

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING MINUTES

November 8, 2017

(Approved by Executive Council on November 22, 2017)

Executive Councilors present (noted by *):

*Karen Frindell Teuscher, <i>presiding</i>	*Dianne Davis	*Bud Metzger	*Michelle Van Aalst
*Filomena Avila	*Deirdre Frontczak	*Terry Mulcaire	*Sarah Whyllly
*Paulette Bell	*Robert Jackson	*Margaret Pennington	*Albert Yu
*Shawn Brumbaugh	*Sean Martin	*Karen Stanley	<i>Adjunct Vacancy</i>
*Ted Crowell	*Molly Matheson	*Mike Starkey	

Negotiators/Appointed Positions present: Warren Ruud, Julie Thompson

Staff members present: Carol Valencia

Faculty members present: 19 faculty members in Santa Rosa; 2 faculty members in Petaluma

The meeting was called to order at 4:32 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4245, on the Santa Rosa campus, and video-conferenced to PC#726, on the Petaluma campus.

1. Negotiations Update. Chief Negotiator, Julie Thompson, reported as follows:

- We usually have one general meeting per semester, but our negotiations ground rules provide for keeping our membership informed about the current status of negotiations by reporting the details of negotiations to our members during general membership meetings.
- The status of the following articles open for negotiations in 2017-18 was reviewed:
 - For *Art. 1: Agreement to the Contract*, the District is requesting a one-year contract (2017-18).
 - Regarding *Art. 10: Benefits*, there is currently a large balance in the Adjunct Medical Benefits Program account. In response to a request last spring, we are working with the District to eliminate the eligibility period (currently five semesters), so that faculty can apply for benefits their first semester if they have a 40 percent load. We also want to add a "triggering event" provision so that faculty members can enroll for medical benefits outside of the two set enrollment periods. The District is working with AFA on both of these goals.
 - Regarding *Art. 13: Chairs and Coordinators*, AFA and the District have agreed to a chair X-factor MOU for compensation for workload that exceeds the chair reassigned time. We are also working on a similar agreement for coordinators. Farther down the line and connected to the problem of faculty members doing work they're not compensated for would be to write language similar to the chair and coordinator X-factor language, to compensate all faculty members for "special assignments" not found in *Art. 17: Job Descriptions*. In addition, we are almost ready to begin the CTE coordinator workload study, which will be conducted during the 2018 calendar year.
 - We would like to revise the charge of DTREC found in *Articles 14A: Regular Faculty Evaluations, 14B: Adjunct Faculty Evaluations, and 30: Tenure Review*. AFA proposes using the provisions in *Art. 6: Interpreting the Contract* for interpretation issues related to evaluations and tenure review; ensuring that evaluations forms do not add evaluation categories that go beyond the job descriptions found in *Art. 17*; and use the *Art. 11: Conciliation/Grievance/Arbitration* process for any grievance-related issues. Our request is awaiting the District's attention.
 - The *Art. 14B* pilot for out-of-department evaluators has expired. The District wants faculty to return to the practice of completing these extra evaluations without compensation.
 - Regarding *Art. 16: Hourly Assignments*, the new scheduling timeline pilot has several "impacts & effects." AFA and the District are discussing the language regarding the query letter, dates related to the electronic publication of the schedule, and new and increased assignments.

- For *Art. 18: Leaves*, we are looking at creating a disaster leave provision similar to the one for catastrophic leave (see [18.02.B](#)).
- The District Package Proposal, given to AFA on November 3, was projected and briefly summarized. One important piece of this proposal is found in the section on *Article 26: Salary Schedule Development*. The District is proposing the elimination of the Rank 10 formula from the Contract to be replaced by an ongoing 1.56 percent increase to the salary schedules starting August 2018; that increase would be applied to last year's salary schedules. This would result in a net decrease to faculty salaries from this semester to next, and from this year to next year. The District's salary proposal would eliminate, effective January 2018, the raises that are currently in effect due to Rank 10 (average 3.17 percent) so that the Spring 2018 pay rate would be the same as the Spring 2017 pay rates. This would decrease this year's actual raise by half—1.585. The District's proposal further states that the 2018-19 salary schedules would be 1.56 percent more than the 2016-17 schedules. In other words, this year's salary schedules would be 1.585 percent more than the 2016-17 schedules, and next year's salary schedules would be 1.56 percent more than the 2016-17 schedules. This would mean that 2018-19 salaries would be .025 percent less than this year's. There were also changes to the lab equity agreement reached in May 2017.
- Q&A:
 - *What will happen with lab equity?*
 - We asked for an MOU immediately to reflect our agreement from last May. The District did not answer that request, but instead gave us this proposal.
 - *What happens to Rank 10 without an agreement?*
 - Rank 10 rolls with the old Contract until we have either a new tentative agreement (TA) or reach "impasse" with the District.
 - We will keep negotiating with the District in good faith and keep chipping away at the items we want.
 - *Is the AFA team looking at any options other than Rank 10?*
 - AFA has agreed to tweaks of Rank 10 over the years at the request of the District. In the final analysis, we are really only at Rank 19 or 20 because of past adjustments to the formula.
 - We want to keep Rank 10 so we can continue to live in the area that we work, but the District wants to strip us of that.
 - The AFA team has stated that it is willing to explore other salary formulas but has no interest in a formula that would result in reduced salaries.
 - *Are they proposing a retroactive pay cut?*
 - No. The pay cut would begin in January 2018.
 - *Has there been any discussion of de-linking the contract and hourly salary schedules?*
 - They have not brought that to the table this year.
 - *What can faculty do to help?*
 - Faculty members are not constrained in speaking publicly about the current state of negotiations. Various attendees suggested that faculty address the board, send emails, and have conversations regarding workload and compensation. An attendee also asked about raising this issue in the Senate and whether it is relevant to the Senate's purview. It was stated that since competitive salaries are fundamentally connected to attracting and retaining a quality faculty and supporting strong educational programs, this is relevant to the Senate's purview.
 - *Is the Board aware of what is going on?*
 - We don't believe they are. They get all their reports from the District negotiating team members, and we have reason to believe that the Board hears select information.
- Comments:
 - Faculty can demand that the lab equity agreement be implemented since the District is holding it hostage. Please speak out, write about and tell your colleagues what is going on. There are no restrictions on what members can say or write.
 - This is appalling and we must say so across the college.
 - When we agreed to the Rank 10 adjustments in the past, the spirit of the District was, "Let's make this work." That is no longer the case.
 - The idea behind the Rank 10 formula is to preserve labor peace so we can spend our time talking about other important matters. They are proposing spending all our time discussing the financial

condition of the District. They want to spend their money on other priorities and many of those also increase faculty workload. Every hour we spend arguing about salary is an hour we cannot spend on other matters.

- I believe the recent management salary survey was based on 11 similar districts. Could we use something similar to that for our salary?
- There were raises of 30-40 percent for the president and senior vice presidents at the same time they were saying they can't afford Rank 10. They also want to divide faculty (lab vs. lecture; part-time vs. full time).
- The District has created its own financial hardship. Rank 10 is a fair comparison to other districts who have the same financial constraints as SRJC.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Carol Valencia.