Minutes Adopted: October 14, 2026

AFT Local 1493 Membership Meeting

Wednesday, Sept. 9, 2026, 2:30-4:30 p.m. (Closed Session to follow)
CSM Building 18-206 or on Zoom at
http://bit.ly/aft1493mm

Facilitator:

Camille Kaslan

EC Members Attending:

Ben Feldman, Luis Zúñiga, Salumeh Eslamieh, Gil Perez, Doniella Maher, Teeka James, Mick Song, Monica Malamud, Rika Yonemura-Fabian, Steven Lehigh, Keira Travis, Elinor Westfold, Camille Kaslan, Nadia Biglari, Dianne Jones, Geoff Balton, Chris Branco, Chet Lexvold (Executive Director)

Members Attending:

Brandon Williams, Roxana Rugliancich, Patrice Reed-Fort, Jennifer de la Cruz, Lee Miller, Maggie de Vera, Jennifer Howze-Owens, Estela Garcia, Lesly Perez Ortiz, Alberto Santellan, Alex Wong, Allison Hughes, Amanda Barden, Daniel Keller, Jacquie Escobar, Laurie Buchholz, Lia Thomas, Lorraine de Mello, Maggie Barrientos, Manny Delgado, Marc Gottlieb, Matt Montgomery, Rachel Cunningham, Rene Anderson, Robbie Baden, Tasia Scott, Tatiana Irwin, Trang Luong, Virginia Rosales, Brianna Cox, Kim Roderick, Althea T. Kippes, Malathi Iyengar, Joyce Lee, Johnny León, Makiko Ueda

Guests:

Alex Caputo-Pearl (UTLA), Cassondra Curriel (UESF), Belinda Lum (LRCFT)

Welcome, 2:30-2:35

Comments by AFT members (non-EC members) on non-agenda items, ~2 minutes per person

- Lia Thomas made the following comment: "I would like to invite AFT to reexamine its equations for calculating non-instructional parity. The current equation makes certain assumptions about non-instructional faculty work weeks and load that I believe are

incorrect. I would also like AFT to confirm that the 35 weeks used in their calculations include finals weeks, and revise their calculations to take into account the different work week loads for different non-instructional positions' work since there is a range. Because of this range, AFT will need to recalculate their parity formula and develop different parity formulas to address different positions with different loads. Related to this issue, part-time non-instructional faculty's current salary schedule is completely inequitable and should be revised to reflect different levels of education earned. The current part-time non-instructional salary schedule has 11 steps. This salary schedule does not take into account any additional earned units or any additional degrees earned. Whereas instructional part-time faculty have access to a salary schedule with 25 steps and five educational categories that take into account additional units and degrees earned, meaning instructional part-timers have access to 125 different possible pay levels. Our part-time colleagues who have additional credits or special degrees are not being valued in this regard, whereas instructional faculty are. Non-instructional faculty are paid on the "special" rate and have 11 steps. Instructional faculty have access to 25 steps and 125 different possible pay levels. Because of all of these factors, I do not believe that AFT has done enough of an investigation to say that non-instructional part-time faculty have parity. They are relying on flawed equations inherited over the years and have not taken the time to meaningfully re-examine these equations despite many attempts by non-instructional faculty to bring attention to the issue. But all of this would be a non-issue if all faculty were paid by load. Since pay by load for instructional faculty is already set to begin for part-time instructional faculty in 2028, I propose that the next step is to add part-time non-instructional faculty to that discussion and get everyone on the same salary schedule. There is no reason not to have all of our faculty on one salary schedule, as other colleges do. If AFT is committed to a fair contract, they need to commit to transparent and fair pay for all faculty."

- Jennifer de la Cruz raised an additional concern about inequities affecting non-instructional faculty. She does not like the language of "non-instructional" vs. "instructional." She asserts that non-instructional faculty are consistently marginalized in negotiations. She did not feel that advocacy for counseling faculty was adequate in the recent round of contract negotiations. She did not feel seen by AFT leadership at a recent contract forum Q and A session.
- Roxana Rugliancich echoed Jenny's experience of the recent contract forum Q and A. She sees the problem as a reflection of issues that go back at least thirty years. She also advocates for a shift to a pay-by-load system.
- Brandon Williams also said he felt disrespected at the contract forum Q and As. He saw Roxana and another non-instructional faculty member shut down.
- Patrice Reed-Fort said she was present to stand in solidarity with other non-instructional faculty and to say that she is determined to do the necessary work to understand our contract more fully. She stands in solidarity with all her colleagues.
- Maggie de Vera advocated for open discussion. Clearly, some of our members are not feeling heard. She noted that she knows how passionate AFT 1493 leadership is about working for a fair contract for all faculty, so the disconnect is sad, and it should be addressed.

COPE Update, 2:50-3:10 (Lee Miller, Ben)

Jason Holt for Trustee Area 2

- Lee explained that we recruited a labor-friendly candidate to run against Mike Guingona.
- Jason Holt is a software engineer for Disney. He has been involved in unionizing his workplace.
- In a recent San Mateo Democratic Party endorsement vote, he won 21-1.
- In a few years, three more seats on the SMCCD Board of Trustees will be available.
- We need trustees who have the interests of the people who work here at heart.
- Ben said that he is struck by how many other unions have much better relations with their own Boards of Trustees.
- We would like to hear from members about potential labor-friendly candidates for future elections and get members involved in recruiting candidates.
- Chet said he fully supports Jason Holt, and he explained one of the reasons to oppose Mike Guingona. Right now the District is funnelling $7-10 million per year out of fund 1 into capital projects. Mike Guingona has said that if the upcoming bond measure passes, and the District ends up with that additional source of funds for capital projects, he will still keep this funneling out of Fund 1 going.
- Ben: We're also going to start talking to the membership more broadly about paying voluntary COPE dues so that in a few years we can fund three campaigns.
- Althea said that in the past it was hard to follow what was going on with COPE. She would like to get clearer communication/ updates. Lee says he aims for good communication, and he agrees on the importance of clear updates.
- Rika said that many unions have a standing COPE item in their newsletters. We can communicate this suggestion with our editor. Also, the last three years we have had no campaigns at all. So that's part of the reason for the silence up until recently.
- Elinor noted that Lee has taken leadership in COPE recently, and he is doing a great job. She thanked Lee for improvements in communications about COPE.

Articles 6 and Appendix D, Article 7, 3:10-3:45 (Rika, Chet)

- Rika introduced herself as a negotiations team member and Past President of AFT 1493. She says she was personally heartbroken when the language we had worked on for these articles did not make it into the final version of the tentative agreement. She had worked closely with librarians and counselors. She wants to thank faculty for standing with the union. She understands that these items are as important as raises because they are about our dignity as workers. She acknowledges that the division between instructional and non-instructional faculty reflects different racial and gender representations. She feels strongly about the social justice dimension of what we failed to win in this round. She is glad to have a productive and transparent conversation. She hopes we can keep standing as one.

- Chet echoed Rika's comments.
- Chet noted that our EC this weekend received emails from two librarians about Article 6,

Appendix D, and Article 7. In response to these emails, we agendized the issues today.

- One of the issues was that language in bargaining reports from 2025 was not in the final version of the tentative agreement (TA). Our last bargaining report was dated 10/ 29/ 2025. Bargaining report number 22, part 2 includes this sentence: "When we returned from caucus, the District said they rejected all of our proposals, and we are at impasse on Article 6 / Appendix D." In other words, when we went to impasse, we had no agreement on those points. This means we never had key wins that some counselors and librarians believe, based on their reading of earlier bargaining reports, we had secured.
- Bargaining reports are a narrative description of ongoing fluid negotiations. Everything is conditional on reaching a tentative agreement on an entire article. So even when we made progress on part of an article, we never had an agreement unless we agreed on the whole article. What Chet is hearing is that we did not fight for our faculty who are impacted by the language of the articles in question. But part of the problem here is that the District declared an impasse in October 2025, and then during the 10 subsequent months, the process was confidential. Bargaining reports stopped because of confidentiality. The team fought for items relating to Article 6, Appendix D, and Article 7 all the way through the end of the process.
- We know now that we need to make it clearer in the bargaining reports what's a done deal and what remains fluid.
- Because of the perceived discrepancy between the bargaining report and the final TA, a faculty member alleged that the ratification vote was held in bad faith. In fact, we followed the same process we followed three years ago for the ratification of the previous contract. But last time we settled with the District earlier in the process. This time we had 9-10 months of not being able to communicate with faculty. So then faculty received a lot of information at once after the conclusion of the fact-finding process, ensuing negotiation, and signing of the TA. We did provide links directly to the TA prior to the vote. We also held contract forums–though we hear faculty who say the tone of those forums was hurtful. We will strive to do better in such forums.
- Rika said we have been having a series of discussions, since the signing of the TA, in order that we as an EC may improve processes and policies.
- Lorraine de Mello said she now understands that it was not the case that there was language in the TA that didn't end up in the final contract.
- Lia said she was happy with Rika's support. However, Lia also said she was not happy to have thanked the District for changes that, it turns out, we didn't actually get. She says there was a "complete communication breakdown." She would have appreciated receiving something like what Chet said today in his statement earlier. Librarians had been so excited to reimagine their duties.
- Roxana: This isn't about feelings; it's about facts. These are factually our working conditions.
- Maggie de Vera: Trying to be as solution-focused as possible, I'm wondering whether there is anything we can do to improve our situation right now?
- Chet: We can improve relationships. And we can work for additional wins in the negotiations for the 2028-31 contract.
- Lia: I still need to understand more about what happened between the impasse and the TA in this recent round of negotiations.
- Chet: The reason we can't explain how the TA was reached is that it was confidential. The insinuation that something improper happened is not true.
- Elinor: I want to say that I want to get to know the counseling and library faculty. I'm a relatively new addition to the EC. I want to help get rid of the noninstructional-

instructional divide.
- Rika: We can only move forward as a faculty as a whole. When we fail in one place, we fail the whole bargaining unit.
- Lia: I want to work with the counselors to try to change the conversation altogether.

*Hiring New Accountant, 3:45-3:55 (Steve)

- Steve: Our long-term accountants have retired. We have made many efforts to find a replacement. So far, we've had two people respond. One of them is an AFT-oriented accountant. He does national AFT's accounting, and he is based in Maryland. Another is a local accountant. The national person quoted $12,000. The local person quoted us $8,000-10,500. The current one charges about $7,000.
- Steve thinks our accounting is not hard. He recommends that we go with the local person. We could try this out for a year.
- The other option is to do the work ourselves, but Steve does not recommend this.
- The accountant would do our taxes and financial review.
- Motion (Teeka): Hire the local accountant that Steve recommends; we will also adjust our budget up from the current $7000 to the quoted $8-10.5 thousand. Luis, second. Motion passes by unanimous vote.

*Appointments, 3:55-4:00 (Ben)

- Rika nominates Ben for DPGC rep. Ben accepts. Motion approved by unanimous vote.

Negotiations Update, 4:00-4:10 (Monica and Luis)

PT Healthcare MOU (Monica)

- We have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on part-time faculty healthcare that is set to expire in December 2026. So we have to negotiate what comes next. We have to wrap up this negotiation by December. Monica said she has some ideas for what we should get in terms of improvements to the MOU. Monica would also like to get PT healthcare into the successive collective bargaining agreement (CBA) for 2028-31. Improvements we have in mind would not have a financial impact on the district.

Due Process for PT Faculty (Monica)

- Adjunct faculty are at-will employees. A new law allows unions to negotiate due process for termination. Monica is open to input from faculty. She thinks we can outline and negotiate a process based on language we have in the contract.

Lab Parity Study Group (Luis)

- Faculty have reported to Luis that they are sad that lab parity was not achieved in this round of negotiations. But they are optimistic for the future because of the relevant provisions in the new TA. We will get very specific guidelines for what information we can provide to the District. Many members of the faculty want to be involved. Luis is taking the lead on this matter. 200 or so faculty are affected. This is a big item that is going to get a lot of emphasis. We have a reopener for lab loads for Spring 2027.
- Camille asked that Luis arrange to meet with Chapter Chairs about lab parity.
- Rika said that it can be hard to understand lab parity as a concept. So we should do forums to help faculty understand.
- Luis says the President of Skyline wants to have a conversation with him on this topic.
- Camille: It's a good idea to collect load sheets from every division. Each Dean seems to do their own thing.
- Chet: One of the things the District negotiators said was that the previous study didn't include costs or specific recommendations.

Part-time faculty standing item and/or The Advocate, 4:10-4:15 (Camille)

- Geoff Balton introduced himself as PT Faculty Rep to the AFT EC from CSM.
- Dianne Jones introduced herself as PT Faculty Rep from Skyline.
- Camille introduced Jessica Silver-Sharp, PT Faculty Rep for Cañada.

CFT Formula-Funded Staff Application, 4:15-4:20 (Ben)

- This application was submitted by the deadline. This will let us continue to get money from CFT to fund Chet's position as Executive Director. Ben will send the document to everyone on the EC.

Comments by EC members on non-agenda items, 4:20-4:30

- Steve: I noted that the District sent out open enrollment information. We should inform members that the numbers in the District's tables are calculated as if we didn't have a new contract. So the numbers faculty will see for 2-party and family medical insurance are indexed to 88% of Kaiser plan cost. When the new contract takes effect, the District will be paying 92% of the Kaiser plan cost for 2-party and family plans. We could send information relating to how the calculations will change based on the new contract. Doniella asked Steve to do the math and Ben to do the writing.

*Action item.

Closed Session

The Closed Session item is for EC members only. All faculty are encouraged to attend and participate in AFT meetings up to the beginning of Closed Session.