



**SAN MATED COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS**

Advocating for faculty since 1963

**Minutes of General Membership/Executive Committee Meeting
March 10, 2021
2:00pm-4:30pm
By Zoom**

EC Members Present: Jessica Silver-Sharp, Doniella Maher, Joaquin Rivera, Teeka James, Evan Kaiser, Rika Fabian Yonemura, Katharine Harer, Timothy Rottenberg, Eric Brenner, Steven Lehigh, David Laderman, Monica Malamud, David Lau, Kolo Wamba, Shaun Perisho, Bianca Rowden-Quince, Marianne Kaletzky (Executive Secretary)

Members Present: Joshua Avera, T. Lee, Umaima Ejaz, Lucia Lachmayr, Masao Suzuki, Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Zhanna Kotsishevskaya, Pate Hui, Tamara Perkins, Vera Quijano, James Wong, Tina Watts, Anne Stafford, Jesse Raskin, Jessica Truglio, Julia Johnson, Lori Slicton

Guests: John Pimentel, Trustee, SMCCD

Facilitator: David Lau

The meeting commenced at 2:30pm.

1. Introductions.

2. Statements from EC members on non-agenda items.

- a. Union Health & Welfare Fund. Katharine Harer reported that Marianne has researched funding models used by other unions that AFT might emulate. The following members will join a smaller working group to propose a model: Katharine Harer, David Lau, Kolo Wamba, Steven Lehigh & Marianne Kaletzky. Meeting dates and times to follow.
- b. David Lau has joined a group to look at faculty evaluations through equity lens.
- c. Monica Malamud announced the upcoming CFT convention: guests can attend in addition to our elected delegates.
- d. Rika Fabian announced that CCSF plans to cancel 600 more classes. Members are encouraged to join the [March 12 socially distanced rally](#).

3. Conversation with SMCCD Trustee John Pimentel on Free College proposal

- a. Pimentel's background and goals: California's Master Plan (1960) originally mandated free public education, but this was reversed. As a Delta Community

College student, first generation in his family to go to college, he organized for free tuition unsuccessfully. He extends a hand of cooperation and friendship to AFT and gives his view on the need for a free community college initiative in the future. To date, there's no specific proposal; it's a broader policy objective that builds on SMCCD's current and prior work to break down barriers for low-income students through programs such as Promise. He believes tuition and rising college expenses have contributed to SMCCD's declining enrollment.

- b. Q: How to bring free/affordable college to the next level? A: State Senator Josh Becker, who represents part of San Mateo County, recently introduced [SB 659](#): Community colleges: California College Promise, which allows districts to charge \$46 per unit rather than mandating it. Pimentel is also looking at possibility of adjustments to Ed Code that would allow districts to make budget decisions about free/reduced tuition prevented by current code, such as to allow SMCCD to use General Fund money toward student fees.
- c. Ideas/discussion:
 - i. Ask County to make money available for tuition. Push the state and fed government for funds as well. Pimentel's mission includes building up the SMCCD Foundation.
 - ii. Reducing tuition to \$0 would simplify FAFSA, bring in more part-time students.
 - iii. Would zero tuition be limited to SM County residents? Secure formal agreement between districts in other counties to make free SMCCD tuition across the Bay. We need Peninsula-wide movement, starting small/local.
 - iv. Idea of means test for folks who don't need free tuition.
 - v. Before we bring free tuition concept to voters, Trustees must regain the trust of the taxpayers due to Galatolo situation. Pimentel proposes setting up systems/functions to ensure "this kind of thing" can't happen again.
 - vi. A recent signature-gathering ballot initiative for free higher ed based on taxing the rich did not succeed. We need statewide solidarity on free college. California has been putting more into bond initiatives. This will be a tough sell as a result of COVID and other factors.
 - vii. We need a state tax on high end properties to benefit public education.
 - viii. Future faculty input must be solicited on programs that reduce/exempt tuition.
 - ix. Need ways to connect with students to move the initiative forward, starting with conversation with Umaima Ejaz, editor of *Skyline View* student newspaper.
4. ***Introduction of Joshua Avera and EC vote on whether to appoint him as CSM PT rep.** Josh Avera introduced himself and was unanimously appointed.
5. **Negotiations update.** Joaquin Rivera reported. [SEE March 4 negotiations report.](#)

- a. District has agreed to set parity goal of 85% for part-timers and to create a new salary schedule of 25 steps and 5 columns for instructional part-time faculty. Instructional PT will be paid on the new schedule beginning in 2022-2023. They have also agreed to a study group to study transitioning to pay by FLC for PT.
- b. Unresolved: AFT is negotiating what the District will put toward instructional PT parity for 2021-2022. They propose 1.25 million, AFT seeks 1.75 million. Also, District is proposing to make the one-column schedule in 2021-2022 the Master's column of the new schedule; AFT proposing making it the Base column. Under District's proposal, some instructional part-timers would lose money. Finally, AFT & District have not yet agreed on how many FLCs instructional PT will need to teach to move up a salary step once SMCCD achieves parity. (Until SMCCD achieves parity, instructional PT continue to move up steps as they currently do.)
- c. This progress in negotiations is due to the hard work of all of you and everyone else who has helped. Once we settle this contract, we can continue building to get to 85% parity and close the gap.
- d. Members' questions:
 - i. Q: Will situation of class size relating to a 1-unit lab class converted to online due to Covid that's resulted in excessive grading work be addressed by negotiations? A: Class size wasn't part of contract negotiations, but suggestions will be taken for Summer/Fall MOUs.
 - ii. Q: Will movement to the new steps (13-25) begin only in 2022-2023 or will it be retroactive? What about instructional PT who've been stuck at Step 11 for years? A: Part-timers (instructional only) at step 11 for 3 or more years will move to Step 14.
 - iii. Q: Are faculty working on campus receiving additional pay? No, not at present, but this could be a consideration for an MOU.
 - iv. Q: do we know what prop. tax increases were for 1st year of contract? Yes.
- e. Further points
 - i. If we have the current schedule as the Base column, it will help the District get to the 85% goal.
 - ii. Most labs will become .8. AFT is trying to get most labs to be equivalent to lecture pay; this is one way we were addressing the situation of the 1-unit lab course.
 - iii. Part of agreement is to continue looking at lab issue, as there are some labs still in need of increased units.

6. Contract Action Team update. Katharine Harer & Rika Fabian reported on BOT letter writing campaign by members.

- a. Summarized CAT's goals and work: 180 letters sent to BOT in short 3-4 day timeframe. We didn't go to the press. This action tested the strength of our base and garnered immediate action from the District. Thanks to all of our participants.
- b. Discussion:
 - i. A few of us had our letters acknowledged by BOT members but most did not.
 - ii. With AFT's urging the Board had decided that all speakers should now be on video, however but we must continue to push until this is the case. Board members can see our names but we can't see other members there.
 - iii. Q: Why was AFT able to make this contract progress now? A: This time we focused said "this [parity] is our top issue." We presented lots of data and carried out many different types of actions. We educated the BOT and had two new board members whom we had worked hard to elect.

7. Anti-Oppression Committee update: Rika, Doniella scheduled to present as panelists at CFT's event on Advancing Equity in Higher Education and ceded their time to the disability issues conversation. No report this month. Emphasized that invisible disabilities must be acknowledged by our administration.

8. Conversation about how AFT can advocate for faculty, staff, and students with disabilities. Marianne Kaletzky thanked members for coming to EC meetings and bringing to our attention that AFT can be a stronger advocate our community members with disabilities.

- a. AFT formed sub-committee to discuss what paths union advocacy might take and put forth proposals. Members: V. Quijano, L. Slicton, J. Truglio, Dr. B. Rowden-Quince.
- b. Members reported on their past and recent experiences as employees with disabilities.
- c. Discussion on potential actions by AFT
 - i. Educate SMCCD employees about the rights of disabled persons. Could develop a brochure/literature to guide folks through the process of seeking accommodations. Plan some activities during 2021 October Disabilities Awareness month and broaden our understanding.
 - ii. Partner with CSEA in our efforts.
 - iii. Existing Issues where we as the union can be an advocate:
 - 1. Explore paths for advocacy. We need to lean on people.
 - 2. Ensuring that faculty with disabilities are provided with what they need to do their jobs, must be part of our role.
 - 3. We can advocate/reality check on job descriptions. Advocate for more sick days. Need a way for employees not to have to "out" themselves to repeated people about their health. Physician's letter should be sufficient.
 - 4. Experiences of potential retaliation for advocating for accommodation, in one case through cancellation of an adjunct's classes. For the next contract we'll seek provisions around when the District can cancel classes for low enrollment, with the goal of eliminating discrepancies across our

campuses. For now, members should reach out to AFT grievance officers around retaliations and accommodations.

9. Introductory discussion about conducting an evaluation of administrators Monica Malamud reported.

- a. District has a process for evaluating administrators called “360 evaluation” which is flawed and inadequate. History: While this process came about due to pressure by AFT, it was created by Eugene Whitlock who would not implement AFT’s proposal for a process whereby all faculty evaluated their deans confidentially. The current evaluation process favors administrators while leaving faculty evaluators vulnerable. AFT alerted the BOT to these inequities but was not heard. When AFT tried to renegotiate during this contract, union was told this was not within our purview.
- b. MM will bring a proposal to April EC Meeting on the union-led evaluation of all administrators to put pressure on District. We’ve done this before. We could work jointly with CSEA. We could choose to publicize the results.
- c. Discussion:
 - i. Members spoke out about their experiences being chosen to evaluate their deans, about press coverage of employees’ opinions of Regina Stanback Stroud, about our lack of information whether our evaluations have any impact on District’s decisions to rehire or promote administrators.
 - ii. Jesse Raskin volunteered to be part of this future work.

10. *EC vote on whether to approve proposed 2022-2023 Academic Calendar. Motion to approve calendar. 4 abstentions. 10 yes.