MINUTES OF NOV. 4, 2017 DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kofi Asare Adomako-Ayisi, Lois Aime, Michael Amouzou, Bill Army, Waynette Arnum, Bryan Bonina, Dave Bosco, Patty Burke, Cindy Casper, Maureen Chalmers, Sandra Couture, Ray Esponda, Amy Feest, Seth Freeman, Tom Jackson, Steve Krevisky, Kevin Lamkins, Nick Lefakis, Merja Lehtinen, Lorraine Li, Jon Morris, Liz Pisaretz, Bob Reutenauer, Minati Roychoudhuri, tony Scott, Kevin Skee, Warren Towler, Trent Wright, Steve Cohen, Kathleen Toedt, Ellen Benson, Kimberly Small.

Nota Bene: Amy Feest, Catherine Gregory. Sandra Vitali and Bill Army were online for this meeting.

STAFF: Ellen Benson, Kimberly Small, Dave Bosco and Bob Reutenauer.

1. 4Cs President B. Bonina called the meeting to order at about 10:15 AM.
2. B. Bonina welcomed the members present, and introductions took place.
3. Discussion of Oct. 2017 DA minutes: R.Edge's name is missing from the members present portion. Staff and online participants should be separated in the attendance count. E. Pisaretz moved, and R. Esponda seconded a motion to approve the minutes, as seen by the delegates. S. Cohen then pointed out that various items were missing from the minutes, which need to be included. Discussion ensued regarding should the minutes be simplified, even though the detail is good? It was pointed out that Robert's Rules need to be followed, and there was a need for transparency and continuity, especially for members not present. It was also mentioned that K. Toedt's items needed to be listed as well. Also, people were concerned that the minutes should not be edited, prior to the delegates seeing them, as such editing seems inappropriate. It was then raised by B. Bonina that items were left out, regarding being too controversial or possibly subject to liability issues. For a while, the meeting got out of control, and order then had to be restored. Issues of respect were then raised. It was again queried regarding why was controversial language removed? Objections were raised to why this removal occurred.

Minutes are for the entire body to review. Also, does UAW language supersede our contract? Also, it was pointed out that removal of language gives the appearance of censorship. People then spoke to the matter that the union is divided, when there is a need for unity. Discussion occurred regarding how and why the minutes were edited. It was then raised that what happened needs to be recorded, and why pit one contract against another, as the issues won't go away. Another comment referred to only reporting action items and announcements, as opposed to interpretation. There were objections posed to claiming there were interpretations, with the claim that the issues raised were factual, and related to the Janus case. At this point, order had to be restored again. M. Lehtinen called the question, seconded by L. Li, and this passed. The vote then took place on the original motion, with a call for division of the house. This included the notion that only delegates should vote. Part of the point was that people should not vote on minutes that we all haven't seen. The resulting vote was 9 in favor, 9 opposed. Questions were then raised, regarding is there a quorum, a request to put back the missing items, and a question of who are the delegates? B. Bonina then ruled that the edited minutes were accepted.

4. President's report: A) B. Bonina stated that the sick bank process will be implemented on March 31, 2018. Each member contributes 3 sick days towards this bank, with a committee overseeing this process. The committee consists of both bargaining unit members, and management. Fee payers still get sick days, but this does not apply to part-timers.

   B) Next, concern was raised that regarding the promotion process, there would be 4 union members and 2 management personnel on the Promotions Committee. It was then pointed out by S. Cohen that this was not agreed to when he was at the table. It was then raised regarding what else was kept from us? Then the question came up that why wasn't the promotion process brought to the DA? It was then stated by B. Bonina that this was an oversight. People were unhappy with this, and people are affected by this, and this could have affected the vote on the contract. Also, how will people speak up with Deans in the room? This was not presented to us, or to the legislature. It was stated by B. Bonina that this issue will be revisited, but others felt that this was a big oversight. Can this be done if it is not approved in the contract? People want to get rid of this. It will evidently be brought back to the BOR. Discussion then ensued over would people go against management, with the concern that management could take over the committee. Some people didn't see this as a big problem, with the need to educate members about the rules for promotion and tenure. The committee composition would also apply to tenure and sabbatical. It was then brought up that the DA didn't approve this, and discussion was needed. If this is not in writing, then it doesn't exist. A comment was then made that a mistake was made, since it didn't come to the DA, and it was not what we voted on. Concerns were raised regarding going up against management. M. Chalmers then moved, and N. Lefakis seconded a motion that the DA ask B. Bonina to go to the BOR, due to this error; we don't agree to keep this language, due to this error, as it isn't in the language of the contract. This passed unanimously, therefore, the current language on promotion should apply. It was then said that if it didn't go to the legislature, then it isn't in the contract. Leave the contract language alone. It was then raised that at QVCC, this matter would only be for promotions. But this seems to be a big problem at CCC. It was then raised as to is there an MOU on this, and there isn't one. We need bigger committees to advocate for our members. Members were reminded of the timeline for applying for promotion.

C) Professional Development: The funds have been increased. Discussion occurred about why don't part-timers get more, though dollars can be moved from FT to PT. People were reminded that they should apply for these dollars.

D) Students First: The CCC chapter asked for this to be on the agenda. CCC members feel that the consolidation proposal is ridiculous, with possible loss of autonomy and mission. It was claimed that shared governance is in that proposal. But the CCC Senate is against this proposal, and the 4Cs should oppose it, if the DA agrees. There was a suggestion that there be a 4Cs statement, focused on contractual issues, and threats to membership. There needs to be an audience for this, and have multi-pronged statements from various groups, in opposition to the proposal. Any extra resources should be at the student level, not the management level. We need to preserve jobs, and have statements put together, especially from the CCGA. Also, people won't be happy about having to teach at another campus, which is a union issue. We should have agreed to fight. There is a perception that this proposal is management first, not students first. The loss of governance concerns people as well. We need well thought out statements, not crafted hastily. It was then posed that consolidation of us, could lead to our extinction, while the bosses save themselves. The 4Cs President should say no to this, as it is a done deal unless we fight it. The question of who defines students first was posed, as our definition differs from OJ. More discussion ensued over the need to fight back against what seems to be more corporatization, and the previously mentioned movement of faculty and staff could undermine job security. Others saw this as people being pitted against each other, while the administration gets more money. It was also stated that we are outmaneuvered over marketing, and faculty and staff have been removed from decision making which is bad for students and the community. CCP issues are also important, with concerns about loss of their jobs.

E) At this point, 4Cs Secretary S. Krevisky had to leave, so S. Cohen took over, re continuing the minutes.

Minutes respectfully submitted by 4C's Secretary Steve Krevisky

Delegate Assembly November 4, 2017 Minutes-Continued

Secretary Steve K departed at 12:15 pm and Steve C. continued taking minutes.

<u>Students First (continued):</u>

Sandy Vitale, TxCC Financial Aid Director on the Financial Aid work group of Students First, noted that the main ideas were dealt with by the BOR before the group was formed, including apparently, the lining up of potential vendors.

This FY will see a $13 million budget cut, and next FY will bring a $27 million budget cut out of an existing CC budget of approximately $161 million.

A Draft 4Cs General Framework Statement was presented by B. Bonina. It was viewed as needing a strong, clear *anti-Students First* focus and additional support. Given the BOR has made its decision, the audience must be legislators, students, and local businesses, so these groups can understand the issues clearly. CBIA may even be an ally here, given the CC train students locally for jobs. The possibility of hiring a PR professional for an *anti-Students First* campaign was raised, but no specific action was taken. B. Bonina will discuss a PR plan for legislators with other bargaining units impacted by *Students First.*

M. Chalmers offered some bullet points for a revised 4Cs Statement, and a follow-up **MOTION** was made by S. Freeman that the 4Cs draft a statement in opposition to *Students First.* This **PASSED** unanimously. A small committee was formed to work on this statement: E. Benson, Coordinating, plus M. Chalmers, C. Casper, and P. Burke.

The idea of polling 4Cs members re: *Students First* was raised, but no action was taken.

The Tuesday *Students First* staff forum was noted. Questions can be submitted, but Ojakian will not face a large crowd; he will be in a small room. The second *Students First* forum will be held Wednesday for students.

The December 15 BOR meeting is when *Students First* is scheduled for approval, so perhaps we should help students to rally there that day? Perhaps there should be a protest on each campus, simultaneously? It was noted faculty, in their classrooms, need to discuss *Students First.* The 1980's Capital/Tunxis/Asnuntuck merger was noted, particularly its eventual undoing due to <u>higher</u> management costs.

<u>SEBAC Long-term Plan:</u>

A $450,000 2018 election plan is proposed, with the 4Cs share equaling $10,000. The plan will consist of message development (via polling and focus groups), communication (materials and targeted, online advertising), and direct voter contact (field work, robo calls, and direct mailings).

A **MOTION** to approve the 4Cs $10,000 share was made by C. Casper and **PASSED** unanimously

<u>Janus *v.* AFSCME:</u>

B Reutenauer. Update: 500 4Cs "recommits" have occurred, membership is up from 76% to 81%, and last Friday, a meeting was held to help members discuss the benefits of union membership with other members

<u>Membership Committee:</u>

L. Pisaretz update: 62 responses to a recent poll were received regarding a Membership Conference and a membership survey will follow.

<u>Part-timers Committee:</u>

P. Burke was elected chair and the committee is working to develop its annual program.

<u>Finance:</u>

N. Lefakis sent the meeting announcement late and to incorrect email addresses. S. Cohen pointed out committee meetings are to be noted on the 4Cs calendar so members can attend.

Next Meeting:

Saturday, December 9 at 10 am for business, followed at 11 am by the Holiday Party downstairs.

L. Pisaretz **MOVED** adjournment at 1:10 and this **PASSED** unanimously.