

AFA GENERAL MEETING MINUTES

May 23, 2011

(Approved by the Executive Council on August 24, 2011)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Warren Ruud, <i>presiding</i>	Dianne Davis	*Reneé Lo Pilato	Eric Stadnik
Paulette Bell	*Cheryl Dunn	*Sean Martin	*Mike Starkey
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	Brenda Flyswithawks	Terry Mulcaire	*Julie Thompson
*Paula Burks	*Karen Frindell Teuscher	*Dan Munton	<i>One adjunct</i>
John Daly	Lynn Harenberg-Miller	*Audrey Spall	<i>Councilor vacancy</i>

Officers/Negotiators present: Ann Herbst, Jack Wegman
Councilor-elect present: Mary Pierce
Faculty present: Approximately 15 faculty members
Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m. in the Bertolini Student Activities Center on the Santa Rosa campus.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Tentative Agreement for 2011-12. After brief introductions, Ann Herbst presented an overview of each of the elements included in the 2011-12 Tentative Agreement (TA) that AFA and the District reached on May 19, 2011. All of the documents included in the TA are posted on the AFA Website at http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/tentative_agreement.shtml .

The TA is comprised of:

- 2011-12 Salary Schedules
(http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/ta_salary11-12.pdf)
- Revisions to six articles
(http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_May2011.pdf); and
- Six Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's):
 - MOU Article 8: Agreement for the Compressed Calendar Negotiations Task Force
(http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/MOU/mou_8_comp-calendar-tf.pdf)
 - MOU Article 13: Department Chairs and Coordinators Task Force
(http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/MOU/mou_13_chair-coord-tf.pdf)
 - MOU Article 16.04F: Spring 2009 and Subsequent Class Schedule Reductions
(http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/MOU/mou_16.04F_sp09.pdf);
 - MOU Article 16.04F: Summer 2011 Class Schedule Reductions
(http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/MOU/mou_16.04F_su11.pdf);

- MOU Article 26: Salary Schedule Development; Sp11 Salary Schedule Adjustment (http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/MOU/mou_26_salary2010-11.pdf); and
- MOU Articles 16 & 28: Loss of Assignment related to implementing District Policy 3.6 (http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/MOU/mou_16-28_3.6pol.pdf)

Ann Herbst and Warren Ruud also presented and reviewed a graph demonstrating the impact on the 2011-12 salary schedules should the District's revenue shortfall from the State exceed \$10.5 million (http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/2011-12_salary_graph.pdf).

Faculty members in the audience raised several questions during the question-and-answer period that followed the presentation.

Q: In terms of the 20 percent limit on contract faculty overload, what is the process a department chair would follow in making cuts to a schedule? For example, in Fall 2011, if a regular faculty member has a 40 percent overload and three adjunct faculty members each have a 60 percent load, how does the chair decide which load to cut first?

A: Basically, when chairs make cuts to the schedule, they need to reverse the process they used when creating the schedule. The faculty members who are the most vulnerable are those who have no assignment priority, followed by those who have a load greater than 40 percent. In terms of the particular scenario you describe, chairs should start by cutting the 60 percent loads, and then back up in the same order they made the assignments—last assignment made, first assignment cut. If necessary, a second pass through the assignments should be made after the initial pass. The one-year provision included in the TA means that contract faculty would max out at 20 percent on the first pass, not that they would be limited to 20 percent.

Historically, AFA and the District have not been able to reach agreement on an orderly process for making cuts to the schedule after it has been "permatized." This provision in the TA applies to the development of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 schedules, which occurs during the 2011-12 academic year, and it states that cuts to the Fall 2011 schedule should follow the same principle. AFA has not reached an agreement with the District yet regarding a process for reducing the Spring 2012 schedule. The negotiations team will need to see if AFA and the District can agree upon a process for making cuts and an interpretation resolving the 60 percent question.

Q: Might there be an unintended consequence of the one-year provision to limit contract overload to 20 percent on the first pass, in terms of the loss of a like-load pattern for contract faculty?

A: AFA's intent in negotiating this provision was *not* to reduce contract faculty like-load patterns, but rather to protect assignments for those adjunct faculty members who are dropping below 40 percent and losing their eligibility for medical benefits. Another goal was to reduce District expenses in 2011-12. (The average contract faculty overload/hourly rate is higher than the average adjunct faculty hourly rate.) AFA and the District might need to craft an MOU or contract language similar to the two existing MOU's that preserve like load for hourly assignments. The consequence of this one-year/temporary provision should not be to "put someone in the hole."

Q: In the Business Administration Department, there are people who are working full-time as realtors and bankers and insurance agents, while also working 40 percent at SRJC. It doesn't feel right that a regular faculty member's 20 percent overload goes to a full-time realtor or a full-timer at Agilent.

A: There is no way to make it fair. AFA's position is that "means testing" is not an appropriate way to assign overload. We understand that it does create a hardship, when the overload part of your income is part of your primary livelihood.

Q: What happens to a faculty member's length of service after s/he retires and wants to start teaching again?

A: Unlike CCSF, SRJC faculty retirees are not a separate class of employees with a separate salary schedule. Retirees returning as adjunct faculty maintain the same salary placement (up to Step 9 on the hourly schedules) and placement on the departmental length-of-service list. (They keep their original date of hire if they haven't taken a break of more than two semesters.) If they had an overload before they retired, they will have a like load. If they didn't have an overload, then the chair will offer them at least one class (typically 20 percent). The same offer of a class (typically 20 percent) also applies to adjunct instructors who have no like load because, for example, they teach only in the fall and not in the spring.

Q: Is there any attempt on the part of the District to encourage "old-timers" to retire?

A: That hasn't been a topic of discussion at the negotiations table, mainly because the cost of health care is so high. There is no savings in backfilling full-time positions with adjunct faculty, because of the very high cost in keeping regular faculty retirees covered under the group health plan until they reach 65.

Q: What about release time for discipline coordinators? For example, there is no formal way that "coordinators" in newly merged departments are paid, which in our case has caused the two newly merged departments to negotiate with each other as we develop protocols. Also, we are losing a sum total of release time, because the department we're merging with is small, so we will only receive a small increase that is not as much as the minimum amount of release time that the smaller department used to receive. Does AFA have any plans to address that issue and formalize some provisions?

A: AFA thought that the District ought to have redistributed the reassigned time fairly, and attended to the merged length-of-service lists, in addition to other issues, *before* merging the departments. At worst, AFA believes the result of the mergers should be expenditure neutral. There will be just as much work to be done after the merger as there was before, since someone will need to coordinate the different disciplines.

Department Chairs & Coordinators Task Force Member Karen Frindell-Teuscher commented that the task force has just started to meet. She said that they plan to crunch the numbers this summer according to the "old" reassigned time formula for department chairs and also develop a formula for coordinators.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Warren expressed his appreciation to the members of the negotiating team and AFA staff for all of their hard work.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.