

SCFA Minutes

November 6, 2023

Via Zoom

REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL ATTENDANCE:

P	Angelina Rivers, President	P	Kara Perry, Chief Negotiator
P	Judith Kreft, Vice President	P	Diana Higashi-Ybarra, Dispute Resolutions
P	Ralph McGill, Treasurer	P	Wayne Barbee, Negotiations
P	Jason Sumi, Secretary	P	Debby Carter, Communications
P	Jay Hester, Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice Director	P	Sonia Delgadillo, Strategic Council Rep
P	Karsten Stemman, Representative Council	P	Ralph de Unamuno, Representative Council
		P	Doug White, Representative Council

P = Present | A = Absent

Quorum Present: Yes

Visitors: None

PROCEEDINGS:

I. Meeting called to order at 4:02 PM

II. **Visitor's Comments:** none

III. **Approval of Minutes** from October 16, 2023, SCFA Meeting

- a. Motion to approve Minutes from October 16, 2023, SCFA Representative Council Meeting
- b. Motion seconded
- c. Discussion:
 - i. None
- d. Roll Call Vote:

Y	Judith Kreft	Y	Kara Perry	Y	Sonia Delgadillo
Y	Ralph McGill	Y	Diana Higashi-Ybarra	Y	Karsten Stemmann
Y	Jason Sumi	Y	Wayne Barbee	Y	Ralph de Unamuno

Y	Jay Hester	Y	Debby Carter	Y	Doug White
----------	------------	----------	--------------	----------	------------

Y = Yes | N = No | A = Abstain | NP = Not Present

e. Motion approved

IV. Secretary Report

a. Yield

V. Treasurer’s Report:

a. Yield

VI. Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice Director Report:

a. Yield

VII. Chief Negotiator’s Report:

a. Yield

VIII. Vice-President’s Report:

a. Yield

- i. A question was asked from a participant about the date of the SCFA NCC faculty event (January 12th or 19th) and will be discussed at a membership subcommittee meeting.

IX. Dispute Resolution:

a. Yield

X. President’s Report

a. Yield

REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL REPORTS:

XI. Wayne Barbee

a. Yield

XII. Debby Carter

a. Yield

XIII. Sonia Delgadillo

a. Yield

XIV. Karsten Stemmann

a. Yield

XV. Ralph de Unamuno

a. Yield

- i. Chief Negotiator: In your report, you mentioned the work with equity partners for new faculty hires in spring?
 1. Rafa: It is coming up and there is general anxiety because it is new and there is a concern if there is enough equity partners for new hires
 2. Chief Negotiator: These are all good questions. There are 6-7 equity partners and we are working on gathering equity partners for next spring to get training. Is there a space where she can communicate this out to you all and ensuring the infrastructure for spring.
 3. Rafa: Some of the concerns were raised at Academic Senate. More familiarity with new contract and language. Concerns that equity is going to be used under evaluation, concern that equity partners are already selected and done thru SARFs (Special Assignment Request Form) and there is not a structure and all equity partners are involved in shared governance. Could very well have a term where equity partners will withdraw from governance.
 4. Chief Negotiator: if you feel comfortable sharing out that there is a plan for spring with about 15-17 equity partners for spring. After we get thru this term we are hoping to have something more solidified going forward. This will be a future negotiations discussion going forward.

XVI. Doug White

a. Yield

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

XVII. Salary Schedules

- a. Participant 1: 30 years ago and prior to that, full time faculty were not on the part time faculty schedule for their overload courses taught. Summer classes were taught by PT (part-time) faculty and FT (full-time) did not teach a summer class, it was helpful for PT faculty to make up any classes that were canceled. But now FT are starting to teach more in the summer. FT faculty who teach 30 units get a bump to move up, but PT faculty stay the same and cannot teach this many units in the year. for FT faculty, they got an increase and a step increase which was really great for FT faculty. As you may know, we do not have a longevity increase for PT faculty. There are 141 faculty teaching overload, there are 676 overload being taught. The impact was that the summer sessions did not work

out. For PT faculty to teach 30 units would take them four semesters. The majority of faculty that are PT and 50 are teaching 4 units are less, 130 are teaching 3 units or less which can take them 8 years to reach 30 units minimum. It takes PT a long time to reach this. I got my data from California Federation of Teachers. Sierra College is one of seven districts who require 30 units. Some districts do by hours and some do by years. We're on the lower end and as you guess it disadvantages PT. I have advocated for several years that all PT faculty get a 1% increase for every 6 units in the year that they get a bump. What we're doing really isn't helping PT, it is very important that all PT know what's going on. FT faculty could make more on the PT faculty salary schedule. In so many ways PT faculty are disadvantaged. I have long advocated that FT faculty not be on the PT faculty schedule. That's my spiel.

- b. Participant 2: Thanks I have to be honest I am having to wrap my head and understand this better. Is there one way you think is more equitable than others? I know you said it is easy to figure out how much FT faculty hourly wage is per hour, but I'm not sure what that would be or how that would be. What I'm hearing is what you're looking at is some kind of different schedule that is more advantageous to PT is not equitable to them.
 - i. Participant 1: So your first thing you weren't sure about: what am I advocating for? I don't have a particular choice, if we want to be strictly equitable it would be 1% increase every year for every year 6 units taught. FT should have their own schedule, now, the way they do it, I just picked the \$83,000 one and divided it by 10 months by 16 weeks and hours of instruction time. Does that help
 - ii. Participant 2: Kind of, but there is a lot to it. FT faculty and PT faculty are paid there are apples and oranges. I'm trying.
- c. Participant 3: Thanks for your presentation. It is a lot of information. It was challenging to understand, but longevity is something we can look into and explore. I will be honest I do not support the separate schedules for PT and FT as it will be very divisive. The other thing I was going to say too is that it is interesting but we have a lot of priorities at the moment. Another thing we are not seeing where the FT and PT are separated, the FT sometimes make significantly more.
 - i. Participant 1: some of those include student contact time.
 - ii. Participant 3: Again, this is a big conversation.
 - iii. Participant 1: The only problem I have with that is that I have been advocating this for years and I never heard back from negotiations. Years and years of no progress. From where I am coming from, the can is getting kicked down the road and would like a change sooner than later
- d. Participant 4: I see a problem and I am still trying to understand what the issue or time. Is it the classroom time?

- i. Participant 1: FT instruction and PT instruction, I teach the same classes in the same department but they get an increase every year so they make more. We get a true-up in November and sometimes a COLA (cost of living adjustment). But some of the strife from PT you get an increase in step every year and longevity, and we do not get that and the only way we can get a step increase is by teaching 30 units and it takes us such a long time to get to that.
 - ii. Participant 4: This is the first time I have heard this is an issue.
 - iii. Participant 1: I go directly to negotiations
- e. Chief Negotiator: Thank you for this research and I did look over your report. I did have concerns with that and agree to look at longevity and talk about salary adjustments. As far as how the pace at which PT can move it also makes sense to have that conversation. As far as separate schedules, we should pause. The contracts from other districts showed that FT were doing better than PT
 - i. Participant 1: They are calculating 30, it's not 15 and 15.
 - ii. Chief Negotiator: The contracts provided show the FT faculty are doing better than PT
 - iii. President: We cannot simply pull Human Resources reports whenever we want as one of our current priorities is trying to figure out PT health insurance. If Representative Council wants to decide where we want to go after we get thru what we get the priorities done, then yes we can go there.
- f. Vice President: We hear you and what was shared from the Chief Negotiator about longevity and can definitely be put in future discussions. Once we get thru the health care discussions, we can look into this for next year.
- g. Participant 2: I just want to thank you, I know you are passionate about this and I am sure you brought this up before. I think our team is very good with asking about input on priorities and you did a good job articulating, and move forward. We will talk about this in a way that was different from what you experienced in the past.
- h. Participant 5: I think the separate salary schedules are over the top and could be a huge bag of worms.
- i. Participant 1: Are you saying the 1% and 6 units taught does not sound appeal?
 - i. Participant 5: That could be very hard to track.
 - ii. Participant 1: Not everyone knows what their load is and HR knows and Division knows. This is something that FT faculty have enjoyed for years and now is the time to say is let's have some equity.
- j. Participant 3: There are some parts of this on longevity and how people move down, but separate salary schedule would be very divisive.
 - i. Participant 1: I would like everyone's concerns to be part of the discussion.

- k. Chief Negotiator: I have big concerns about separating the overload schedule and PT salary schedule, i'm more interested in understanding the interest behind this. I'm concerned that it would not achieve the interest, from the research over time the separation of salary schedule lead to disadvantages for PT. But I am open to talking about longevity as potential topics for next year. We are not positional bargaining, we are Interest Based Bargaining (IBB) when it comes to negotiations.
 - i. Participant 1: Wen I say 1% and 6 units taught, that is one way to level the playing field. Nothing I wrote or said today
- l. Participant 6: I remember a long time ago, we got money from the state to strictly help for PT salary adjustments and some time what took place to allow that.
- m. President: Even just in our space and for our general practice. We could have IBB come in and use the topic as an example and go thru the full IBB process, it would be a great refresher and training for everyone. Thank you again for bringing this forward and I'm glad we had an opportunity to discuss this as a group and look at how we can go into next negotiation cycle.
 - i. Participant 1: It has been a while and would be a great to have!

XVIII. Conflicting Interest on Benefits

- a. Chief Negotiator: We are right now trying to figure out what the need is because we do not hear about this issue from PT faculty as much. However, Vice President has brought it forward at Union conferences and now there is a reimbursement process thru the state. Our PT come from different walks of life some are retired and some have partners and some have this as a hobby. It is very hard to survey PT to get an idea of what they need. It is going to be emailed on November 15th. We have a PT open forum on November 14th at 4pm.
 - i. Vice President: Could you include something on there for different options for not electing into healthcare such as a stipend.
 - ii. Chief Negotiator: The survey that was sent out last year was sent out by the California Community College Chancellors Office. We are developing this survey with research and the district as there is a shared interest. I will look into this
 - iii. Participant 1: It would be nice to have an example to show what that could look like.

XIX. Meeting adjourned at 4:59pm