only in response to the two categorical program cuts.

- Member Concern: If we take a salary reduction, we can earn that back over time; however, we would never make up a reduction in health benefits.

AFA Response: That's true. One alternative first step would be to increase the copays or what the health insurance industry calls "user fees." People who go to the doctor use the services more and, therefore, would pay more.

- Member Concern: I understand the first two options under Regular Faculty Initiative #3 (premium cost-sharing). With the first option (a fixed percentage of salary), if I am single with no dependents, I would pay the same amount as someone who is married and has 8 dependents. With the second option (a fixed percentage of the premium), the person with 8 dependents would pay more than me. I don't understand the third option.

AFA Response: Many other districts utilize the third option, which is to decide on a fixed amount of money (e.g., the Kaiser rate for single, double, and family) that they will pay for each regular faculty member. If the faculty member wants Blue Shield, s/he would have to pick up the extra cost. With SISC, Medicash is not an option because they do not allow faculty to opt out of the group coverage. The downside of the third option is that single, healthy people are more likely to take the Kaiser option, and older, sicker people are more likely to take the more expensive plan, which would ruin our experience and rates would go up. Another downside to the third option is that there would be no incentive for the District to negotiate a cheaper price for the more expensive plan option. Money that could be going on the salary schedule is going to pay for other costs like health care.

- Member Concern: How often would that pre-determined base or benchmark be renegotiated?

AFA Response: If that option were ever negotiated to be the agreement, the rate would be renegotiated every year. There isn't a lot of competition among carriers, doctors, and hospitals in northern California. There is still a real advantage to having competing plans in one district. Districts that go to one plan only see their rates skyrocket. A district in Marin went to Kaiser only and saw a 39% increase in premiums.

- Member Concern: Does voting yes on Regular Faculty Initiative #1 contribute to the AMBP or just salary?

AFA Response: Just salary. Voting yes on R4 would contribute to the AMBP if a majority of adjunct faculty also votes yes on A1.

- Member Concern: Why isn't the District using its reserves?
AFA Response: Our district doesn't have a lot in reserves. A lot of schools with larger reserves and better prospects are spending off their reserves, hoping it's a two to three-year problem. Reserves are one-time money. Hiring with one-time reserve money and committing to paying someone 30 years out is not financially wise. Also, Sonoma County's high schools are not generating students like other districts, and it will take SRJC longer to rebound from this economic crisis than other districts through State growth funding. SRJC is no longer considered to be a "growth" district.
- Member Concern: Does AFA have any influence with the District in terms of the use of the reserves?
AFA Response: AFA monitors the District's budget on a regular basis; however, the Board is in charge of the financial health of the District. In the past, people have complained that the reserves were too high. The District was banking money to build the buildings. Then the bond money came in. Our district never did recover from the 2003-04 budget crisis. AFA has negotiated well, and the District has not put a lot of money in reserves over the course of the last several years. SRJC doesn't have the reserves that other districts have. Many districts are going to weather the storm this year by spending down reserves, but not next year.

At the conclusion of Member Concerns, Janet McCulloch reviewed a spreadsheet about enrollment that was shared at a recent Budget Advisory Committee meeting. She explained the history of budget cuts at the state level that led the District to the target goal of 20,436 FTES. For enrollment above that number the District gets no money, and falling below that number would result in the loss of \$1 million. The District can borrow and carry forward FTES from summer. The credit schedule has taken a small hit compared to the non-credit schedule. The entire non-credit Unit B schedule (the Seniors Program represented by CFT) has been decimated. After making dramatic cuts to the Spring 2010 schedule last week, departments were just told to add courses back in. AFA is trying to preserve Article 16 rights to ensure that the restored classes go to those who have assignment priority based on like-load and date of hire, not as new or increased assignments which can be assigned however a chair chooses. The District's goal for Spring 2010 is 497.5 FTEF, which is based on a certain ratio of FTEF to FTES. The target could still move. The District needs to decide if it's worth chasing unfunded growth in order to maintain the base allocation. The Student Information System cannot adequately account for non-credit positive attendance; however, it is the case that non-credit courses are less expensive than credit courses and the District may choose to increase those offerings. Multi-college districts receive higher base allocations, but have the increased costs of hiring a chancellor and setting up another district office, making this option much less attractive as a method to increase funding

MINUTES

The minutes from the October 14, 2009 Executive Council meeting were accepted as submitted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Adjunct Issues Committee Recommendation re: Second Adjunct Faculty Referendum. Warren Ruud reported that Mike Starkey conveyed via email the committee's recommendation to use surveymonkey.com to conduct the second adjunct faculty referendum. The online survey tool, which costs \$19.95 for one month, requires that AFA provide them with an email distribution list. Currently AFA does not maintain separate email lists for members and fee payers. It would take some time for AFA staff to create such a list or another possibility would be to use the Outlook distribution list for all adjunct faculty (DL.STAFF.FAC.ADJ.ALL), let everyone vote, and then have AFA staff sort out members from fee payers as the responses come in. (A side benefit of this approach is that some fee payers might be encouraged through participation in the referendum to become members.) Each person's name would have to be attached to his or her vote, in order to prevent someone from voting

more than once. Another option that would preserve confidentiality would be to use the Academic Senate model, which would involve sending out a paper ballot by email, telling people to fill it out and send it back. The latter option, however, might not result in as high of a turnout as the online voting option because of the tight turnaround time. Brief discussion followed, and included concern about the need for verifiability, a suggestion about using voice mail to remind faculty to vote, and a request to include on any paper ballot the background information for the initiative along with the question. Following the discussion, the Council approved by unanimous voice vote a motion made by Lara Branen-Ahumada, which was seconded by Alix Alixopulos, to move this item to an action item.

2. November 13, 2009 Council meeting. Warren Ruud presented an update regarding the likelihood of a Council retreat on Friday, November 13, from 12 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. The Council meeting that ordinarily would have been scheduled for November 11, the second Wednesday in November, has been cancelled because it falls on the Veteran's Day holiday. Warren said that the November 13th retreat would be held at an off-campus location to be determined. The results of the referendum will be available by then and AFA staff will submit a proposal for a group Flex activity for those three hours. Warren added that FACCC, in their continuing efforts to build their membership ranks, is interested in making a presentation to the Council and providing lunch. According to FACCC's Membership Director Brian Ha, approximately 60% of regular faculty members at SRJC are FACCC members, and a much lower percentage of adjunct faculty members are FACCC members. Currently, SRJC faculty has the option of joining AFA and/or FACCC on an individual basis. FACCC has expressed interest in entering into a contract relationship with AFA at some point in the future. (Membership in FACCC would become mandatory for every AFA member.) There are currently three independent (unaffiliated) community college faculty unions in California that are contract members of FACCC. The California Teachers Association, which is affiliated with the National Educators Association, and the California Federation of Teachers, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers, have been working together recently; however, they represent both K-12 and community college instructors. FACCC is the lone voice in Sacramento lobbying solely on behalf of California community college instructors, in particular those instructors who are not affiliated with any state or national union. Warren said that there are currently no plans for AFA to become a FACCC contract member and that the issue would require further study.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Appointment of Regular Faculty Representative for Spring 2010 Sabbatical Leave Replacement. Reneé Lo Pilato nominated Ann Herbst to serve for one semester as a regular faculty Councilor, filling the vacancy that is a result of Warren Ruud taking his Spring 2010 Sabbatical Leave. Dianne Davis seconded the nomination. Warren announced that the nominations would remain open until the November 25, 2009 Council meeting, when the appointment would be scheduled as an action item.
2. Nomination of Candidates for AFA Officer Positions for Spring 2010. Cheryl Dunn nominated Ann Herbst to serve as AFA President for the Spring 2010 semester, filling the vacancy that is a result of Warren Ruud taking his Spring 2010 Sabbatical Leave. Reneé Lo Pilato seconded the nomination. Warren announced that the nominations would remain open until the November 25, 2009 Council meeting, when the election would be scheduled as an action item.
3. Adjunct Issues Committee Recommendation re: Second Adjunct Faculty Referendum. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #1) and a motion made by Michael Ludder, which was seconded by Alix Alixopulos, the Council approved by unanimous voice vote the Adjunct Issues Committee's recommendation re: conducting the second adjunct faculty referendum. Details remain to be worked out; however, the recommendation basically includes the following: 1) the referendum will be conducted online via surveymonkey.com; 2) AFA staff will send an Outlook email distribution list of adjunct faculty to surveymonkey.com; 3) each adjunct instructor will be required to use his or her santarosa.edu email address when s/he casts his or her vote; and 4) AFA staff, with oversight by one faculty member, will sort out members from fee payers when tabulating the results.

MAIN REPORTS

1. President's Report. Warren Ruud reported that he and Dan Munton made a presentation to the Department Chair Council recently regarding AFA's review and posting of departments' Hourly Assignment Procedures on the AFA Website. Dan expressed appreciation to members of the Article 16 Committee for all of their work reviewing the procedures.
2. Treasurer's Report: Third Quarter 2009. A copy of this report was distributed to Councilors for their review prior to the meeting. Paula Burks invited questions about the report. Warren Ruud drew the Council's attention to the breakdown of AFA's reserves into sub-accounts (e.g., legal fund, equipment fund, strike fund). He remarked that most of the CCCI-member unions have larger reserves than AFA, and that some of them have reported spending as much as \$150,000 on legal cases and arbitrations in some years. To date, AFA's largest legal expense was \$12,000. In response to a question, AFA staff clarified that the figures that appear at the bottom of the report reflect the number of active faculty members who have paid either a Fair Share Service Fee or union dues in the particular month covered by the report.
3. Conciliation/Grievance Report. This report was conducted in closed session.
4. Negotiations Report. This report was conducted in closed session.

COUNCIL/SENATE/COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. District-wide Committee Reports. Warren Ruud reported that he had recently spoken to Academic Senate President Barbara Croteau about the possibility of her regularly sharing her summaries of committee meetings, noting that distributing these written summaries to Councilors via email is a good alternative to oral reports, as there typically isn't sufficient time during Council meetings for the latter. (Warren had forwarded one of Barbara's summaries prior to this meeting for Council review.)
2. Professional Development Committee (PDC). In a follow-up report to one given at the 10/14/09 Council meeting, Karen Frindell updated the Council about the plans for the Spring 2010 mandatory institutional PDA day. There will be a Tauzer lecture in the morning, followed by large format workshops, where participants will learn about Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's). After lunch, every department will be required to hold an SLO workshop, which will also be attended by faculty designated as SLO experts. Karen also reported that she had conveyed AFA's grave concerns to the PDC about the lack of a menu of activities and the lack of a shared governance process in the planning of the day's schedule. She commented that many workshop proposals, which the PDC committee thought would be worthwhile but which had nothing to do with SLO's, had to be discarded. Warren Ruud reported that the Academic Senate, which has a broader interest in the PDA Day program, shares AFA's concerns and that AFA officers would be consulting with Senate officers on the matter. In the ensuing discussion, some Councilors expressed support for the idea of having an opportunity specifically set aside for departments to finish up their SLO's. Others said that their departments had already completed their SLO's and that they thought having an expert present might tend to slow the process down. Councilors briefly discussed the various SLO requirements that departments need to meet, in terms of the number of outcomes and assessment projects per course per year that need to be completed.
3. Publications Committee. Lara Branen-Ahumada encouraged Councilors to submit ideas, proposals, and/or written articles and opinion pieces for potential publication in the *AFA Dialogue*. Any faculty member whose full-length article is published in an issue of the *Dialogue* will receive a \$200 stipend.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein