

AFA

# DIALOGUE

AFA

*Spring 2010 • An Open Forum for Faculty at Santa Rosa Junior College • April 9, 2010*

THE AFA DIALOGUE HAS BEEN CREATED TO AIR CONCERNS OF ALL FACULTY. THE AFA UPDATE WILL CONTINUE TO BE THE FACTUAL VOICE OF AFA, WHILE THE AFA DIALOGUE WILL ENCOURAGE CONVERSATION AND PUBLISH PERSONAL OPINIONS ABOUT WORK PLACE ISSUES AND POLITICAL CONCERNS. WE INVITE ANY FACULTY MEMBER TO SUBMIT LETTERS, ARTICLES, OR OPINION PIECES. **THE OPINIONS CONTAINED HEREIN ARE SOLELY THOSE OF THE WRITER AND AFA NEITHER CONDONES NOR CONDEMNS THESE OPINIONS.** AFA RESERVES EDITORIAL PREROGATIVES.

## BY THE NUMBERS: A PERSPECTIVE

*by Jack Wegman, Instructor, Economics*

I recently was elected to serve on the AFA Executive Council. Since the election, I have attended three AFA meetings and one four-hour AFA retreat.

All members of the Council recognize the difficulty of these times. Anxiety among both regular and adjunct faculty permeates all discussions. Despite the best efforts of all members of the Council to respect different perspectives, there is always the sense by one group (sometimes regular faculty, sometimes adjunct) that their views are not “being heard” or respected. I imagine that therapists frequently observe this phenomenon when they listen to couples discussing their relationship problems. There is a wonderful scene in the movie “Annie Hall” where (in split screen) Woody Allen is asked by his therapist “how often do you have sex?” and Allen replies “hardly ever, . . . three times a week”. In the adjacent screen, Diane Keaton is asked exactly the same question, and replies “almost always . . . three times a week”. The problems arise not because we do

not “hear” or “see” the viewpoint of the other party, but more that we do not come to the issue(s)

**THE PROBLEMS ARISE NOT BECAUSE WE DO NOT “HEAR” OR “SEE” THE VIEWPOINT OF THE OTHER PARTY, BUT MORE THAT WE DO NOT COME TO THE ISSUE(S) WITH THE SAME PERSPECTIVE, I. E., WE DO NOT SHARE THE SAME ASSUMPTIONS OR METHODOLOGIES, AND/OR WE DO NOT AGREE ON THE APPROPRIATE REMEDIES.**

with the same perspective, i. e., we do not share the same assumptions or methodologies, and/or we do not agree on the appropriate remedies.

At the March 24, 2010 AFA meeting in Petaluma, the Council was presented with a petition by

some members of the adjunct faculty. The petition is dated March 20, 2010. The petition can be broken up into three broad subject areas: (a) “pay cuts for adjunct faculty of 7.30% in Spring 2010, and further cuts up to 9.9% in Summer 2010 while full-time faculty have only taken a 0.565% cut, (b) job losses for adjuncts and the continued right of regular faculty to take hourly assignments as per Article 16 and, (c) “the root cause for the inequities is the present ratio (13 full-time faculty and 6 adjunct faculty members) of faculty on the Council”. Some of the recommendations (either explicit or implied) made by the adjunct instructors include regular faculty pay-cuts so as to “share the pain”, repeal or suspension of the right of regular faculty to take hourly assignments as per Article 16, and a reconfiguration of the AFA representative structure such that, “. . .50% of the Council members, AFA Officers (including the Grievance  
*(cont. on page 2)*

Officer(s), and Negotiation Team members must be adjunct faculty (excluding regular Contract faculty performing overload assignments, on reduced loads, and/or District regular contract retirees teaching hourly assignments)”.

### **ISSUE A – PAY-CUTS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY OF 7.30% AND 0.565% FOR REGULAR FACULTY:**

ALL 2009-10 Salary Schedules have an important note in parentheses that the annual or hourly “salary rates shown below have been reduced by 0.565% to reflect the one-day mandatory furlough of...”). ALL salary schedules have been reduced by 0.565% whether contract or hourly. EVERYONE has taken a 0.565% salary reduction. The uniform 0.565% reductions for ALL salary schedules are due to the fact that ALL salary schedules (contract and hourly) are **LINKED** by **CONTRACT**. Any change in the salary schedule of contract faculty **MUST** “ripple” through the remaining salary schedules at the same rate. Since regular faculty who teach hourly assignments are paid off of the same hourly schedules as adjunct faculty, it is **IMPOSSIBLE** for regular faculty to take only a 0.565% pay reduction and for only adjunct faculty to take a 7.30% pay reduction!

Approximately 9 years ago, the State of California offered “categorical” funds to college districts to be used with the goal of encouraging additional office hours by adjunct faculty. Since the funds were “categorical”,

they could not be used for any application other than to “enhance” the hourly salaries of adjunct instructors (although AFA negotiated that part of the funds be allocated to the Adjunct Instructor Medical Benefits Fund). Regular faculty received not one penny of these funds in their annual salary adjustments (although regular faculty who took hourly assignments received increases in their hourly salaries). These funds would not become part of the base hourly salary schedule. In fact, the District was very concerned that these funds not be incorporated into the base salary just in case the state chose to reduce or eliminate the funding at some future date. In Article 26: Salary Schedule Development (Section 26.08, D, 3) Stability of “Adjunct Faculty Salary Enhancement Funds”: The District and AFA agree that should the Legislature .....increase, reduce or eliminate the Adjunct Faculty Salary Enhancement Funds, that the “Enhanced” portion of the Hourly Assignment Schedules will be modified to equate to the available funds. In addition, should the funds become permanent or get folded into the base funding as a **NONCATEGORICAL** item, the salary enhancement will become a permanent part of the Hourly Assignment Salary Schedules”.

### **THE ISSUES: HOW SHALL WE MEASURE THE SEVERITY OF THE SALARY REDUCTIONS AND HOW SHALL WE FIX THEM?**

- a. The claim that adjunct salaries have been reduced by 7.30%

is true **ONLY IF** the salary schedule used in the analysis is the Enhanced Schedule (including categorical funding) rather than the Normal Base Hourly Salary Schedule. If the base salary schedule is used as the reference point, then adjunct hourly salaries and regular faculty salaries are both reduced by 0.565%. Hence, the claims that hardships are not being shared equitably becomes a function of which salary schedule one chooses to use in the analysis,

- b. Although the Enhanced Funding has not been entirely eliminated by the State, there is no question that adjunct instructors (and regular faculty who were taking hourly assignments in Spring 2010) are taking a pay cut. They will receive fewer actual dollars in their future pay checks than in the past,
- c. Some adjunct instructors are suggesting that regular faculty should take salary reductions, and those reductions should be used to compensate adjunct faculty who have seen a reduction in enhanced funding salaries. In a sense, regular faculty are being asked to make the adjunct faculty “whole”. Some regular faculty will argue that they received no benefits from these enhanced funds, why should they pay the costs of the reductions? In addition, some regular faculty will argue that taking pay-cuts to compensate adjunct faculty

*(cont. on page 3)*

## BY THE NUMBERS: A PERSPECTIVE *(cont. from page 2)*

for losses in the enhanced funds, in effect, makes the enhanced funding permanent and violates Article 26 as stated above,

- d. Since AFA negotiated that part of the enhanced funding be used for the Adjunct Faculty Medical Benefits Fund, it follows that the reduction in state funding also adversely impacts this medical fund,
- e. Anyone (adjunct or regular faculty) who takes a summer school assignment will take a cut up to 9.9%. The real issue is that this claim indicates a fundamental misunderstanding of the summer school pay schedule, or the claim intentionally misrepresents facts. Summer school salaries are ALL paid on an hourly basis. Therefore, the claim that regular faculty are taking a 0.565% cut in summer school salaries with adjunct faculty taking a 9.9% cut is FALSE.

### **ISSUE B – ADJUNCT REPRESENTATION ON THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL: WHAT IS THE FAIR WAY TO APPORTION MEMBERSHIP ON THE AFA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL?**

CURRENT: there are 19 members on the Council (13 full-time faculty and 6 adjunct faculty). I assume that an odd number was chosen to prevent voting deadlock. Full-time representation constitutes 68% of the Council with adjunct faculty holding 32% representation.

Proposal A: Representation on the Council should reflect

the percentages of “for-credit” sections taught by adjunct and regular faculty. Although the ratios have changed marginally in the past few years, they remain stable at approximately 50% of all sections taught by adjunct faculty and 50% taught by regular faculty. Hence, it follows that appropriate representation ratios should be 50/50.

#### Article 17: Job Descriptions

17.01 Faculty Duties: Regular, Probationary and Temporary Faculty:

“Faculty duties of the average 40-hour workweek are divided into three (3) areas of responsibility”:

- A.. Student Contact
- B.. College Service
- C.. Professional Service and Development.

In fact, the Contract specifically states that Student Contact represents an average of 35/40 of the workweek, with College Service and Professional Service and Development together averaging 5/40 of the workweek. The ratio  $35/40 = 87.5\%$ .

17.02 Faculty Duties: Adjunct Faculty

“Duties of adjunct faculty (including credit and noncredit, instructional and allied) are divided into three (3) areas of responsibility:

- A. Student Contact – these responsibilities are identical to those of regular faculty
- B. College Service–Not required of all adjunct faculty
- C. Professional Service and Development – limited to Professional Development Day

### **THE ISSUES:**

- a. Does the proposed 50/50 representation model ignore the fact that regular faculty have contractual obligations that are different from adjunct faculty?
- b. Does the current model make sense? Note\* this analysis applies to all 3-unit courses. Hopefully, it can still be used as a general model for understanding current and future representative structures.

Since both regular and adjunct faculty have identical teaching responsibilities, and since the Contract states that student contact makes up 35/40 of the workweek for regular faculty, this means that an instructor teaching 5 (3 unit courses) spends approximately 7 hours per course. This actually makes some sense given that 3 hours are spent in the classroom per week, and 1 hour is spent maintaining office hours for each section. The remaining 3 hours may be devoted to preparation, grading, etc.

If individual A teaches 5 sections (full-time), and individual B teaches 3 sections (maximum 60% load for 3 unit courses), then A spends 35 hours and B spends 21 hours per week in student contact related activities. This demonstrates that Individual B (adjunct) is teaching 60% of individual A's load. But individual B is not spending

*(cont. on page 4)*

## BY THE NUMBERS: A PERSPECTIVE *(cont. from page 3)*

60% of the TOTAL hours spent doing student contact related activities by A and B. Since the total student contact hours by A and B is  $35 + 21 = 56$ , it follows that Individual B has provided 37.5% of the total. If we add the 5 hours that regular faculty are required to spend doing college service and professional development, then the % actually falls to  $21/61 = 34.4\%$ . This 34.4% is very close to the current representation structure of the Executive Council (although a very strong argument could be made that adjunct representation should be increased by 1 person based upon this analysis). Coincidentally, this analysis could possibly also explain the fact that regular faculty contribute approximately 68% of all AFA revenues and adjunct faculty contribute approximately 32% (All Faculty Association – Santa Rosa Junior College: January 2010 Treasurer’s Report).

- c. What is the appropriate representation model given the analysis? (1) head-count

(700 adjunct v 300 regular),  
(2) % of sections taught,  
(3) contribution to the District including College Service,  
(4) financial support of the organization.

### **ISSUE C – REGULAR FACULTY TAKING HOURLY ASSIGNMENTS: SHOULD REGULAR FACULTY BE PERMITTED TO TAKE HOURLY ASSIGNMENTS?**

Current: Article 16 allows regular faculty to take hourly assignments. Proposals include:

- a. Some faculty members wish to re-write Article 16 so as to forbid regular faculty from taking hourly assignments,
- b. Restrict hourly assignments only to times when the economy is not in crisis,
- c. Restrict hourly assignments to only one section,
- d. Permit hourly assignments but change the “date of hire” criteria so that regular faculty cannot bring their date of hire as a full-time instructor to the hourly assignment list. Create parallel date of hire lists,
- e. Maintain Article 16 as it is currently formatted.

### **THE ISSUES:**

- a. Adjunct faculty may lose a section as a result of the fact that a member of the regular faculty has chosen to take an hourly assignment,
- b. Regular faculty are often given hourly assignments by department chairs in a non-transparent manner,
- c. The contract is too vague with regards to issues of expertise and qualifications,
- d. Regular faculty feel that they are being “singled-out” since many adjunct instructors have full-time jobs outside of their employment at SRJC (double standard),
- e. Could job announcements for the adjunct pool that state ‘that instructors with full-time positions at SRJC will not be considered for the adjunct pool’ meet the Equal Opportunity Employer mandate?

These are some of the issues that all members of the faculty will be discussing in the very near future. These are not easy issues, so I hope that this information will make us all more aware of the discussion parameters.



### **AFA WELCOMES YOUR FEEDBACK!**

SUBMIT COMMENTS, LETTERS, AND/OR ARTICLES  
VIA EMAIL TO [AFA@SANTAROSA.EDU](mailto:AFA@SANTAROSA.EDU)  
OR VIA FAX TO (707) 524-1762



AFA MEMBERS WHO SUBMIT ORIGINAL ARTICLES OF 500 WORDS OR MORE  
THAT ARE PUBLISHED IN AN ISSUE OF THE AFA DIALOGUE  
WILL BE AWARDED A STIPEND OF UP TO \$200.