

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

The following are faculty responses emailed to [afa@santarosa.edu](mailto:afa@santarosa.edu) from santarosa.edu email accounts with subject line, *Faculty Comment*:

DATE	
6/15/10	<p>AFA Leadership,</p> <p>While I strongly agree that faculty should share in the burden of a balanced budget, this potential agreement does NOTHING for us.</p> <p>There are many concessions that could save \$ without so many giveaways, such as volunteer leaves, difference in pay leaves, banked time (temporary savings while banking), volunteer teaching from retirees, non-monetary compensation for early retirement (such as adding years of service), etc.</p> <p>Interest-based negotiating is important, but the interests of the district in balancing the budget could be accomplished in a myriad of ways, none of which need to involve the measures suggested here. It's truly unreal that we cannot do better. If the district could only be as generous as you are being!</p> <p>Needless to say, if this is put before a vote of the faculty, I will be voting no.</p> <p>For every concession, we should get something in return.</p> <p>Anonymous</p>
7/15/09	<p>Since Michael Ludder suggested we each write our opinion about the financial situation we have forced upon us, I will follow his request.</p> <p>I have been teaching at Santa Rosa Junior College since 1983. I am in the Consumer &amp; Family Studies Department.</p> <p>Since none of us have caused this financial problem but are a part of it, I feel everyone at Santa Rosa Junior College should help correct the situation. Perhaps we could save classes if all of us, administrators, full time faculty, part time faculty, classified employees, maintenance employees, campus police, (EVERY EMPLOYEE) should consider to cut their salary by 10%. That money to be used to restore classes. I think the full time and part time employees with the longest time at the college should be considered first. Each class is important, or it would not be offered.</p> <p>I think the ideas listed by Laurie Taylor in her Wednesday, June 17 email has very good ideas to consider.</p> <p>I don't think it is too relevant if I have an off campus job or just my JC job, but currently I only teach one class at the junior college. I</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS

### Faculty Comments

	<p>use the money to assist in financing my grandson in college. This is a priority to me.</p> <p>I enjoy teaching at the college and wish to continue my career here. I feel the group effect of all of us showing our sincere interest in retaining classes and supporting the Santa Rosa Junior College is important. Our 10% salary cut will show how important it is to us and our students to retain classes.</p> <p>With my support and best wishes to all employees of Santa Rosa Junior College.</p> <p>Jo Caulk Adjunct Life Management Instructor Department of Consumer &amp; Family Studies</p>
7/7/09	<p>After reading all the comments about the current budget crises, one thing has become clear to me: The solution lies in across the board cuts of what ever percentage is necessary to avoid laying off adjuncts and limiting classes for students. There are far too many special circumstances to try to figure our what is fair. Across the board cuts of administration, teachers, and support staff would have the most chance of appealing to the greatest number of people.</p> <p>Tula Jaffe</p>
7/2/09	<p>Here are my thoughts and opinions concerning alternatives to the Schedule of Classes reductions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) I am 100% NOT in favor of ANY salary cuts to Full-Time Regular faculty. They have already PAID their dues a million times over: salary freezes = salary cuts for goodness sake, no increase in salary <b>means</b> they already took a salary cut and the district saved money!</li> <li>2.) I heard that the President, the VP's, and the Management Team all just were given salary INCREASES! Well, if this is true, then they should definitely NOT honor those increases, in addition to the 3% cut they just agreed upon. Otherwise, they all should take a 5% decrease, not a 3% decrease.</li> <li>3.) Giving the FT Regular faculty a salary cut is a death sentence for the Adjunct faculty. If you give the FT faculty a salary cut, then they will surely all need and ask for and get an overload schedule. The FT faculty all have financial obligations to take care of with their salaries. If you cut this, then they will just ask for overload to compensate for the loss. And justly so. It will totally defeat the purpose of saving money and a reduction in classes. Don't do it, NO MATTER what the amount!!!!</li> </ol>
6/30/09	<p>The furlough on non instructional days is a brilliant idea. I will vote for that, as long as in exchange we are not picking up health benefit cost sharing at least during this contract cycle. Furloughs work well because it doesn't otherwise touch the existing salary schedule that AFA worked so hard to secure.</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS Faculty Comments

	-Name withheld by request
6/30/09	<p>It was not my intent to offend anyone with my response to the situation we are all in. I was sharing my sadness at the loss of ALL effected by the budget cuts. No one is singled out or disrespected in any way. I believe there was a misunderstanding to my reference to full time teachers as being "lucky" to be hired. I would feel "lucky" if I ever had the opportunity to become a full time instructor. I would consider myself "lucky" to be working there at all right now. If I offended anyone, please know it was not my intent. I do not question anyone's dedication or who goes above and beyond in the pursuit of providing students with the best instruction, or who is the hardest working group. This college is great because we are all willing to go the extra mile.</p> <p>Laurie Bischoff</p>
6/28/09	<p>Dear Dr. Agrella:</p> <p>As one who has called for shared sacrifice across the entire College community, and one who called for the highest management levels to do so proactively as a demonstration of leadership, I congratulate you on your announcement, and thank you and the rest of the management team for your personal contributions to the College's well-being, over and above your formal responsibilities.</p> <p>I have already spoken in favor of a similar sacrifice on the part of faculty, and I'll continue to do so. My hope and expectation is that the savings accomplished by such a widely shared effort will be put toward preserving the academic schedule -- the teaching mission of the College -- to the greatest degree possible.</p> <p>Thank you for being the first to take this action.</p> <p>Best regards, Mike Drayton ESL</p>
6/25/09	<p>I think the faculty should follow the President and management team by taking at least a 2% (regular faculty) and 1% (hourly assignments) cut in pay. We should make this contingent on taking the benefits cost sharing off the table at least for this contract.</p> <p>We have the ability as a group to help now, and we should do so. This is an unprecedented time and we need to take unprecedented action.</p> <p>-Name withheld by request</p>
6/25/09	<p>Dear AFA Executive Council Members,</p> <p>With 113 FTEF cuts coming this Summer and Fall alone, our college</p>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

will be decimated if we do not come up with a workable alternative immediately. Thousands of students will be turned away, and hundreds of adjuncts will lose their livelihood and their health insurance. Imagine the level of demoralization and lost productivity that these cuts will have for all college employees and students.

As an adjunct in ESL, I have been teaching a maximum part-time load since I started at SRJC 4 years ago. This has never actually provided me with quite enough monthly income to support myself and my 2 children, but I have managed by doing curriculum development and other projects in my department to supplement my teaching. At times I have simply had to pay some of my bills with my credit cards. I have accrued a lot of debt because of this, which I pay off monthly, even as I continue to try to earn enough to pay the household bills.

Qualifying to have half of my health insurance paid by the college, as I did after 3 semesters, has been an enormous help, economically and psychologically. My children are taken care of by Healthy Families, which is about to be cut drastically, and they may well lose their health insurance soon.

Needless to say, losing even half of my regular load would have dramatic consequences on my family's well-being. I understand that many full-time college employees are struggling as well. I do not want to see any hardworking families take a pay cut. Nevertheless, our legislators have elected to take the cuts from the most needy and socially important areas of our lives, rather than finding the money in corporate, alcohol, cigarette, and vehicle taxes. We are now forced to decide whether we, as a community college, are willing make huge cuts in courses and lose students and faculty, or whether we, as a community, are willing to make temporary, across-the-board cuts.

I believe we should also temporarily limit full-time faculty overloads, request retirees on hourly assignments to cede their classes to adjuncts, that we defend seniority and like load across campus, and that medical benefits be forcefully protected.

Sincerely,

Michelle Deya Knoop, M.A. TESOL  
Adjunct Instructor  
English as a Second Language Department

6/25/09

Dear AFA,

I read Dr. Agrella's letter to the college community this morning about management taking a pay cut. Am I the only one who thinks this is deflecting from the real issue? So the management has taken a 3% pay cut and Dr. A has taken a 5% and each have gotten unpaid

## BUDGET CRISIS Faculty Comments

	<p>furloughs. Wow....</p> <p>Here's a comparison: I just took an 18% reduction in load, which is really more like a 31% pay cut (given I was originally teaching at 58%) this semester. Oh....and because I'm not teaching two classes I originally was going to teach, I get unpaid furlough days, too...</p> <p>I think we should keep things in focus: the adjunct have still—by far—taken the brunt of this budget crunch. If we had been pro-active the college community could have taken a shared paycut across the board the college could still have kept classes being offered.</p> <p>-Name withheld by request</p>
6/25/09	<p>Dear Dr. Agrella,</p> <p>I appreciate you communicating with all of us, and for sharing the process leading to the decision to reduce the salaries of the Management Team. I realize this is a sacrifice for all of you, with your varied financial obligations, and I thank you all for making it.</p> <p>I sent an all staff email in which I stated that the job descriptions of faculty, whether they be adjunct, full-time, or retirees, were not the problem, that we had no knowledge of the financial circumstances of our colleagues, and it was important that we relate to one another with compassionate respect. I also said the "conspicuous absence of administration in this conversation, and the decline of California" were more problematic.</p> <p>I had no agenda for what administration should do, other than to share with us your perspective, your experience, and your ideas. Thank you for doing all of this, and more. It is impossible for me to know the extent of the challenges that you face, or the level of responsibility you carry, but I do believe you will do it skillfully, with compassion and respect for all concerned.</p> <p>Sincerely, Linda Gwendolyn ESL</p>
6/25/09	<p>To the AFA negotiators,</p> <p>As I understand it, the reduction to management salaries results in management working fewer days. If there were reductions to faculty salaries negotiated, would it be possible that the reductions could come in the form of time off or reduced workload or would we still be required to work the same amount for less money? Unfortunately, I think I know the answer to this, but I wanted to make sure. I just want it to be understood that this reduction in management salaries is NOT the same as if we were to take a salary reduction.</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS

### Faculty Comments

	-Name withheld by request
6/24/09	<p>Budget cuts affect everyone, and SRJC is faced with painful decisions. We all have a story to share about how these potential changes are going to change our lives in the workplace as well as digging into our personal lives. Greg's email brings up some interesting issues, especially for many of the fulltime faculty preparing to retire, of which I am currently one. I'm going on reduced load for the first time in the Fall and working with adjunct to take over some of my classes, yet I am anxious as to what will now happen to my carefully planned retirement plans. Ironically, my professional consulting that I do in the corporate world just got cut. Ouch!</p> <p>In my 33 years at SRJC, I've served as classified staff, adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty, and department chair. I've walked many miles in lots of different shoes. On each of these paths, I've worked with dedicated faculty and staff who go the extra mile to make this college a great institution. Do we go beyond our job descriptions to support students and instructional programs as well as to provide the best instruction possible in the classroom? I can't think of anyone that I work with who doesn't, from the staff at A&amp;R to my colleagues in the Computer Studies department to my dean. I imagine that many of you feel the same in your area. Many years ago in the days of Brook Tauzer (famed SRJC administrator), we seemed such a small family. You knew everyone on campus. Now we are a much larger family, communicating via email to everyone with a click of the mouse.</p> <p>We all have value, and let's be careful of the tone of some of these frustrated emails. Referring to me as "lucky" to be hired as a fulltime instructor after 28 years of service where I have worked above-and-beyond to serve my school and students doesn't sit well with me. The adjunct faculty that I work with are treasured colleagues — some work fulltime in industry and others have only part time work at SRJC. The fulltime faculty that I work with are the hardest working people I know. Those who work to support our instructional programs are equally as dedicated. As hard decisions are made to survive in hard times, let's be respectful of each other.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">C Y N D I • R E E S E Adobe graphics instructor, Computer Studies Department</p>
6/24/09	<p>I have been reading all these emails with a heavy heart. Here is what I know to be true. I have been an adjunct for the past 10 years. I just found out my short courses have been cut. I began my association with SRJC in 1996, at 39 years of age</p>

## **BUDGET CRISIS**

### **Faculty Comments**

when I enrolled as a student. I had been in the corporate work world and found myself with as opportunity to go to school. Everyone I came into contact with at the JC seemed to really be interested in my success as a student here. This was a shock as I was used to the corporate world of cut throat business....My department head and mentor helped me navigate the academic world, and cutting to the chase here; my goal of teaching in the animal field was realized. Even better was the fact that I would be able to teach here, at the JC!

I wrote three short courses (with lots of help from my department head and the AG dept. people), and began to teach here. One of the classes I teach is in conjunction with the A.K.C., and this is the ONLY college in the U.S. that this class exists! Over the last ten years, I have been attempting to introduce a new certificate program/courses. Just when it seems that the time is right, it has been put on hold, due to budget issues. I used to instruct the three short courses each semester. Last Budget crisis changed that to one class one semester and two the second semester. When the budget issues lessened, the classes were to be once again offered each semester. That did not happen. Now all three classes are not going to be offered at all.

Why am I sharing this with you? Because I am devastated by the fact that after ten years, I will not be teaching as all. And by the fear that these classes will not be offered ever again. And mostly because the students, you remember the students, are going to be missing out on so many courses (all the cuts from all the departments) are they going to be receiving the high quality education they had access to ten years ago? I do not see how. So while we are all concerned with budget cuts, why are we not MORE concerned with the quality of education that will not be available?

And lastly, just for the record, I really depend upon the income from my JC classes. I work at several other jobs and this one is so important financially that I am left in a quandary without it. I also would like to let some of you who believe adjuncts do not spend as much time preparing for their classes as a full timer, you are so incorrect. I spend so much of my time, unpaid, preparing for each class I teach. I actually put together a manual for one of my classes in an effort to give the students as much information as possible.

We seem to be forgetting that we are all teachers, some were just lucky enough to be hired full time. But there are only so many full time positions in each department and lets face it, it is cheaper to hire part time help (less pay, benefits, etc)

So now I must question why did no one see this budget crisis coming? Again. And how are we going to give these students the education they deserve?

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

	<p>Thank you for allowing me to vent my frustrations. I can only hope my classes will once again be available and I can come home.</p> <p>Laurie Bischoff Adjunct Instructor Animal Health Program</p>
6/24/09	<p>Dear Colleagues,</p> <p>On Monday, during the Member Concerns portion of the AFA Executive Council meeting, I spoke in favor of an agreement for all employees of the College to accept a shared sacrifice in order to maintain our programs and preserve teaching assignments for as many part-timers as possible, as well as protecting the jobs of classified employees.</p> <p>During economic downturns in the 80s and 90s at Hewlett-Packard, everyone, from top management down, accepted a 10% cut in gross pay to survive what our managers believed to be a temporary slowdown, as opposed to a long-term structural change in the business. The net loss in pay to employees was tolerable, and we were all in place, ready to spring back into high gear as the economy picked up.</p> <p>Our current state fiscal crisis is certainly a temporary slowdown; the need to educate students has not changed, nor will it. For this reason, maintaining our roster of part-time instructors is necessary for the future of the College. Equally important, support functions must remain intact. A shared sacrifice, spread across every part of the College, would make this possible.</p> <p>UC San Francisco and City College of San Francisco have both arrived at plans of this sort; SRJC executives and deans, the AFA, and SEIU should study these and incorporate the best ideas of both into a plan to insure that the College remains an indispensable part of the community.</p> <p>The main points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The president, vice-presidents, and deans should announce a voluntary pay cut, thereby demonstrating leadership and boosting morale at the College.</li><li>2. AFA should negotiate an MOU limiting overloads for full-time faculty.</li><li>3. Retirees should take a hiatus in scheduling hourly teaching assignments.</li><li>4. SEIU should negotiate a temporary, progressive pay cut.</li><li>5. Medical benefits should be protected for those adjuncts whose</li></ol>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

	<p>loads have fallen below 40%.</p> <p>6. Like load should be based on semesters prior to Spring '09, i.e. protected from the current, temporary reductions in the academic schedule.</p> <p>This should be a College-wide effort, residing not just with the AFA, but with active cooperation from management and the SEIU as well. It should be obvious that all the support activities, including those carried out by management, are only justified as long as the College's teaching mission is carried out to the fullest.</p> <p>Best regards, Michael Drayton ESL Department, Adjunct Instructor</p>
6/24/09	<p>Hi Warren et.al.--</p> <p>First, thank you so much for the wonderful job you're all doing during this terrible time. I know how very, very hard it is juggling so many realities and interests, but think you've found an equitable and collegial course to navigate. So thank you on behalf of us all.</p> <p>One question I had regards the possibility of full-time faculty taking a voluntary load reduction for one semester, without the requirement of load-balancing later. (In my mind it's equivalent to taking a voluntary salary cut.) Would this be possible, and, if it were, what would the consequences (to STRS, for example) be? By "releasing" one class I think I could help assure that every Italian adjunct receives at least one class, thus preserving their jobs-- so I'm willing to take this option if it's available.</p> <p>Another one involves the strategy I understand the CCSF is adopting (it was written about in the Press Democrat this week)-- that is, finding groups or individuals who are willing to "adopt" a specific course by paying \$6000 to make sure that it's offered. If it's actually possible (legally) to do this, are we looking into it officially? Can we begin to approach possible contributors?</p> <p>Finally, I had a question regarding creating Proof 3 based on the MOU. The MOU says that we need to look at like load from F08 in conjunction with the seniority list. But we have a situation where a mid-senior faculty who had no load in F08 ended up with one in F09 proof 2 due to the presence of an unstaffed course. But now 3 courses have been cut, and we are no longer in an "unstaffed" situation. If we truly treat Proof 3 as if it were Proof 1, then this faculty should have no load in F09 until everyone else-- even those less senior-- has as close to possible to their F08 like-load,</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS

### Faculty Comments

	<p>correct? Please let me know, so that I can make the contractually correct recommendations to the chair.</p> <p>Thanks again for all of your collective hard work, and I really appreciate the clear, thoughtful messages you're sending out so regularly. Take care, and best wishes for a good summer.</p> <p>Sincerely, Terri Frongia</p>
6/22/09	<p>Colleagues,</p> <p>I listened carefully to the presentation and all comments/questions at the AFA meeting last Monday, and I have read the emails regarding the budget cuts. Some vocal individuals have taken the path of vilifying AFA, regular faculty, or administration as a misguided means to advocate for their group. Fortunately others have spoken or written with a more productive attitude by offering ideas and understanding that AFA is constrained by nil degrees of freedom.</p> <p>The reality is the SRJC community – students, faculty, staff, all the way down to administration – are faced with a situation so dire there is no solution, and our only hope for any significant mitigation is trusting every member in our community. I trust that my full-time colleagues who take an overload do so only because they absolutely must. Similarly I trust my adjunct colleagues to take loads that are essential. I trusted the administration to step up as well, and Dr. Agrella's email today validated my trust. The students trust our community to do all we can to minimize their looming hardships, and I am considering taking more students than my limit, in turn trusting the administration not to expect it in the future when we're fully funded. Finally, I trust AFA to do the right thing because they have done so consistently and skillfully for many years. Let's continue our dialogue with this premise.</p> <p>Terry Shell</p>
6/22/09	<p>Dear Colleagues,</p> <p>Simply saying that most adjuncts with workloads of less than 40% have other full-time work or spouses with full-time work doesn't make it so. Even if that ideal situation were once the case, in these tough times, situations are changing. If it was ever appropriate to equate a small workload with supplemental income, that time is decidedly past.</p> <p>If an arbitrary line must be drawn, someone, please, have the decency to call it "arbitrary," and stop pretending that an unresearched, unverifiable assumption about adjuncts' economic circumstances somehow represents an equitable and fair basis for lay-offs.</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS Faculty Comments

	<p>Thank you, Risa Aratyr Production Stage Manager / Adjunct Instructor Theatre Arts Department</p>
6/22/09	<p>Gone for a week and so much dialogue.</p> <p>After reading all the response to Michael's concerns I have some questions. I think there are too many unknowns to be singling out one group to give something up. Only 9% of the hourly assignments are taught by contract faculty. How many of the 1600 adjunct faculty, do have other full time jobs? Are we asking them to give up their JC part time jobs? Maybe we should ask all employees to show their last two 1040s? Would it be fair to ask a JC contract employee to give up their overload and not another with a full time job? How many retirees could only retire because they could continue to teach an hourly assignment? How many contract faculty have plans to retire in the next couple of years and how would a reduction in salary or overload affect these plans?</p> <p>I have been on the AFA as a counsel member for over 16 years and believe me when I say the AFA spends 75% of it time protecting adjuncts and adjuncts issues. I think article 16 is a fair article. It should apply fairly to all who are teaching overloads or adjunct hourly assignments.</p> <p>Greg Sheldon</p>
6/22/09	<p>Ed LaFrance wrote:</p> <p>&gt;I think it is important to note that the administration is conspicuously absent from these discussions.</p> <p>Yes, the silence has been deafening, ever since Dean Rudolph's initial announcemen of plans to cut the schedule by 18%. Maybe this is as it should be -- leaving it to those of us in the trenches to figure out how to keep the College in one piece through this difficult time. As our thoughts come together, we can express them through the AFA, and, as a faculty, we'll exert our leadership through negotiated agreements as to how to move forward. Or we can sit quietly and take whatever comes our way. It's our choice.</p> <p>Mike Drayton</p>
6/22/09	<p>Dear Colleagues,</p> <p>I believe that both full-time and part-time hold the necessary qualification to teach that particular subject as they have been offered the positions. Most people have no doubt about the qualification of the adjuncts.</p>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

**At JC, some programs have been taught only by adjuncts and have never had a full-time position.** I am talking about not only the Foreign Language Programs, but also some like in the Culinary Dept, Consumer & Family Studies, ESL non-credit, many courses in DRD, College Skills, Tutorial, etc.... These wonderful programs have been available **because of the DEMAND from the local community/students, not because somebody needs a job.**

I don't know how many existing programs at JC fall into this category. However, I hope that Chinese and Russian Programs are not the **ONLY** ones that have been **completely eliminated** due to the budget cut.

The programs that have only part-time positions might have a relatively smaller population than those that have full-time positions. However, the elimination of the programs has terminated the dreams of those students who need such programs to fulfil their requirement to be admitted to a future program as a career (for example, Chinese medical school, ...) I believe that these students (although a relatively small percentage) have the equal right to take the classes that they need for their future.

I can understand that the critical situation of the budget cut, but there is a Chinese saying, "A little bird has all the organs that a giant bird has". If the giant birds need to be slimmer, the little ones don't deserve to be slaughtered as they have only taken a small amount of the space. They could take even less, but please do not take their lives.

The elimination of such programs has terminated 100% of the small population's needs. They deserve an equal opportunity of the larger population. Their right should not be terminated because their instructors are adjunct!!!

Is it possible to keep the program so that the students can earn their credits to fulfil their requirement to a four-year program? I am willing to teach without any pay in exchange of an opportunity for those students. As mentioned, such a program exists because of the demand of the community, not because someone needs a job.

Dr. Li Li, Instructor and Coordinator of Chinese Program  
Modern & Classical Languages Department

6/21/09

Lending support to Brita Olson's comments:

My family keeps our heads above water as long as I can maintain three part-time jobs, each (theoretically) at a 40% load; one requiring a 220-mile round trip commute twice weekly. If any of those disappears, we are instantly in the red.

## BUDGET CRISIS Faculty Comments

	<p>Obviously I could devote more time to students if I could focus on work in one location. However, it is a misconception to think of adjuncts as partly-committed, partly-credentialed instructors. With a PhD and three MAs, I believe I am qualified for a full time position... if any were to be had in my field. I see the problem as a systemic one -- combining insufficient funding with a reluctance to commit to full time, tenure track teachers in positions where those services are apparently in demand. Adjuncts are, after all, a cheap way to handle growing budgetary (and instructional) demands.</p> <p>Deirdre Frontczak</p>
6/21/09	<p>Dear SRJC Colleagues,</p> <p>I believe 90% is way overstating the percentage of "full time job" adjunct instructors. I, for one, am not and I think you would find that a number of us, especially women, provide the sole support and child care for our families. I don't think you can make such sweeping across the board statements without looking at each person's individual circumstances. My husband and I together barely make one full time salary and many months not even that much.</p> <p>Regards, Brita Olson</p>
6/21/09	<p>[reference to <a href="http://empirereport.org/reports/20090619-faculty-say-no-to-furloughs">http://empirereport.org/reports/20090619-faculty-say-no-to-furloughs</a> ]</p> <p>Interesting article, but to me it seems to miss a crucial detail: *The CSU is considering introducing furloughs for all CSU employees, ***including management and executive levels***.</p> <p>This strikes me as a good faith gesture. IF furloughs are made mandatory in a fair fashion (perhaps regressive furloughs-- the more one makes the more one is furloughed) then this seems to be, at the very least, a good faith gesture on the part of the CSU executives.</p> <p>It leads me to wonder if such a gesture is being considered at the Community College level.</p> <p>The considerations I have heard so far involve students, faculty, being asked to bear the burden-- are community colleges also considering furloughs which include management and executive levels?</p> <p>Miguel Balboa</p>
6/21/09	<p>The idea of across the board pay cuts is beginning to surface in some of the recent posts.</p>

## **BUDGET CRISIS**

### **Faculty Comments**

The implicit assumption in across the board pay cuts is that they are "fair" because all concerned parties "share the pain" equally.

Instructors who earn more income will pay more dollars, while instructors who earn less income will pay fewer dollars. However, all instructors will pay the same percentage of their income in the form of pay reduction. This is the principle behind a "flat tax" (proportional tax). An individual earning \$100,000 per year, would pay \$10,000 in salary reduction, while an individual earning \$50,000 per year would pay \$5,000, but all would reduce income by 10% (or whatever % is being discussed). Voila! a fair solution. (The key word is percent).

Let's look at a different scenario. Individual A is a full-time instructor earning \$100,000. Individual A would take a pay-cut of \$10,000 (10%). Suppose individual B is an adjunct instructor who is retired after 30 years of teaching, and whose primary source of income is the \$90,000 per year that he receives from STRS. In addition, suppose individual B is an adjunct instructor earning \$10,000 per year by teaching one course per semester. Clearly, both individuals A and B are earning \$100,000 in income. Will they both take 10% pay reductions? The answer depends upon which part of individual B's income takes the reduction. If he take a 10% reduction on only his SRJC salary, then he will lose \$1,000 on an actual income of \$100,000 (1%). Since he takes the reduction on only his SRJC income, his \$90,000 STRS income is exempt from the reduction. But his total income is \$100,000. He is paying a smaller % of his total income in the reduction than the instructor whose sole source of income is the SRJC salary even though they both have identical incomes.

In the first scenario (paragraph 2), individual A and individual B have different incomes, but pay the same % of income in reduction. That makes it "fair" in the sense that the pain is equally shared based upon each individual's relative income. In the second scenario (paragraph 4), both individual A and individual B have identical incomes but pay different % because of the different income sources. That makes it "unfair" in the sense that the pain is not being equally shared. The same analysis is applicable to situations where adjunct instructors have a spouse earning a high salary elsewhere.

To be fair, the analysis can (and should) be applied to regular faculty who may have sources of income outside of their teaching positions. By the same logic, we could demonstrate that a very well-off full time instructor whose primary income is derived from sources outside of teaching is paying a smaller % of his annual income in pay reduction than an adjunct instructor whose primary source of income is only his teaching salary. In either scenario, the claim that the "pain is being equally shared" is false.

Only individuals who take hourly assignments (for whatever reasons),

## BUDGET CRISIS

### Faculty Comments

	<p>can decide how adversely affected a loss of assignment would be to their well-being. The real problem is that we are attempting to develop policy with insufficient data, and there is no mechanism by which we can differentiate those who truly need assistance from those who do not. The idea that across-the board pay-cuts will somehow work as a fair strategy for sharing pain simply fails the math test.</p> <p>I wish you luck in these difficult times, and appreciate the work that you do on my behalf.</p> <p>Jack Wegman</p>
6/21/09	<p>Hello, It's gratifying to see that the understanding going on includes the parsing of the categories of full-time, adjunct, and retirees in terms of their financial needs and responsibilities. (see Mark Nelson and others).</p> <p>I think it needs to be underlined that the most important function we as faculty serve is to give students a quality education. In this context it should also be highlighted that an SRJC retiree who continues to be actively engaged in his or her discipline and who has developed his or her teaching abilities over the years becomes an asset to his or her department.</p> <p>Will Collier, Art Dept</p>
6/20/09	<p>Dear Members of the AFA Executive Council, Negotiating Team, Dr. Agrella, VP Rudolph and VP Roberts:</p> <p>I realize how difficult your jobs have become of late, and I appreciate your willingness to receive feedback and suggestions.</p> <p>As an adjunct of 4 years who truly loves her job at SRJC, I am devastated by the prospective loss of classes, benefits and possibly even of my job altogether. Like many adjuncts, my family depends upon the income and especially the benefits provided by the JC. We adjuncts have our entire schedules revolving around the JC calendar, and I would venture to say that the great majority of adjuncts do a fabulous job. For me, having my schedule/life revolve around the JC is a pleasure and not a sacrifice.</p> <p>But if my load is reduced to one class and I lose benefits, where is the incentive for me to remain part of the community? My students would be extremely upset to not have access to my classes.</p> <p>I am aware that many people are suffering from these cuts, but please don't give an unfair burden to adjunct faculty. You need us and we need you!</p>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

	<p>I suggest the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That full-time faculty overloads (32 FTEF) be limited (as the President has suggested), and/or even eliminated during this budget crisis;</li><li>2. That (as the President as suggested) retirees coming back to teach hourly assignments, give those classes to adjunct faculty</li><li>3. That an across-the-board cut by ALL members of the College community be implemented to save classes and jobs, a progressive cut would be the fairest</li><li>4. That seniority and like-load be protected forcefully across campus</li><li>5. That medical benefits be protected, especially for those whose loads have dropped below the qualifying threshold</li><li>6. And that AFA move on this immediately to save classes and hourly (adjunct) jobs.</li></ol> <p>Thank you, Judy Garson, Adjunct Instructor, Dept. of Modern Languages</p>
6/20/09	<p>Please do not let the burden of the budget crisis fall solely on the shoulders of the adjunct faculty. We are ready to take our fair share of the burden, but there are ways to make sure we do not carry ALL of the load.</p> <p>I am asking you to not allow adjunct faculty to lose health benefits during this very challenging time. Adjuncts who depend on the group health insurance can not afford to lose medical insurance. I realize in a very tight budget, this is an area that could be perceived as a cost-cutting measure, but the impact on adjuncts would be devastating! I thank you for your support of adjunct health benefits in the past. They have given many of us the peace of mind we need to be effective teachers.</p> <p>As we lose our classes we also fall below the 40% requirement to be part of the program. Please change the requirements so that the adjuncts who depend on this program do not lose the coverage we depend on. This will cost the district nothing.</p> <p>Also, please preserve like-load during these difficult times. Many of us have worked here for so long and given so much of our energy to the college. We are, without a doubt, an integral part of the college. This will also cost the district nothing.</p> <p>Please encourage full-timers to not go over 100% load as President Agrella has asked. No one wants to cause division between full-timers and adjuncts and this would be one area that full-timers could show their concern.</p> <p>As far as our students, I'm sure you know the effect the lack of</p>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

	<p>classes and choices will have on students. Our students are struggling to educate themselves and get ahead - a dream we all share. How will the State of California ever survive these times if we have a large and getting-larger under-educated and unskilled population on our hands? We are not in a business where we can simply back away from accommodating those who come to us for help.</p> <p>Sincerely, Julie Kazemi</p>
6/18/09	<p>Dear Colleagues,</p> <p>I am a ten-year adjunct history instructor at SRJC and have been closely following the current budgetary crisis. Several aspects of the situation are extremely alarming:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The community college system provides an critically important gateway of opportunity to a broad segment of the state's population. We desperately need educated, trained citizens. Community colleges play a crucial role in allowing Californians to become productive citizens. Draconian cuts to the system will cost much, much more in lost productivity than they will save in near term finances.</li><li>2. Given the necessity of emergency budget cuts, why is the adjunct faculty expected to bear this entire burden? -Adjuncts make up an ever greater segment of the JC teaching staff. We are necessary instructors! -- I take my job as a JC instructor very seriously. I consistently expand and upgrade my course curricula. I am readily available to my students in class, during regular office hours, and via email. -This is my only job. I do not, as has been suggested, have other sources of employment. This is it. -This is my only source of health insurance.</li></ol> <p>There are viable, more fair, alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Implement an across-the -board cut on the entire college community. This would allow both a shared burden and a means of saving classes sorely needed by students!</li><li>2. Limit and/or eliminate full time faculty overloads as suggested by the President.</li><li>3. Also as suggested by the President, allow adjuncts to teach hourly assignments now taught by returning retirees.</li><li>4. Protect seniority and like-load.</li><li>5. Protect medical benefits. Again, this is the only health insurance available to me, and I'm sure I am not alone in this.</li><li>6. I urge AFA to provide the necessary leadership to save classes and adjunct jobs.</li></ol> <p>I know this is a difficult time for all.</p> <p>Thank You, Anne Exton Social Science</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS Faculty Comments

6/18/09	<p>[response to Linda Hauser's comment]</p> <p>Linda – I agree completely with this approach, and I hope more people speak up. We need to preserve our classes and programs, and share the burden of this crisis.</p> <p>-Name withheld by request</p>
6/18/09	<p>Dear AFA Executive Council and Negotiation Team members,</p> <p>I am saddened that the adjunct faculty is bearing the brunt of this economic burden with reduced classes (and thus opportunities to teach), compensation, office hours, and medical benefits. I consider myself as qualified and committed as a full time faculty member, and yet it seems my commitment is not reciprocated by the college. How is it that with these reductions that "our community colleges are to remain strong to help our economy recover" when so many classes are taught by adjunct faculty? Although I teach "part-time", I rely on my compensation and medical benefits for the "full-time" welfare of my family.</p> <p>Please represent the adjunct faculty, who are also members of the AFA by working to make sure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Full-time faculty overloads (32 FTEF) be limited (as the President has suggested), and/or even eliminated during this budget crisis</li><li>2. And (as the President as suggested) that retirees coming back to teach hourly assignments, give those classes to adjunct faculty</li><li>3. That an across-the-board cut by ALL members of the College community be implemented to save classes and jobs, a progressive cut would be the fairest</li><li>4. That like-load be protected forcefully across campus</li><li>5. Medical benefits need to be protected, especially for those whose loads have dropped below the qualifying threshold</li><li>6. And that AFA should move on this immediately to save classes and hourly (adjunct) jobs</li></ol> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kimberley Fetzer Adjunct Instructor Department of Culinary Arts</p>
6/18/09	<p>Dear SRJC colleagues,</p> <p>Here I go once again tip toeing into the Lion's den (which for an atheist is a scary proposition). Tip toeing is probably a bad analogy, I guess I probably stomping my feet. Oh well.</p>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

After reading quite a few emails lately either asking or perhaps even going further and suggesting that policies be put into place to forbid regular faculty from teaching overload classes I have finally felt the need to put in my two cents on the opposite side of the proposals. Just call me the loyal opposition. I mean, how can we have a legitimate debate on this issue if only one side is being heard from? I know that there are many regular faculty who teach overloads who are feeling pressured into giving up their classes. I believe the pressure being placed on these individuals is unjust and unethical. Before I begin, I will be upfront--and this is not new news to most of you--I have taught overload classes since I arrived at SRJC in 1990 and I will continue to do so for quite a while. I feel no guilt whatsoever about doing so. I was raised by parents who both worked overtime (and normally got time and a half to boot). I guess I am just proud to be following in their footsteps.

Now, on to the opposition analysis.

I am assuming that regular faculty are being requested to give up their overload classes on the premise that adjunct faculty need the money more. Let's start with that premise. Is it true? Do all adjunct faculty need the money more than all regular faculty do? I know for a fact that this premise is not true. I know that there are numerous adjunct faculty who have full time jobs outside of SRJC or are self-employed (many of whom make more than SRJC regular faculty do) who teach classes to supplement their full time income. Are these full-time employees also being asked/required to give up their hourly assignment classes? I have not heard of any such requests? Why is that? Let me ask it this way. Why should a regular faculty member at SRJC give up his/her hourly assignment classes so that a person who has a full time job at another company can teach hourly assignment classes? Maybe we should require all individuals to provide income tax returns and only allow those who have an income of less than some agreed upon demarcation point to teach hourly assignments. I would guess that number would need to be \$55,748 since that is the lowest starting salary for a new regular faculty member (at least I believe that is the correct number). Hence, ANYONE, who shows an income equal or greater than that amount would be excluded from teaching hourly assignment classes regardless if that income is generated by the SRJC or some other company (though I doubt this would be legal).

Second, I also know for a fact that many adjuncts who themselves don't have a full time job outside of the JC have a spouse who does. These adjuncts teach at the JC to supplement their spouse's full time income. Are these adjuncts being asked/required to give up their hourly assignment classes? Once again, I guess we could collect income tax forms for spouses as well to make sure that these spouses aren't making more than the demarcation point set above. In line

## **BUDGET CRISIS**

### **Faculty Comments**

with this, I know there are regular faculty who are single who teach overload classes because they believe they need the extra income since they don't have a spouse bringing in a second income. Why should these regular faculty be required to give up their hourly assignment classes so that another adjunct, who has a spouse who has a full time job, can keep theirs?

In terms of retirees, it seems that SRJC retirees are also being singled out unfairly. Why is no one speaking up for them? I certainly will!!!! I know that there are adjuncts who are retirees of companies other than the JC who are teaching classes at the JC in order to supplement their retirement income. Are these retirees being asked/required to give up their hourly assignments? If not, why not? Why should retirees of SRJC not be given hourly assignments when retirees of another college or company are given hourly assignments? Do SRJC retirees need the supplemental income these classes provide less than retirees of other companies? Again, maybe income tax forms are needed.

I believe the big mistake being made of the "anti-regular faculty" movement is to group all regular and all adjunct faculty in two different groups and then assume that these groups are 1) inherently different in terms of income/needs and 2) to assume that internally, each regular faculty is in the same situation as any other regular faculty and that each adjunct is in the same situation as any other adjunct. Neither of these premises are true.

Beyond analyzing just income (pure dollar amounts that could be provided on an income tax form) there are also numerous family/household circumstances that can make "financial need" from one person to another very different (regardless if regular or adjunct faculty). For example, if an instructor has an elderly parent in a nursing home they are paying for this could generate a greater "need" for extra income than someone who is not in that situation. Or perhaps an instructor has a child with medical conditions that require great care and expense. Maybe an instructor just lost a spouse and thus needs to generate extra income to help make up for their spouse's income. On the opposite end of the spectrum maybe an instructor just inherited a fortune and could live the rest of their lives without working yet they want to continue to teach because they really enjoy it. I think trying to figure out a system that determines who should be allowed to teach hourly assignments based on "financial need" is probably not only illegal but futile to begin with given the multiple variables that would come into play. Ironically, it seems that Michael Ludder (whom I like quite a bit) has zero problems allowing someone like Bill Gates, one of the richest men in the world, from teaching hourly assignments if he so desired, yet he would not allow a SRJC regular faculty member who makes \$55,748 from doing so. Again, why the double standard?

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

	<p>Article 16 attempts (though it is not perfect IMO) to lay out a fair methodology for assigning hourly assignments. Regular faculty are given their contractual load first and then the rest of the classes are distributed to all other individuals who want to teach. Regular faculty have the opportunity to teach these extra classes, just as do individuals who have other fulltime employment, as do individuals who have spouses who have fulltime jobs, as do retirees of SRJC, as do retirees of some other company, as do individuals who won the lottery and are millionaires. Article 16 says we will treat ALL individuals in the SAME manner when it comes to distributing hourly assignments. What is wrong with that????</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Mark Nelson Chair, Communication Studies Department (707) 527-4217 <a href="mailto:mnelson@santarosa.edu">mnelson@santarosa.edu</a></p>
6/17/09	<p>I attended the AFA meeting and it is apparent that no adjunct jobs need to be eliminated. The problem is not finding an alternative to cuts but caring enough about the adjuncts (who are the backbone of SRJC) to save their jobs. Here are some suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. full-time faculty overloads (32 FTEF) be limited (as the President has suggested), and/or even eliminated during this budget crisis</li><li>2. and (as the President as suggested) that retirees coming back to teach hourly assignments, give those classes to adjunct faculty</li><li>3. that a across-the-board cut by ALL members of the College community be implemented to save classes and jobs, a progressive cut would be the fairest</li><li>4. that seniority and like-load be protected forcefully across campus</li><li>5. medical benefits need to be protected, especially for those whose loads have dropped below the qualifying threshold</li><li>6. And that AFA should move on this immediately to save classes and hourly (adjunct) jobs</li></ol> <p>Does it not seem strange to you that we have right here at SRJC a apartheid like system?</p> <p>Tula Jaffe</p>
6/17/09	<p>Dear President Agrella, SRJC Administration, AFA Executive Council and Negotiation Team members,</p> <p>I have been an adjunct faculty member of SRJC since January 1985 and I am writing today to ask that the adjunct faculty NOT bear the brunt of this economic burden. Although I am a "part time employee" at SRJC, I believe that ALL part time employees are vital to SRJC at</p>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

	<p>all levels. And although I am very concerned for all the of the adjunct colleagues, but I am most concerned for my students and all of the students of SRJC. In this desperate economic climate, many will have to delay attending a four-year college or will be looking to learn a new skill or trade and will turn SRJC only to find that the courses are not available to them. Please, I implore you, we must find other ways to deal with these issues other than those layed out in the most recent MOU. We ask that these steps be seriously considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Full-time faculty overloads (32 FTEF) be limited (as the President has suggested), and/or even eliminated during this budget crisis</li><li>2. And (as the President as suggested) that retirees coming back to teach hourly assignments, give those classes to adjunct faculty</li><li>3. That an <b>across-the-board cut</b> by ALL members of the College community be implemented to save classes and jobs, a progressive cut would be the fairest</li><li>4. That seniority and like-load be protected across campus</li><li>5. Medical benefits need to be protected, especially for those whose loads have dropped below the 40% level</li><li>6. And that AFA should move on this immediately to save classes for our students and hourly (adjunct) jobs</li></ol> <p>It seems only fair in these desperate economic times, that we take a serious look at how these cuts can be shared by ALL. ALL of us are suffering during these times and it is time for ALL of us to share the burder, not just the adjunct.</p> <p>Please reconsider the cuts to the courses and the adjunct and consider an across the board cut from the top down!!! Thank you.</p> <p>Pamela Rippin Sorensen BOT (now BAD and CS) Adjunct</p>
6/17/09	<p>Dear President Agrella, Vice-Presidents Rudolph and Roberts, AFA Executive Council Members, the Negotiation Team and Staff of SRJC:</p> <p>I am in the twenty-second year of my employment as an adjunct ESL Instructor with SRJC, and I sadly say that this is not our finest hour. I was impressed by how UCSF is handling its budget crisis with shared sacrifices and a commitment to sustaining the quality of their programs. How can it make sense to cut our programs and turn students away who cannot afford the UC or State University systems and would be dependent on SRJC to begin or continue their higher education?</p> <p>UCSF found multiple ways to handle their budget shortfall, including reductions of 5 percent in the salaries of the employees most able to bear it, the President, his Vice-Presidents and other highly paid employees, and then an across-the-board wage reduction for all employees, with smaller reductions for lower paid employees. The</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS Faculty Comments

	<p>Chancellor of UCSF calls this action a means to keeping their institution a "humane and gratifying place to work," in alignment with their "strong sense of community."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If what we need to do to protect the jobs of our adjunct colleagues is for full-time instructors to give up their overload, then eliminate that option for the present, without endangering their ability to return to teach 40 percent when they retire.</li> <li>• Give the hourly assignments that retirees now teach to adjuncts.</li> <li>• At this difficult time, protect the medical benefits of instructors whose load has dropped below 40 percent.</li> </ul> <p>If UCSF and other higher education institutions in California are figuring out ways to cut their costs in ways that extend from top to bottom, including energy savings, consolidation of administrative functions, eliminating vacant staff positions, unpaid holidays, and salary cuts for all, then SRJC can do that, too. I hope I can boast that we can make this our finest hour, as UCSF can.</p> <p>Linda Hauser ESL Instructor</p>
6/17/09	<p>Dear AFA Executive Council and Negotiation Team members,</p> <p>I am a loyal adjunct faculty member of SRJC and I am writing you all today to ask that the adjunct faculty NOT bear the brunt of this economic burden. I consider myself as qualified, committed, and engaged as any full time faculty member, and yet I am so saddened to know that the depth of that commitment is not reciprocated by the college. And though I am very worried and saddened for myself and my adjunct colleagues, I am most concerned for my students and all of the students of SRJC. In this desperate economic climate, many will have to delay attending a four year college, or will be looking to learn a new skill or trade, and will turn SRJC only to find that the school has abandoned them. Please, I implore you, we must find other ways to deal with these issues other than those layed out in the most recent MOU. We ask that these steps be seriously considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Full-time faculty overloads (32 FTEF) be limited (as the President has suggested), and/or even eliminated during this budget crisis</li> <li>2. And (as the President as suggested) that retirees coming back to teach hourly assignments, give those classes to adjunct faculty</li> <li>3. That an across-the-board cut by ALL members of the College community be implemented to save classes and jobs, a progressive cut would be the fairest</li> <li>4. That seniority and like-load be protected forcefully across campus</li> <li>5. Medical benefits need to be protected, especially for those whose</li> </ol>

## BUDGET CRISIS

### Faculty Comments

	<p>loads have dropped below the qualifying threshold 6. And that AFA should move on this immediately to save classes and hourly (adjunct) jobs</p> <p>We are real people, with real families, health issues and financial concerns, and we are also people who are deeply committed to teaching and SRJC. Please help us, and help our students. You all have the power to implement these changes- we can do it if we try.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. I deeply appreciate it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Laurie Taylor M.A. Adjunct Anthropology Instructor Department of Behavioral Sciences 707-527-4999 ext. 9693</p>
6/17/09	<p>Colleagues: I believe the assumption that "adjunct" faculty are all part time, working only at SRJC is false. That assumption allows prioritization of hourly instructors who hold full time jobs elsewhere, such as the full time engineer at Agilent, the full time high school principal, the full time instructor from SSU, the full time instructor from SFSU, the dean of a Law School, the SSU retired faculty drawing retirement (all real hourly instructors at SRJC)... as somehow having greater need or right to hourly assignments over regular faculty at SRJC. I think we need to move away from the terms "adjunct" and "overload" and stick with "hourly assignments" without a distinction. Presenting a request that "full timers" consider giving up "overload" so their "adjunct" colleagues can have the work sets off fierce arguments in departments and adds fuel to a very difficult time for the college. If we move in the direction of restricting regular faculty from taking hourly assignments, then all hourly instructors should be required to submit their tax returns to verify they are not employed full time elsewhere.</p> <p>Patie Wegman</p>
6/16/09	<p>In response to Warren's request, here are my thoughts on some things raised at Monday's meeting.</p> <p>First and foremost, I agree that our goal as a faculty unit should be to preserve classes and encourage the college to find other ways to deal with funding reductions. Across-the-board reductions in salaries and budgets would be preferable to eliminating classes, in my view. If police and fire unions can take voluntary cuts rather than see staffing reductions, why not college employees?</p> <p>I also agree that pitting FTF against PTF is a dangerous waste of energy and division of our forces. However, I do think the issue of FT</p>

# BUDGET CRISIS

## Faculty Comments

	<p>overloads needs to be addressed, even if that upsets some of our FT colleagues. I agree with statements at today's meeting that having some FTF work overloads while PTF lose their jobs is wrong. I am heartened to hear that in at least one department, FTF have voluntarily stopped taking PT hours for themselves; I hope more departments follow that example. In the short term, could we just vote to suspend overloads while this crisis is upon us?</p> <p>In the longer term, I'd like to see a couple of ideas explored that were raised today. One is the issue of like load for FTF who become PTF upon retirement. Could we not allow FTF an assumed like load of 40% and their FT date of hire when they become adjuncts without them having to teach an overload while they are FT? The other issue was flexibility for FTF who might like to work less than 100% -- could we negotiate a flex option that would allow those folks to voluntarily share their load with an adjunct without compromising their FT status?</p> <p>My biggest short term concern is transparency. The college is cutting classes, and nothing has been explained to us about how these were chosen or how the cuts will be implemented with regards to seniority and like load considerations. Faculty deserve, and should demand, a seat at the table as these decisions are made AND a full and honest explanation for each one.</p> <p>Thanks for your hard work on our behalf,</p> <p>Julia McDermott-Swanson Communication Studies</p>
6/16/09	<p>1.) I fully support the idea of 'shared burden'. However, to me, 'shared' means more than just Regular Faculty and Adjunct. Shared means cuts across the board. Shared means <b>ALL</b> Administration, Management, Classified, Regular FT Faculty, and Adjunct. <b><u>Everybody</u></b> shares the burden of cuts.</p> <p>2.) I support the opinion that Regular FT Faculty should NOT be allowed to have overload - at this time. If we cannot change the contract to mandate this (which I know we cannot at this time) - I think we should have a collegial agreement. Just like the Art Dept. is doing - they said that they have not had a Regular FT Faculty teach overload or summer school for the past 8 years. How about asking ALL Departments to agree for the next year, or maybe two, for the good of our Adjunct Faculty, to please not have Regular FT Faculty take any overloads or summer school. This to me is just such an obvious action. I would support this before I supported cuts to regular faculty salaries.</p> <p>3.) I support the idea that Jeanie Harmon from Child Development proposed about 'work sharing'. I too would consider taking a small cut</p>

## BUDGET CRISIS

### Faculty Comments

	<p>to my salary if it also meant taking a small cut from my work load, and giving that class to an adjunct. Maybe a lot of our Full-Timers feel this way and would support this action.</p> <p>4.) I TOTALLY support the concept that all faculty need to work and come together to work through these challenges. It should not be a PT vs. FT battle. When the meeting first started yesterday, the sense I got was that the Adjunct were blaming the Full Time faculty. After a few faculty spoke up (both PT and FT) and addressed this issue as not being conducive to our goals, I sensed a better collegiality amongst us.</p> <p>-Name withheld by request</p>
6/16/09	<p>I have heard that the Faculty Overload policy allows full-time tenured faculty to take on extra classes, thus potentially depriving an adjunct of a class. If this is true, I would consider this to be especially unfair at this time.</p> <p>A question I have is this: If adjuncts lose their benefits because they are not given a 40% load, will this not be a great disincentive for adjuncts to make a commitment to the college?</p> <p>Thank you, Judy Garson</p>
6/15/09	<p>I am an adjunct faculty at SRJC and unable to attend the meeting today. But I hope that, in this time of cost-cutting and class-cutting, you will consider an <u>across the board</u> cut - full time and adjunct alike. The adjunct faculty is responsible for teaching the majority of classes at the JC. One of our jobs is to empower students. We can't do that unless we are empowered ourselves. These are painful times and adjuncts should not be feeling that pain alone. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>-Name withheld by request</p>
6/15/09	<p>President Rudd and AFA Reps,</p> <p>I cannot make it to the meeting today, as I'm starting a very intensive online class. However, I wanted to share a couple of comments.</p> <p>1. If Rank 10 was a prerequisite to sharing costs of health care, then I believe we need to take a hard line that Rank 10 is MET and KEPT FIRST, then we'll negotiate a cost-sharing plan. And that Rank 10 MUST be Rank 10 across the board in each and every step from one to infinity. AND...any cost sharing must be linked to a continuance of rank 10. Slipping out of rank ten should mean NO MORE COST SHARING (in the future). If that was indeed the agreement, then we need to make them stick to their side of it before we make any concessions. And I continue to believe that we should not have</p>

## **BUDGET CRISIS**

### **Faculty Comments**

agreed to the language of the previous contract to institute cost sharing. That is going to haunt us for a long time.

2. Try to make some headway on things like banked time, items that do NOT really cost the district much money and have the potential to save money. In effect, banked time can be used as a difference in pay leave, but the district keeps the difference. It could even be mandated that to begin banking for use of a difference in pay leave, you must be rank 10 or higher, for example. That would all but guarantee the district some savings once the faculty member took the semester off. And depending on the wording of the ed. code, banked time could mean some savings short term, while the faculty member teaches courses for free during the banking period. If the latter is true, a side agreement on banked time could be agreed upon and voted on asap, so that the district could start the short term savings asap.

-Name withheld by request