



*AFA is working for you.  
The strength of faculty working together.*

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

August 25, 2010

*(Approved by the Executive Council on September 8, 2010)*

Executive Council members present (noted by \*):

*Warren Ruud, <i>presiding</i>	*Dianne Davis	*Reneé Lo Pilato	*Mike Starkey
*Alix Alixopulos	*Cheryl Dunn	*Michael Ludder	*Julie Thompson
*Lara Branen-Ahumada	*Brenda Flyswithawks	*Sean Martin	*Jack Wegman
*Paula Burks	*Karen Frindell	*Dan Munton	<i>One adj fac vacancy</i>
*John Daly	Lynn Harenberg-Miller	*Audrey Spall	

Officers/Negotiators present: Ted Crowell, Ann Herbst  
Faculty present: Approximately 50 regular and adjunct faculty members  
Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. in Room #4246 in the Doyle Library on the Santa Rosa campus and was video-conferenced to Room #726 in the Mahoney Library on the Petaluma campus.

**DISCUSSION ITEM: TENTATIVE AGREEMENT**

Following introductions and acknowledgement of the hard work and contributions made by each member of the AFA Negotiations Team and AFA staff, as well as outgoing Academic Senate President Barbara Croteau, AFA President Warren Ruud presented some background information and an overview. The August 2010 Tentative Agreement (TA), which is posted on the AFA Web site at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/tentative\\_agreement.shtml](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/tentative_agreement.shtml), is a compilation of six Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's). During the course of negotiations conducted in 2009-10, AFA posted these MOU's on the Web site after AFA and the District had reached agreement on each one, the Executive Council had reviewed and approved it, and AFA and the District had signed it. On June 9, 2010, AFA sent out an email (posted at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email\\_afa\\_060910.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email_afa_060910.pdf)), which explained the major points regarding salaries and benefits included in two of the MOU's that were signed on June 3, 2010. On August 19, AFA sent out an email announcing the Council's approval of the TA and this General Membership Meeting. On August 24, AFA sent out an email including a link to frequently asked questions about the TA (TA FAQ's) (posted at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_FAQs\\_Aug2010.html](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html)). Also on August 24, AFA sent out an email (posted at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email\\_afa\\_082410.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email_afa_082410.pdf)) regarding the current open enrollment period for medical and dental benefits (which ends August 31) and changes to SRJC's group medical plans with Kaiser and SISC/Blue Shield/Medco. Warren recommended that faculty members inform themselves about the TA

and contact the AFA office or any member of the Executive Council if they have any questions. Ratification ballots will be sent out via email at 5:00 p.m. (following the General Membership Meeting) to the Outlook accounts of all adjunct faculty members (AFA members and Fair Share Service Fee payers) and regular faculty members of AFA. In addition, AFA will be sending a separate email to regular faculty members who are fee payers (not AFA members). The emails will include a link to an AFA membership form (<http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Forms/membership.pdf>) and will inform faculty members that they will need to join AFA 24 hours prior to the close of balloting (5:00 p.m. on September 3), if they want their votes to be tallied. Warren concluded by saying that each MOU went through hours of discussion and vetting, prior to Council approval. On August 18, a majority of the Council approved the TA in its entirety and is recommending a “yes” vote.

Following the overview, Ann Herbst, AFA Chief Negotiator for 2010-11, reviewed the highlights of each of the MOU’s included in the TA. A summary follows. (See the TA FAQ’s at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_FAQs\\_Aug2010.html](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html) and the TA at: [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_Aug2010.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_Aug2010.pdf) ).

1. MOU October 8, 2009 and April 8, 2010: Voluntary Relinquishing of Load: These two MOU’s created an electronic “paper trail” which allows faculty to relinquish load in order to enable others with lower seniority to get an assignment.
2. MOU May 14, 2010: Tenure Review: This MOU incorporated the new dean III position in Petaluma into the tenure review process for faculty with assignments in Petaluma.
3. MOU June 3, 2010: Monetary Concessions (includes revisions to five Contract articles): ([http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_FAQs\\_Aug2010.html](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html) - [201011reductions](#) )
  - In addition to the furloughs, the District asked AFA for a proportional concession from faculty of 3% in across-the-board salary reductions. AFA would not negotiate any salary reduction until all possible furloughs were taken. AFA negotiated a 2% salary reduction, with an additional 0.96% possibly withheld from payroll should the State budget not be approved by September 1, 2010. The 0.96% cut would start September 1 and would apply for the entire year, but might be renegotiated at the end of the fiscal year. (The MOU includes trigger language for a retroactive paycheck, should it turn out that the State budget crisis is not as dire as projected.) The District and Board also agreed to spread a reduction of 0.116% across all salary schedules offsetting categorical cuts to hourly pay from 2009-10.
  - Paragraph 26.08.D in Article 26 in the existing Contract sets out how the enhanced hourly schedules will be cut to reflect the cut in categorical funds. (This paragraph is not included in the August 2010 TA, and it will be implemented regardless of the outcome of the present vote on the TA.)
  - The Article 32 portion of this MOU includes provisions for a workload task force to address workload inequities, and for the District to address those inequities after money returns to the District. One of the biggest inequities is credit laboratory compensation. For every hour in the lab, instructors receive 66.67% of what credit lecture instructors receive. Lab pay factors at other community colleges in the Bay Area range from 75% to 100%. The MOU reflects the first time the District has committed, based on the report, to spending money to adjust workload factors.
  - When State budget funds begin to return to the District at previous levels, trigger language included in the MOU will help faculty salaries return to Rank 10. The methodology for achieving Rank 10 still exists in the contract, but AFA and the District have agreed not to apply that methodology this year.

#### 4. MOU June 3, 2010: Regular Faculty Benefits:

( [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_FAQs\\_Aug2010.html#benefitplans](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html#benefitplans) )

- Beginning in 2010-11, all regular faculty members enrolled in either Kaiser or SISC/Blue Shield will begin premium cost-sharing, paying rates that are approximately 4% of their current medical benefit premiums. The rates will not increase for three years. Faculty members on the SISC Blue Shield/Medco plan will also be subject to a new prescription deductible (\$200 deductible per individual, \$500 aggregate deductible per family) and increased co-pays. Further information is available on the AFA Web site ( [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email\\_afa\\_082410.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email_afa_082410.pdf) and [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/Benefits\\_Open\\_Enrollment\\_Aug2010.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/Benefits_Open_Enrollment_Aug2010.pdf) ) and the District's Human Resources Department Web site ( <http://www.santarosa.edu/hr/employee-benefits/index.shtml> ). Louise Burke ( [lburke@santarosa.edu](mailto:lburke@santarosa.edu) ) is the contact person in the District's Human Resources Department.
- One of the reasons the AFA Council agreed to premium cost-sharing was that it helped AFA achieve some of the proportional cost savings in a way that did not further negatively impact adjunct faculty. A larger pay cut would have affected all faculty members for this regular-faculty-only benefit. Other options would have been to agree to more deductibles or an 80/20 or 90/10 plan; however, those options would have affected both adjunct faculty and contract faculty on the plan, and would have been more expensive for the users. The AFA Council debated this issue at many meetings and, while they were not generally in favor of premium cost-sharing, they concluded that it was a fair way to achieve proportional cost savings.

#### 5. MOU December 16, 2009: Adjunct Faculty Medical Benefits Program (AMBP):

( [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_FAQs\\_Aug2010.html#AMBP](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html#AMBP) )

The adoption of the AMBP occurred at roughly the same time as the implementation of the enhanced hourly schedules. To support community college adjunct faculty, the State provided options for increased funding in the form of categorical funds for hourly salaries. From the beginning when AFA negotiated to join the State's program, the District was clear that they did not want to promise any ongoing money towards the program. Adjunct participants have been subject to cost sharing (50% of the premium) for the entire program. While many community college districts did not participate in the State program, AFA convinced the District that the AMBP was a worthwhile program. The State program was soon oversubscribed and the State never paid its full 50% share of the premiums. Over the years, AFA negotiated to shift funds from other faculty line items in the District's budget to maintain the AMBP. For the last two years, the AMBP has been paid for through the forfeiture of regular faculty sabbatical leaves. In 2009, AFA asked regular and adjunct faculty members if they would be willing to take a small salary decrease to sustain the AMBP. Regular faculty participants were opposed, and adjunct faculty participants were in support. Subsequently, adjunct faculty members voted to take a 2% reduction in salary in order to sustain the AMBP. The 2% salary reduction on all hourly salary schedules is a result of that vote.

Following is a summary of the answers to questions raised by faculty members in the audience regarding a variety of issues related to the TA:

- Rank 10: Rank 10 is based on three benchmarks — Class C, Steps 1, 16, and 28 — and the rates for the remaining steps are linearly interpolated between the three. SRJC is approximately two to three percent behind in each of those benchmarks.

- Regular Faculty Medical Premium Cost-sharing:

Last year, the District's medical benefits premiums for regular faculty increased by \$494,000. Kaiser rates increased by 16% and SISC/Blue Shield rates increased by 9%. Existing language in the Contract states that if the cost of medical benefit increases is greater than the State COLA, AFA and the District will work together to close the gap. (Even when there was a positive COLA, it has not covered the increased cost from year to year.) Towards that end, AFA agreed to three items: (1) adding a prescription deductible; (2) taking \$200,000 out of the AFA Health & Welfare Benefits Account, which was created by the forfeiture of regular faculty sabbatical leaves; and (3) implementing the faculty contribution to premium cost-sharing, with an agreement that the contribution rates would not increase for three years, regardless of increases in Kaiser or SISC Blue/Shield premium rates. At this point, no one knows what the impact of the federal health benefits program will be on the District.

The only other feasible way to close the gap would have been to increase salary reductions. However, since the salary schedules are linked, any further salary reduction would have also impacted adjunct faculty. AFA has a strong investment in protecting the linkage between the annual contract and hourly salary schedules, because of the link's relationship to parity. On the other hand, the District has an interest in increasing salaries, in order to attract new faculty to replace the baby boomers who soon will be retiring. The Council and the negotiations team felt it was symmetrical for regular faculty to assume a larger share of the burden of the benefit costs to balance out the categorical reductions to the hourly salary schedules. (See [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email\\_afa\\_082410.pdf](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Misc/email_afa_082410.pdf) .)

Responding to the AFA Health & Welfare Survey, approximately 60% of regular faculty participants said that they strongly supported, supported, or were neutral about premium cost sharing. Approximately 40% said they were opposed or strongly opposed.

- Salary Reductions vs. Increased Efficiency: The State has set a workload reduction limit and will pay the District for a certain number of students (20,436 FTES). Once the enrollment reaches that 20,436 FTES figure, the District won't receive any additional apportionment funds. Thus, increasing the number of students that faculty members take into their classes will not solve the budget shortfall problem.
- Trigger Language: AFA negotiated trigger language into the MOU to restore money onto the salary schedules once State funding starts coming back into the District. The District would not agree to trigger language in the premium cost sharing MOU. However, salaries and benefits are negotiated every year. There is also no trigger language in the AMBP MOU. The District has no interest in the AMBP and the 2% that is being redirected from the hourly schedules to the AMBP; therefore, that item could be renegotiated, should the faculty indicate to AFA that they want to change direction. Both the 6/9/10 AFA Summer Update email and the 8/24/10 AFA FAQ's email addressed this issue.
- Social Security for Adjunct Faculty: Based on adjunct faculty responses to a survey, AFA has put a high priority on negotiating with the District to offer Social Security as an option to adjunct faculty; however, because of the increased cost to the District and the current budget crisis, no progress was made on this issue. The option for Social Security will likely be reconsidered when sufficient State funding returns to the District. It was pointed out that there is a CalSTRS task force in place at the State level looking at retirement options for adjunct faculty.
- Consequences of the TA Vote:  
( [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_FAQs\\_Aug2010.html#vote](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html#vote) )  
If the TA is approved, it would help plug the District's \$6-8 million budget hole. The faculty portion of the shortfall is \$3.45 million. Approximately 90% of the \$105 million in

the District's budget is salaries and benefits. Other fixed costs, like utilities and student-based fees, cannot be reduced further. STNC's are gone, classified staff has been cut, the schedule has shed sections, the faculty has increased efficiency, and management and classified have taken furloughs and salary reductions. There is no other place to go than to turn students away. Last year, 200,000 students were turned away across the State.

If the TA is not approved and the District were to cut 500 sections, they could apply to the State for "stabilization funds" and the State would front them the money for one year. After that, the District would need to make up for the decreased enrollment to maintain that level of funding. Decreasing sections would be a short-term solution to the problem — and the problem would be worse the following year. It is very difficult to pull out of a tailspin. Students would start to go to other community colleges and many adjunct faculty members would lose their jobs. The nightmare is that SRJC would go into a downward spiral of decreasing enrollments and funding, and not be able to pull back out of it.

If AFA members don't approve the TA, AFA and the District are willing and able to go back to the bargaining table. However, the same budgetary problems would remain. The negotiations process takes time. If the faculty say no to the TA, which took ten months to negotiate, it isn't likely that a new agreement could be reached within the three to five weeks that are left before the second proof of the spring schedule of classes is published.

The TA amends an in-force Contract. If AFA members do not approve the TA, the District and AFA will return to existing Contract language. The District did not reduce the Summer 2010 or Fall 2010 schedules, which is why the number of sections they have said they would need to cut in the Spring 2010 schedule, if the TA isn't approved, is so high.

- Salary Cuts for Adjunct Faculty. The 4.16% cuts to the hourly schedules are a pass-through resulting from the cuts in State categorical programs. In 2001, AFA and the District agreed that if the State categorical funding was to increase or decrease, the hourly schedules would reflect that change accordingly. The cuts to the linked salary schedules affect both regular and adjunct faculty. The adjunct faculty is taking a 2% cut to contribute to the AMBP; however, the regular faculty is also taking an approximate 2% cut through forfeiting sabbatical leaves — the latter cut just doesn't show up on the annual contract salary schedule. If you add in the premium cost sharing on the regular faculty side, then the only difference between the two groups is the State pass-through. The Board of Trustees through their negotiators said that they would not agree to spread the categorical program cuts to hourly salaries across all salary schedules. (See also [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative\\_Agreement/TA\\_FAQs\\_Aug2010.html#categoricals](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative_Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html#categoricals).)
- Ratio of Regular Faculty to Adjunct Faculty: The historical ratio by total salary is approximately 53% regular faculty and 47% hourly faculty, which include adjunct and overload. District reporting of the actual count is typically delayed by six months, so an accurate ratio for Spring 2010 is not yet available.
- Reducing the Schedule of Classes: There are fewer sections in the schedule this year as compared to last year. Rather than employing the method the District used in 2003 during another state budget crisis when they had to reduce the schedule, they have been looking at reengineering and program review. It would be better if the District took its time and the process was done in an organized, thoughtful, and careful manner. The Academic Senate has been working hard for the past year to ensure that they are very involved in the process of identifying triggers and making decisions regarding cuts in programs.

It is very possible that sometime in the future the District will be cutting 500 sections (or more, accurately, 1500 FTES, which is approximately 500 sections). If the District were

to cut 500 sections in the Spring 2010 schedule, they would be 500 core classes and the reductions would be made almost completely from hourly assignments.

- Enrollment Targets and Impact on Faculty: As mentioned earlier, the District's workload target is 20,436 FTES, because they will receive full funding for that number of FTES. For every FTES above 20,436, the District would receive no apportionment from the State. There is another threshold of 20,000 FTES that comes with a block grant of \$1 million and is subject to stabilization. The next threshold below 20,000 is 10,000 FTES.
- Management and Classified Salary Cuts: Management took a proportional cut, which was larger last year and again this year than the across-the-board faculty salary cuts included in the TA. Management and classified accepted a blend of salary cuts and furlough days. Based on the 2008 data from the State chancellor's office (which contains rankings for average hourly rates for adjunct and annual salaries for contract faculty, classified, and management), management is 44 out of 72 in the State and 3% below the State average. Regular faculty is above the mean, at 23, and hourly rates are at approximately 8 or 9. This ranking is not the same as Rank 10, as it compares the average salaries of all individuals in each category, not the actual salary schedules.
- History of AFA Tentative Agreement Votes: Historically all TA's have been approved, although individual faculty members have voted against approval.
- Council Vote on TA: There were two Council votes opposed to approving the TA. A majority of regular faculty Councilors and a majority of adjunct faculty Councilors voted in favor of approval.
- Calculation of Parity Rate: AFA's target goal for parity between adjunct and regular faculty is 87.5%. (The remaining 12.5% is for the regular faculty obligation for college service and professional development, which is not an obligation attached to hourly assignments.) To achieve that goal, one FTEF of hourly instruction would be paid at 87.5% of the regular faculty rate. The pay factors on the AFA Web site's "Of Interest to Adjunct" page will be updated soon. Since the enhanced schedules went into effect, there have been increases in the pay factors. The current pay factors are higher than when the enhancements went into effect.
- Furloughs instead of Salary Cuts: There are different rules for CSU's, UC's and K-12 than for community colleges, which cannot drop below 175 days per academic year, or they are penalized and lose two days of State funding for every day under 175. In terms of CalSTRS, faculty would earn less than a full year of service credit if SRJC dropped below 175 days. (See also ([http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative Agreement/TA FAQs Aug2010.html#furloughdays](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative%20Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html#furloughdays) and [http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative Agreement/TA FAQs Aug2010.html#furlougheffects](http://www.santarosa.edu/afa/Contract/Tentative%20Agreement/TA_FAQs_Aug2010.html#furlougheffects) .)
- Link between Restoration of Pay Cuts and Balance in District General Fund Reserves: Reserves are only one-time money and the District's General Fund reserves are low relative to other districts in the State. If the District puts money into a restricted fund, it is not a trivial matter to move it back to an unrestricted fund. The District is no longer putting money into the unrestricted fund for retiree health care benefits, and currently there's only enough in that fund to last for about three to four more years. Somehow, \$3 million needs to be pulled out of the District's budget in order to preserve 500 sections. AFA and the District could go back to the table and renegotiate, but the same problems would still exist.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein