

**ALL FACULTY ASSOCIATION
SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE
AFA GENERAL MEETING MINUTES**

April 14, 2010

(Approved by Executive Council on April 28, 2010)

Executive Council members present (noted by *):

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

Officers/Negotiators present:	Ted Crowell, Janet McCulloch
Councilor-elect present:	Jack Wegman (2010-12)
Other faculty present:	Approximately 100 faculty members
Staff present:	Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. in Newman Auditorium in Emeritus Hall on the Santa Rosa campus and video-conferenced to Room #726 in Mahoney Library on the Petaluma campus.

MEMBER CONCERNS

Ann Herbst stated that AFA is required to hold one general meeting each semester and that a General Meeting had tentatively been scheduled for April 28. On March 24, a group of faculty members presented the Council with a signed petition stating their concerns, proposing amendments to the AFA Constitution and AFA Bylaws, and requesting that a general meeting be held. The AFA Bylaws requires AFA to hold a general meeting upon request of 25 members. Subsequently, the General Meeting was rescheduled for April 14. Ann announced that 50 minutes had been set aside for faculty members to express their concerns. She also said that, no later than 4:00 p.m., the Council would move to another venue for closed session negotiations and conciliation/grievance reports. She asked faculty members who spoke during Member Concerns at the Executive Council meeting in Petaluma on March 24 to refrain from speaking until others had a chance to speak. Ann said that it was hoped that there would be enough time remaining after Member Concerns to approve the minutes from the March 24, 2010 Council meeting and to hold a Council discussion about the proposed changes to the AFA Constitution and Bylaws as presented by the petitioners.

Prior to the meeting, the grievances listed in the petition were sorted into four basic categories: (1) adjunct pay cuts; (2) elimination of adjunct faculty jobs; (3) failure to advocate on behalf of adjunct faculty; and (4) inequity in ratio of Council representatives. Four separate sign-up sheets were made available for those who wished to sign up to address the Council regarding their concerns on each topic, with a 10-minute time limit per topic. Ann noted that, at the end of each topic, any AFA Councilor who wished to make a response, ask a question, or provide information would be provided with an opportunity to do so. A two-sided handout re: the history of AFA-negotiated salary changes was distributed to faculty members in the audience (and is also posted at: www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/SalarySummary_GenMtg-4.14.10.pdf).

Eleven faculty members spoke. In alphabetical order, the speakers were: Michael Aparicio, Philosophy; Daniel Doolan, Health Sciences; Cheryl Dunn, College Skills/Tutorial; Carla Grady, Philosophy; Dave Henderson, Modern & Classical Languages; Tula Jaffe, Behavioral Sciences; Michael Ludder, Social Sciences; Susan Murany, College Skills/Tutorial; Mark Nelson, Communication Studies; Ed Sorensen, Social Sciences; John Tully, English as a Second Language; and Marsa Tully, English as a Second Language. Three of the eleven speakers (Daniel Doolan, Dave Henderson, and John Tully) read from prepared statements.

During the course of Member Concerns, it became clear that the majority of speakers wished to comment on the last topic — the ratio of representatives on the Council — and on the proposed changes to the AFA Constitution and Bylaws. A brief discussion about procedure took place and it was decided not to adhere to the separation of topics. For the benefit of those faculty members in the audience who had not seen a copy of the petition, Ann read the list of grievances — projected on a screen behind her — within each category (posted at <http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/AdjunctCaucusPetitionGrievances-3.20.10.pdf>).

In response to a question, Ann mentioned an important problem that she said AFA is continuing to address with the District. About a year and a half ago the District changed the way they keep information about instructor's loads. Historically, an instructor could look up his or her or anyone else's assignment and then AFA would hear from adjunct faculty when there were problems. With the new Student Information System, that ability to look up others' loads has been lost. AFA has been complaining to the District about this problem since implementation of the new system and intends to propose a solution, which is in use by some departments that do not have this problem because they maintain spreadsheets in the order of assignments given, showing the like load for spring and fall, and other important data. Ann said that AFA is attempting to convince the District that it is in their interest as well as the faculty's interest to make this information readily available to all and to have that happen sooner rather than later when the schedule goes online. Some faculty are feeling very frustrated because it feels like AFA is not doing anything; however, AFA continues to meet resistance from the District. AFA has argued that, if the District catches a mistake before the schedule is "permatized," it will cost them less as they won't end up having to pay extra to an instructor for load that should have been assigned to him or her but was assigned to someone else instead.

One speaker posed several questions, including the following:

- Why are the pay cells tied to specific funding rather than negotiated? Has AFA attempted to negotiate the language again since 2001-02? *In response to these two questions, Ann directed audience member's attention to the handout and suggested that faculty participating via videoconference in Petaluma contact AFA staff to request a copy. She said that in 2001-02 then Governor Davis and the legislature proposed categorical funding for adjunct salary enhancements. At that time, AFA pressed the District in negotiations to agree to make the enhancements a permanent part of the salary schedules; however, they would not agree. At that time, faculty with hourly assignments received a 9% raise that the regular faculty did not receive. AFA has attempted to negotiate the language again since 2001-02; however, the District would not agree to any change.*
- What was the formula or metric for initially determining the ratio of 13 and 6 and was it based on load? *Ann replied that she did not know as she was not present at the beginning of AFA. Janet McCulloch replied that 13/6 was not the initial ratio, that the original ratio was 75/25 to begin with, and that the number of adjunct representatives was increased later because the District had not met the 75/25 goal. Two years ago, the ratio was adjusted and the size of the Council was expanded. In response to a second question, Ann confirmed that the Council has no position on this issue at this time.*

Speakers in support of the proposed changes to the AFA Constitution and Bylaws made the following comments:

- I've been at SRJC since 1982 and am a dues-paying member. I strongly support the proposed changes and urge you to vote in favor. I've always been a strong supporter of AFA and appreciate your successes and the introduction of adjunct benefits. I have come to the conviction that, in the past several years, there has been a lessening in AFA's attention to adjunct. Although there are some regular faculty representatives who are attentive to adjunct issue, there are some who are not. There is a bias, perhaps unconscious, in assuring that there are adjunct officers and adjuncts on the negotiating team. When there is a preponderance of one group over another, it is out of proportion and results in excessive negative influences. The main issue is glaringly simple. Other concerns fade in relation to the importance of fair and equal representation. The ratio of representatives should be determined by overall teaching loads. Adjuncts teach slightly more than half the courses — that fact amply justifies 50/50. Any type of

compromise would be unfair. What does the AFA Council have to fear from increased adjunct representation? The Council would be more reflective of the entire faculty and more responsive to faculty. The present makeup lacks moral legitimacy. Should these proposed changes be defeated, it would be a slap at adjunct. The equality train has now left the station and we ask you to be on board.

- The AFA is a union, it's our union, and I believe that the union needs to represent its constituency fairly. I don't believe we're being represented fairly. To not trust the body as a whole, but for the Council to make a decision, bespeaks a lack of faith and intelligence in all of the educators to make an intelligent and informed decision.
- In the field of social psychology, we approach issues in terms of being market-based or community based. I'd like SRJC to look at the human toll the unequal representation has resulted in. I support the changes in the constitution. It is so basic — this isn't fair. I encourage you to let the general membership speak. The talk about how good everything is is paternalistic. The issue is equal power. So many of the adjuncts have a difficult time raising their families. They don't get retirement because there is no equal representation.
- I wanted to make sure that full-time faculty spoke on behalf of adjunct to change the composition. If this doesn't go before the general membership for a vote, doesn't it seem odd that 13 full-time and 6 part-time Councilors will be making a decision for all of us? The deciders are skewed in favor of one position. I have not heard a reasonable argument as to why the ratio should remain as it is. How does it make sense that 13 represent 300 people and 6 represent 700 people? I don't understand what's keeping the ratio as it is. It wouldn't be fair for the Council to decide for all of us. Please allow this to go to a vote of the general membership.
- On behalf of the signers of the petition, we are pleased that AFA has honored our request for a discussion of the proposed changes and equal representation for full-time and for adjunct on the AFA Executive Council. Nothing else is more important — everything else is secondary. Members of the adjunct caucus have displayed their concerns by following AFA's process and submitting required documents. We are serious people on serious business to achieve equal representation — 50/50 for full-time and part-time on the Executive Council. Membership in AFA gives each person one vote. The vote doesn't depend on the amount of dues paid, teaching load, or parity. In terms of members, 65% of the membership has 6 representatives on the Council, and 35% of the membership has 13 representatives on the Council. The adjunct voice is reduced to a whisper, and the full-time voice becomes a shout. This shouldn't continue. If it does, will AFA continue? It has been suggested that part-timers take 65% of the Council, but the caucus said no — equal representation is the only way that AFA can represent all faculty. The goal in AFA's mission statement is not to represent some and be dismissive of others. AFA has had successes and we applaud them; but, in recent times, some members have become more equal than others. If AFA represents all members, all members must be equally represented on the Executive Council. Along with a request for a General Meeting on April 14, the adjunct caucus requested that the Council vote to bring changes to the membership. We request that the vote take place at the latest on April 28, then the membership will have chance to vote. Nothing else is more important. Nothing else will do.
- I want to reiterate that AFA is not a governing body or part of the District's governing body or committees. This is a union and members of the union should be equal. There should not be a concern about load, seniority, or anything else. One person has one vote. Those votes should be reflected. Why are adjunct not represented?
- One of the items included in this proposal is that all faculty would vote for all representatives. The reason why this aspect is in the proposal is because we want all faculty seated on the Council to be responsible and accountable to all faculty. This is an aspect that we can discuss, but it furthers this idea of equality.
- We're a union, not a school. This isn't about a school, it's about a union — one vote per person.

Speakers opposed to the proposed changes to the AFA Constitution and Bylaws made the following comments:

- I am adamantly opposed to the proposal. I have worked both as adjunct and as regular faculty. There is a disparity between benefits and salary issues as they pertain to full-time faculty versus adjunct faculty; however, this is the same for all schools across the nation — and even if you work at the post office. There are certain market-based realities that are the way things are done. AFA has done and is doing a fine job representing both its constituencies. Faculty have to be realistic about market conditions that are similarly facing other colleges. It would be a huge mistake to adopt the constitutional changes being proposed.
- I don't support the proposed amendments because I do believe that full-time faculty members are required and we step up to the plate to run this District along with administrators and classified. Adjunct are not responsible for the business of the District. Full-time faculty are required by contract. It may seem like 12.5 % or 5 hours a week is not that much, but it doesn't really represent what we do. The full-timers do the major work of this college. Not to say that many adjunct faculty don't put in a lot of hard work for the District, but they are not required by contract. If you look at workload, there is an amount of workload that every full-time faculty member has to do, the work that not every adjunct chooses to do. There are a lot of adjunct who come and go. They don't have the same kind of investment that full-time faculty have in the operation and continuance of the college. Full-time faculty are invested in where this college is going as a group, working together with administration and with adjunct. There is a qualitative difference in what we do. Many of my full-time colleagues feel strongly that we work very hard. If we're talking about equality, we have to be talking about it on all fronts — not just numbers. How much work does each group do?

A few speakers talked about broader issues, such as the definition of equality and the process for reaching a decision on the proposed changes:

- I want to go on record stressing equality. I'm not sure that this is the place to discuss what equality looks like. It is important to promote equality and to acknowledge that anything short of that is a reflection on our own attitudes towards each other. This issue is important and should be decided by the general body. It concerns me the way that people have a tendency to personalize and demonize one group over another. I have great respect for representatives in AFA, who have done great things. Compare what they've done to what's been achieved at other schools — it's remarkable; however, we're facing times that add stressors and it's forcing us to recognize that, however well AFA has done, there is still room for improvement. We're facing difficult times now, and facing an opportunity to start eating at each other or turning against each other or working together. There should be a general membership vote and discussion about what equal representation looks like.
- What do we mean by equality? Every state has two representatives but is there equal representation? Look at California versus Wyoming. I'm not sure what the definition of equality is. Lots of inequality exists. For a full-time position, you have to jump through more hoops — it's not a level playing field. There is inequality in the hiring process. One might argue that you could have equality in the number of bodies regardless of the number of classes they are teaching. You could also argue the opposite. In terms of the proposal to have everyone voting for all representatives — that's an interesting way to stack the deck in terms of part-time representation. If one person gets one vote, regardless of the amount of work done, then if someone is running for a full-time position that maybe adjuncts opposed, that person would have to swing adjunct votes over to his or her side. One could argue whether that's equal or not. What do you mean by equality to begin with? Something could be equal in one sense, but not equal in another sense, like the Senate.

Ann Herbst thanked the faculty for participating and adjourned the General Meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.