

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING MINUTES

May 17, 2013

(Approved by the Executive Council on August 28, 2013)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Julie Thompson, <i>presiding</i>	Ted Crowell	Andre LaRue	Margaret Pennington
*Paulette Bell	Dianne Davis	*Sean Martin	*Audrey Spall
Lara Branen-Ahumada	Terry Ehret	*Bud Metzger	Mike Starkey
Shawn Brumbaugh	*Deirdre Frontczak	*Terry Mulcaire	*Phyllis Usina
*Paula Burks	*Brenda Flyswithhawks	*Nikona Mulkovich	

Officers/Negotiators present: Will Baty, Jacqueline McGhee, Warren Ruud

Faculty members present: Bettina Armstrong, Smita Avasthi, Robin Fautley, René Lo Pilato, Norberto Quiroz, Ed Sikes, Ed Sorensen, Karen Stanley, Tad Wakefield

Staff members present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m. in Room #4246 in Doyle Library on the Santa Rosa campus, and it was video-conferenced to Mahoney Library Room #736 on the Petaluma campus.

NEGOTIATIONS UPDATE

President Julie Thompson expressed her appreciation to the members of the Council and the AFA Negotiating Team (which, in addition to Julie, includes Warren Ruud, Lara Branen-Ahumada, Dianne Davis, Lynn Harenberg-Miller, and Jack Wegman), Budget Analyst Will Baty, and AFA staff members Candy Shell and Judith Bernstein for all of their hard work throughout the year and especially during this spring's intense period of negotiations regarding monetary items.

Chief Negotiator Warren Ruud went over the various elements of the May 2013 Tentative Agreement, and he responded to questions from faculty members in attendance. (This morning, AFA sent an email to DL.STAFF.FAC.ALL with a link to the T.A. summary. See http://santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_May2013.pdf.) Warren's comments included the following:

I. AFA/District Tentative Agreement 2013

- Using a weighted mean, every step on the salary schedule will move 78% towards Rank 10. The average salary increase on total payroll for 2013-14 will be 5.3%, but the percentage of each individual's salary increase will vary depending upon his/her step placement. (See *Table 1* on page 6 of the summary.) There is a structural reason for this variance, which is that the construction of the Annual Contract Salary Schedule changed several years ago from being based on one benchmark to three benchmarks (C-1, C-16, and C-28), and SRJC's salary schedule evolves as other community college districts' salary schedules evolve. Every step will see an increase, but some steps have to move farther than others to reach Rank 10. Salary movement towards Rank 10 is happening proportionally, and AFA's goal is to hit Rank 10 next year (2014-15). (See *Chart 1* on page 7 of the summary.)
- Governor Brown's May Revise included a 1.57% COLA, but the final COLA percentage may change after the legislature and the Board of Governors weigh in on the proposed budget.

- The hourly salary schedules are linked to the Annual Contract Salary Schedule, which is why the same percentage step increases on the contract schedule will apply to the hourly schedules. (See *Table 1* on page 6 of the summary.)
- The District doesn't have data yet on the total number of hours faculty members were paid for last year. Based on data from 2010-11, a 1.57% COLA increase would cost approximately \$470,000. The cost to move all the way to Rank 10 is approximately \$2.9 million, and the cost of moving 78% of the way to Rank 10 is approximately \$2.3 million.
- AFA conducts a salary study every year, using the three benchmarks (C-1, C-16, and C-28), and every year AFA and the District negotiate salaries. AFA anticipates that salaries across the state will rise a little next year, as they have done this year, given the pent-up demand for raises. Faculty at many other community colleges have put up with deferred compensation. It is hard to predict the amount of salary increases in the future, as they depend on the state budget and movement at the various benchmarks across the state.
- SRJC's contract faculty salary had slipped to 53rd in the state, while adjunct faculty salary rates are still around 7th or 8th in the state—making any improvement in pay parity a hard sell to the Board of Trustees. That may change when funding for categorical line items in the state budget come back, although Governor Brown seems to be more in favor of categorical funding for programs related to student success. Funding for categorical programs in the May revise was conspicuous by its absence.
- One of the Contract provisions that was included in the 2012 T.A. was that AFA would receive 50% of the amount of the District's unrestricted fund balance in excess of 7.2% of its general fund expenditures, to use for salaries. During the last phase of negotiations on monetary items this year, AFA was able to successfully negotiate the use of some portion of that discretionary money to cover the increases in the cost of benefits, and the replacement of that money with funds from other sources.
- The decline in the number of full-time faculty is an Academic Senate issue more than it is a negotiations issue. This dynamic between AFA and the Senate is true across the state. Hiring more full-time faculty and increasing salaries are diametrically opposed and competing interests. AFA doesn't address those contradictory interests, because the Senate champions full-time faculty hiring, and AFA champions salary increases. The Senate has done a good job in making that point to the District. When money comes back into the system, hiring more full-time faculty will be one of those lagging items that the District will be addressing. SRJC will be competing against many other community colleges—many of which are down 30-40 faculty members. Increasing salaries is a good first step in attracting high quality faculty.
- Workload is a pay issue. Faculty members should get paid for what they do. If they're doing too much college service, they should receive reassigned time. There should be Adjunct Faculty District Activities Fund money to pay adjunct faculty who perform college service. Hiring more full-time faculty is one of many solutions.
- The sabbatical leave program will return to full force in terms of the formula. The total number of sabbaticals is still down a few, because there are fewer full-time faculty members. Usually, the number of full-time faculty members is around 300. If the total number is down to 279 FTEF, the total number of sabbaticals will be down, too. It will take time to build up that number. In a normal year, there are 16-17 sabbaticals.
- Article 1: Agreement to the Contract. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art01_TA_2013_Markup.pdf and http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art01_TA_2013_Clean.pdf .) Article 1 and Article 7: Definitions will be added to the list of automatic reopeners. The latter will help to update the definitions on a more regular basis and, also, resolve problems with misinterpretations or language that is difficult to read.
- Article 10: Benefits. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art10_TA_2013_Agreement.pdf .) Some of the distribution from the excess in the District's fund balance over what they anticipated will get credited back to the District for the salary increase, and some will be

applied to the AFA Health & Welfare Benefits Account (AHWBA) to help control costs. The AHWBA is similar to the state's rainy day fund. Sometimes there are moderate increases in health insurance rates, and sometimes there are significant spikes. AFA maintains the AHWBA to level off the increases, so that it doesn't become necessary to modify the health plan every year to control costs. AHWBA will provide some security for the health plan for the next two or three years, although the AHWBA funds could get used up. Neither AFA nor the District has any control over the increases in benefits.

- The Adjunct Faculty Medical Benefits Program (AMBP) is still being financed by an offset in the hourly salary schedules (for adjunct and overload assignments). The cost of the AMBP is about \$1 million per year. The District will be adding more classes and the excess balance in that fund—currently \$100,000—may be affected; however, AFA has found it extremely difficult to negotiate any increase to the hourly schedules. The main focus now is on what the District pays lab and noncredit faculty.
- Article 14 A & B: Evaluations. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art14A_TA_2013_New.pdf and http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art14B_TA_2013_New.pdf .) The pilot program will roll over, with a few additions. There will be no "double jeopardy" (i.e., if an evaluation is nullified due to the District's failure to follow Article 14, it can't automatically trigger another out-of-cycle evaluation in the subsequent semester). The Department of Public Safety and Work Experience Department have a significant problem, in that they have many adjunct faculty members working small loads, typically off-site, who need to be evaluated (often, in addition to the evaluation required to maintain their certification). DTREC will be given some latitude in developing a pilot program to address this issue.
- Article 17: Job Descriptions. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art17_TA_2013_Markup.pdf and http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art17_TA_2013_Clean.pdf .) There will now be separate job descriptions for coaches, librarians, counselors, Disability Resource specialists, and Work Experience coordinators. The job description for department chairs has been moved to Article 13.
- Article 13: Department Chairs & Program Coordinators. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art13_TA_2013_Markup.pdf and http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art13_TA_2013_Clean.pdf .) The job duties have been reduced from six pages to two pages. While even six pages can't adequately describe what chairs do, this Contract article is still one of the longest in the state. Also, language was added to (1) address what happens when a chair voluntarily removes him- or herself from office; (2) reinstate the evaluation of chairs, using a simplified, online evaluation form; (3) provide protections for chairs and spell out the rights of faculty serving as chairs; (4) set the stage for future negotiations as to the definition, categories, duties, and compensation of coordinators; and (5) begin the development of a new formula for chair compensation, based on two questions: How big is the "pie" (i.e. the total amount of reassigned time available to compensate all chairs)? And how do you cut up the pie (i.e., how much reassigned time does each chair receive)? AFA and the District have been working on this issue for a couple of years (with the assistance of a task force and input from the Department Chair Council), and they have resolved the answer to the latter question but have yet to reach agreement on the former question (the size of the pie).
- Article 22: Professional Development. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art22_TA_2013_Markup.pdf and http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art22_TA_2013_Clean.pdf .) AFA worked with the Senate to clean up the language that defines professional development. Now, it matches Title 5. The Flex pilot program that began several years ago has been institutionalized.
- Article 25: Sabbatical Leaves. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art25_TA_2013_Markup.pdf and http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art25_TA_2013_Clean.pdf .) Revisions will allow the Academic Senate to have more supervision in the process and input into the sabbatical leave guidelines. The Senate's interest comes from a shared-governance perspective, while AFA's

interest comes from a narrower, working-conditions perspective. AFA's perspective is that sabbatical leaves are a benefit that is conferred upon contract faculty members when they are hired, and that a little bit of every year's salary is being put away until the time when their turn comes up for a sabbatical.

- Article 26: Salary Schedule Development. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art26_TA_2013_Agreement.pdf .) New language addresses where the money will come from to construct the 2013-14 salary schedules.
- Article 31: Working Conditions. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art31_TA_2013_New.pdf .) New language addresses the length of time that adjunct faculty members' email accounts will remain open after the last paid assignment. Ever since the move to the new Student Information System, the I.T. Department has had an interest in controlling access to confidential information, which requires only an Outlook user name and password. There is a great deal of sensitive information in SIS (including credit card and Social Security numbers). AFA has an interest in ensuring that adjunct faculty members maintain the ability to receive offers of assignments for the next semester. It took a long time to work out, but AFA and the District ultimately agreed to a limit of three semesters since the last paid assignment, with the exception of those who resign their positions or are terminated. This provision applies to retiring adjunct faculty, independent of whether they want to teach anymore; however, if one were going to retire with no intention of returning, one could resign.
- Article 32: Workload. (See http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/TA/Art32_TA_2013_New.pdf .) AFA and the District have been trying to codify the practice of compensating Disability Resources specialists, counselors, and the SRT director, all of whom perform part of their contract duties outside of the academic year. Summer is a busy time for those faculty members, and they are compensated with "comp" time during the academic year. This practice precedes the Contract, but it has not been included in the Contract until now. This year, AFA attempted to draft language that matched past practice (exactly how it's been done in the past), and those three to four new pages in the Contract represent a big step forward. In the future, there may be an appendix that addresses what happens when a contract faculty member hired as a coach wishes to retreat to a full-time teaching load.

II. Other results of 2012-13 Negotiations

- Article 8: Academic Calendar. AFA commissioned Janet McCulloch, English Department regular faculty member and former AFA President and Chief Negotiating Officer, to step in as chair of the AFA/Senate/District Compressed Calendar Committee to complete the work of that committee before it disbanded. After having received the templates from the District, Janet has recently completed the final report. That report will become part of the College-wide discussion next fall. AFA will be conferring with the Senate. What happens in terms of implementing a compressed calendar depends a great deal on what is happening with the state budget.
- Article 16: Hourly Assignments. AFA and the District reached agreement on a formal interpretation about converting contract load to hourly load, and we will be revisiting that agreement. Contract faculty had been signing up for excess contract load and then converting it to hourly load without going through their departments' hourly assignment procedures, which caused harm to adjunct faculty in some cases. AFA and the District had an interest in fixing those problems so that adjunct faculty would not be injured and would receive offers of load according to their position on the length-of-service list. Also, the 20% restriction on overload will sunset at the end of this year. There will be an increase in hourly assignments, and that restriction would put a burden on many departments.
- Article 27: Salary Placement. AFA and the District reached agreement on a formal interpretation about prior summer work counting for credit towards higher initial salary placement. The District is now adhering to this interpretation.

III. Ongoing negotiations from 2012-13 to 2013-14

- Article 16: Hourly Assignments. The goal is to rewrite the article using language that people can read and understand and to address problems that have existed since 1991.
- Article 23: Progressive Discipline and Due Process. AFA developed a draft, delivered it to the District in February, and is hoping to conclude negotiations on that article for the next T.A.
- Article 24: Retirement. AFA and the District have an agreement in principle to look at the Early Retirement Option (ERO). Currently, the minimum requirements, which apply wall-to-wall (to managers, classified, and faculty), are 15 years of FTE service in the District and 55 years of age. Faculty members don't usually retire at 55; most retire at 61 or 62. Age 62 coincides with the CalSTRS maximum age factor. The ERO is not a big expense on the faculty side; it's a larger expense on the classified side, as they tend to work more physical jobs, start earlier, and leave earlier. The District is interested in changing the minimum requirements to 20 years of FTE service and age 60. If AFA were to agree, we would want a grace period—for example, an effective date of June 2015—so that faculty would know that this was coming and could plan accordingly. AFA agreed to talk to the District about this issue. The District is interested in linking up the ERO requirements with pension reform, such that there would be two tiers, using CalSTRS' definition. For those who are considered "2% at 60" employees, the requirement would be 20 years of FTE service and age 60 (after 2015). If a faculty member has no creditable service in the CalSTRS system before 1/1/13, then the ERO requirements would be 20 years of FTE service at age 62. AFA and the District are relatively close to signing an MOU for next year. It's an important issue for the District, and the two parties have been working on it over the course of the last few weeks.
- Article 32: Workload. The focus of the Workload Task Force was originally on lab and online workload. Six months ago, the two were split off, because lab seemed to be more quickly resolvable. Online workload is still in progress.

Lab Workload. AFA and the District have reached agreement in principle on the final report about lab workload, and it will be put out to the college community in the fall. Negotiating the implementation of the recommendations will be a separate task. Currently, most lab assignments are compensated at two-thirds of the compensation for a lecture assignment. (One FTE lab load is 22.5 hours per week, whereas one FTE lecture load is 15 hours per week.) Compared to the rest of the state, SRJC's lab/lecture ratio, which reflects the old Carnegie ratio, is at rock bottom. Preparation for Life Sciences, Chemistry, and Physics lab classes requires the same amount of time as preparation for lecture classes. Student contact outside of a lab class may or may not be the same as for a lecture class. In the report, labs are broken up into three groups, and the task force recommendation is that the lab/lecture ratio for each group be set at .75, .80, and 1.0, respectively. The Academic Senate and the District would do a triage to categorize all the different labs, working together through shared governance (like the curriculum review process). Compensation will become a factor. By increasing loads, the number of FTEF is reduced, and each FTEF costs about \$50,000 per year, which would be ongoing money. AFA's interest is in taking some money and making progress towards those goals over the course of time.

Online Workload. Addressing online workload is a more difficult challenge. Phyllis Usina has done an amazing amount of work, as has Candy Shell. Phyllis Usina noted that online workload is challenging because it's so different from the model that everyone is familiar with. With online courses, the workload is disbursed over the course of the week. The faculty member checks in a couple of times a week. She came up with a survey instrument that was modeled on the lab survey, and collected data from 44 out of 75 faculty members teaching full-semester courses. Working with Candy, she analyzed the data and put it in summary format. Phyllis is sorting through the comments and will put forth a report next semester. The District is interested in online load in relation to class size. Nikona Mulkovich is chairing a class-size task force, and Phyllis has funneled her work into what that task force is doing.

Class Size Task Force. Nikona Mulkovich noted that the task force report would focus on class size recommendations. The job of the task force, which is comprised of three District

managers and three faculty members, was to take a look at how the District assigns class size limits across the College and to create an equitable system that coincides with the statewide Academic Senate's Spring 2012 statement, while at the same time recognizing the unique needs of the college. The task force has been reevaluating the existing pilot program for medium and large lecture loads, with the idea of moving away from those terms and towards language that defines the appropriate limit for any class that is taught and describes what happens if there are more or fewer students than that number. In its research, the task force has looked at about 60 colleges. For most colleges, class size is set in the curriculum review process. SRJC doesn't have that component as part of its curriculum review process at this point. Around the state, there are many variations in how faculty load is determined for increasingly large classes. For example, at some colleges, rather than enrollment limits of 70 and 100 students, the class sizes increase at increments of 5 or 15 students, with additional compensation for faculty at each increment. AFA believes that the District needs a better system than the one that currently exists, and the members of the task force will be talking to the Department Chair Council, the DCC/Instructional Managers group, and the District about these issues.

Following the review of the T.A., Julie announced that the Executive Council voted unanimously to recommend that the membership approve the T.A. Ballots have been sent out to AFA members, and the voting deadline is noon on Friday, May 24. AFA will announce the results via a DL.STAFF.FAC.ALL email.

Warren encouraged those present to talk to and encourage their colleagues to vote. If the turnout is high, it will send a strong message to the District that this T.A. is important to the faculty.

Julie concluded the meeting by expressing her gratitude to all the people who worked very hard on the T.A. and to the AFA members who showed up to the General Membership Meeting and asked good questions.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein