

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

July 29, 2009

*(pending approval)*

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, Janet McCulloch; Staff present: Judith Bernstein  
Faculty present: Rhonda Findling, Marco Giordano, Arthur Hayssen, Mark Nelson, Ed Sikes, Fred Utter

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

**MEMBER CONCERNS**

Warren Ruud again requested that faculty members wishing their comments to be available publicly should email them to [afa@santarosa.edu](mailto:afa@santarosa.edu). He noted that all such comments would be shared with the Executive Council, and posted on the AFA Web site. (Note: These written Member Concern comments are posted at [www.santarosa.edu/afa/Budget\\_Crisis.shtml](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Budget_Crisis.shtml) .)

**MINUTES**

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes from the July 8, 2009 Special Executive Council meeting, which were accepted as submitted.

**MAIN REPORTS**

1. President's Report. Warren recommended that every faculty member read Chancellor of the California Community College System Jack Scott's budget update, which Warren emailed to DL.STAFF.FAC.ALL on July 29. (The update is also posted on the AFA Web site at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/CCCCO\\_Budget\\_Update\\_07\\_28\\_09.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/CCCCO_Budget_Update_07_28_09.pdf) ) Mr. Scott's update, which Warren said was well written and probably more realistic than other analyses, describes what has happened over the last couple of weeks, while the governor and legislators have argued over the budget. Warren reviewed its key points:
  - Student fees have been increased from \$20 to \$26 per unit (instead of \$40 - \$60 as had been discussed). Last time there was a fee hike, the community college system lost 300,000 students (representing about a 10% drop in total number of students).
  - Growth funds have been eliminated, which wasn't a surprise, but it does mean that there is no longer the same economic benefit to the District to increase enrollments.

- There is no COLA for 2009-10. SRJC salary schedules have always been tied to COLA. (Basically, the formula in the Contract is Rank 10 plus COLA minus 0.5%; however, there is no deduction of 0.5% when the COLA is 0%.)
- Categorical programs have been cut by \$333 million statewide, which represents a 16 - 32% reduction, depending upon the program (not 58% as predicted earlier). Among the SRJC categorical programs taking big hits will be part-time faculty compensation, part-time faculty health insurance, and part-time faculty office hours. For SRJC, part-time faculty compensation and office hours is about \$1.6 million, and the 32% cut represents about \$500,000. The Contract stipulates what happens when those funds are cut; however, AFA will negotiate with the District how and where any cuts to the salary schedules will be made.
- General purpose funds have been reduced by \$120 million statewide.
- There had been a proposal to change the apportionment rate for P.E., Dance & Athletics courses from credit to non-credit. The State reimburses districts \$4,500 for credit apportionment, and only \$2,700 for non-credit. That proposal was not approved; however, the District significantly reduced the number of PED&A course offerings (about a 30% cut in sections) for the fall semester. There is speculation about future cuts to PED&A apportionment, and additional cuts to Music and Art Department sections.
- One of the big differences between community colleges and K-12 funding is how the property tax shortfall is handled. community colleges get whatever the State decides to give them. SRJC will suffer a large reduction in income — somewhere between \$1.6 and \$1.7 million.
- There is talk of relaxing or forgiving the full-time faculty obligation requirement (the “75/25 rule”) in terms of hiring. There is also talk of relaxing the Fifty-Percent Law, which requires that districts expend at least 50% of their operating budgets on faculty salaries.
- Restrictions on how categorical program funds are spent may be relaxed, but a public discussion would need to occur at a public hearing first before any such change could be made. The District has indicated to AFA in previous discussions that they have no intention of increasing discretion in that arena.
- It’s possible that there will be another adjustment to the budget in terms of mid-year cuts. The State has moved a June 30 payroll to July 1, which will just make the 2010-11 budget that much worse. The erosion of revenues is still growing. The current crisis is different than what happened in 2003-04, when revenues were reduced, because now it’s become a structural problem. Even if the economy rebounds, it will take longer for California than other states because California is at the center of the foreclosure problem. The state’s budget shortfall is forecast to reach \$20 billion by 2012-13, and another \$26 billion by 2013-14.
- The Community College League of California has issued a budget analysis, which is a little more pessimistic than the Chancellor’s Office analysis. The discrepancy between the two concerns how any federal money would enter into the situation.

A question-and-answer period followed and the following points were made:

- At this point in time, faculty who teach P.E.D&A courses will still be paid on the credit salary schedule. Any change would have to be negotiated, and changes to curriculum would most likely be required as well.
- Reducing the obligation to employ more full-time faculty only applies to hiring. Since it is very likely that there will be fewer students, replacing full-time faculty retirees should not cause a problem with the full-time obligation number. Tenure is not on the table — everyone in the tenure review process is as safe as in any other year.
- In terms of categorical programs, the State allocated a certain amount of money to cover office hours, and another amount to enhance the salary schedules (about 6-7%). The cut to the Part-time Medical Benefits Program is more insult than injury, since the State only contributes \$60,000 to that particular program, so a 32% reduction is not a substantial amount of money. (Originally, the State was supposed to cover 50% of the premiums.)
- Part-time Faculty Compensation accounts for 3% of the money that's on the hourly salary schedules. When it was originally signed into law, it was an acknowledgment that part-time faculty were being paid less than their full-time colleagues. At that time, AFA took an amount and put it into the Adjunct Faculty District Activities Fund. The office hour line item is separate and must be used specifically for office hours — it can't be used for other part-time equity issues. For the past five years, all of that extra money from those two budget lines has been funding the "enhanced" hourly salary schedules. Each assignment type was affected differently (credit lecture received the biggest increase). Any change to the hourly rates would have to be negotiated.
- The District is currently hovering around one of the State's enrollment benchmarks, which is 20,400 FTES for the year. If they were to drop below that figure, they would lose \$1 million in State funding. When the District reduces the schedule, they will want to stay above that benchmark; consequently, the spring schedule will be written with that idea in mind.
- There is something to be said for individual faculty members voluntarily enrolling a couple of extra students in each section, in order to help the District reach that benchmark. (Faculty should not succumb, however, to pressure from deans.) By doing so, it would allow the District to save sections in the spring. While it may erode the quality a little bit for the other students, it will make for a softer landing in the spring.
- The District is currently working out their target figures right now for spring. Talk of an 18% cut for the spring could be mitigated by a shadow schedule, which establishes a maximum class size of zero until the shadow class is opened for enrollment. Current enrollment for the fall is at 80% capacity (meaning that 80% of the chairs are full). Those who read the paper know that it's going to be tough to get into classes, so many students are signing up early. While the District did not have a clear plan from the beginning of this budget crisis, it is true that they have been subject to the vagaries of the State budget situation.

2. Negotiations Report. This report and subsequent discussion were conducted in closed session.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. Proposed AFA Donation to Bridging the Doyle Scholarship Campaign. Warren solicited Council feedback about the idea of a faculty contribution to the Bridging the Doyle Scholarship campaign. The current balance in the Doyle fund is approximately \$150,000. One councilor had suggested previously that an amount somewhere between \$15,000 and \$20,000 be set up as a matching fund challenge to encourage individuals and other campus groups, such as the Alumni Association, to match the donation on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Warren also suggested that faculty could be offered the option to add to the seed money. Brief discussion followed about the timing and logistics of the donation. Council members expressed support for the idea and some shared personal anecdotes about the role the Doyle Scholarship program had played in helping to further their children's college education. Following the discussion and a motion made by Michael Meese, which was seconded by Cheryl Dunn, the Council unanimously approved a motion to move this item to an action item at this meeting (13 in favor, 0 opposed).

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Proposed AFA Donation to Bridging the Doyle Scholarship Campaign. Following discussion (see Discussion Item #1), and a motion made by Michael Meese, which was seconded by Cheryl Dunn, the Council unanimously approved a motion to issue a matching fund challenge and donation from the faculty to the Bridging the Doyle Scholarship Campaign for an amount not to exceed \$20,000 (13 in favor, 0 opposed).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.