

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING MINUTES

October 25, 2017

(Approved by Executive Council on November 8, 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 Whylly
*Paulette Bell	*Robert Jackson (SR)	*Margaret Pennington	*Albert Yu
*Shawn Brumbaugh	*Sean Martin	*Karen Stanley	<i>Adjunct Vacancy</i>
*Ted Crowell	*Molly Matheson	*Mike Starkey (SR)	

Negotiators/Appointed Positions present: Warren Ruud, Julie Thompson

Staff members present: Carol Valencia

Councilor-Elect present: Erin Sullivan

Faculty members present: Steven Kessler, Matthew Martin, John Stover (Petaluma); Canon Crawford, Michael Ludder (Santa Rosa)

The meeting was called to order at 4:24 p.m. in the Mahoney Library Reading Room (PC721), on the Petaluma campus.

1. Negotiations Update. Julie reported to the Council and guests on the following items:

- We have been working without a contract since July 1. Some short-term agreements have expired. If faculty members are still serving on out-of-department tenure review or evaluation teams, please let AFA know so we can make sure you are being fairly compensated.
- Our 2017-18 salary schedules are based on the Rank 10 methodology in place in *Article 26: Salary Schedules*. The District is attempting to make changes to Art. 26 and Rank 10. AFA and the District are far apart in their positions on this matter.
- We completed our agreement with the District on lab equity implementation (negotiated last spring), and we shared the details with faculty at that time. However, because there is no Tentative Agreement (TA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the agreement is not in effect. As a result, the Fall 2018 schedules are being developed using the lower lab rates. We have asked the District to consider signing an MOU to implement the agreement in advance of a TA and are waiting to hear from them.
- Terry Mulcaire explained that the District's last Art. 26 offer was to eliminate Rank 10 and instead give faculty a percentage of any "net new ongoing revenue." This would give the District total control over whether there is ever any money for raises. They may be hoping to reach "impasse" with us so they can impose their "last best offer." Sean Martin commented that Rank 10 is always the District's number one issue in negotiations. Deirdre Frontczak added that they also persistently point to the de-linking of the contract and hourly salary schedules as a way to solve the District's financial problems.
- Julie stated that AFA will maintain its commitment to negotiate for the betterment of *all* faculty. She added that AFA does not want to agree to their "net new ongoing revenue" model because the District has demonstrated many years of out-of-control spending that they are refusing to address, including the bloating of administrative positions. At the same time, faculty workload has increased greatly with the inclusion of many new "required" duties.

- Ted Crowell stated that it's also important to note that AFA has addressed and made changes in the Rank 10 methodology over the years in response to the District's financial constraints.
- There was a discussion about what is likely to happen if we fail to reach an agreement with the District.
- Julie listed the following items that have been accomplished this year in negotiations:
 - We have agreed to language for an "x factor" for chairs to compensate them for duties after their chair reassigned time has been used up. The chair would have the right to decline to perform the duties if the District does not authorize the extra compensation (paid at the base hourly rate for the number of hours that the chair needs to complete the task). We hope to have agreement on a similar provision for coordinators soon.
 - We are also working on language that would address instances where contract and adjunct faculty are asked to perform duties outside their job descriptions (Article 17). Faculty would be paid at the base hourly rate if they accept the assignment and would also have the option to decline the assignment without prejudice. Such language would probably live in *Art. 17: Job Descriptions* or *Art. 32: Workload*. Such an agreement would help to eliminate the District's practice of "direct dealing" to unilaterally determine compensation for individual faculty assignments.
 - A form for the CTE coordinator workload study (see [Art. 13 MOU regarding Coordinator Workload](#)) has been developed and agreed upon. The study will begin in January and will be conducted for the duration of the calendar year.
 - We have cleared up a mistake in the application of *Art. 27: Salary Placement* for faculty members with occupational experience. It was discovered that the Human Resources department misread and misapplied the Contract. The District will be correcting the problem, and the teams have almost finalized revised language that they believe will prevent future misunderstanding.
 - We have signed an MOU for exchange assignments for Disability Resources Department faculty members (see [Article 32 MOU regarding DRD exchange assignments](#)).
- We have heard that the District is considering using a discipline model called "FRISK." We are asking the District for information on this. Since AFA and the District have been engaged in the long-term process of negotiating a due process article (Article 23), it is illegal for them to impose this on faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Carol Valencia.