

# FACULTY MATTERS



FACULTY  
ASSOCIATION  
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS  
LOCAL 6157

## CFT Begins Emergency Response to the Governor's Education Plans

by **Mark Newton**

President, Faculty Association, AFT 6157

**"I can't remember a time where we have faced so many assaults on so many fronts, and all at the same time."**

These were the (not so) welcoming words from California Federation of Teachers (CFT) president, **Mary Bergan**, to approximately 130 people (a combination of classified staff, K-12 teachers, community college faculty, and CFT staff) on Saturday February 5<sup>th</sup> in

Oakland's Clarion Hotel. That day, Executive Director Barbara Hanfling and I spent about six hours at an emergency Special State Council listening to a dire report about a mounting (and unbelievably serious) assault on education.

—Continued on page 8

## Faculty Action Needed to Repeal Social Security Offsets

The California Retired Teachers Association (CRTA) has designated this coming March 17 as the date for a national mass email campaign to repeal the Federal Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP/GPO). This provision basically cuts social security for faculty members who are participating in the STRS program. As a first step to build support for repeal, CRTA, in conjunction with the 14 other states affected

by the WEP/GPO, is participating in a mass e-mail campaign to urge local Congressional representatives to become co-sponsors of H.R. 147 and work for its passage. CRTA will publicize March 17 and provide instructions on how to participate in CONTACT, on the CRTA website ([www.calrta.org](http://www.calrta.org)), through its e-mail lists and local division newsletters. Please plan to participate on March 17

## Negotiations: Adjunct Faculty Issues

by **Jesse Votaw**

SJCC Adjunct Faculty Member, Real Estate Department  
AFT 6157 Negotiations Team

Last year was a pivotal year for adjunct faculty. Contract provisions, which will beneficially affect part-timers for many years to come, were won at the bargaining table. Your negotiations team and its adjunct faculty representative at the time, Sarita Tamayo, put their hearts and souls into the hard won fight

over defining parity for part-timers as 100% as well as Seniority Rehire Preference Rights (SRP).

Sarita's departure left an opening for an adjunct faculty representative on the negotiations team that I have been given the

—Continued on page 7

## A LOOK INSIDE

**CFT Begins Emergency Response to the Governor's Education Plans**  
PAGE 1

**Faculty Action Needed to Repeal Social Security Offsets**  
PAGE 1

**Negotiations: Adjunct Faculty Issues**  
PAGE 1

**Know Your Rights! What Happens When a Class is Cancelled?**  
PAGE 2

**Governor's Radical Retirement Plan**  
PAGE 3

**Adjunct Faculty Voices**  
PAGE 4

**Leveling the Playing Field for Writing Courses**  
PAGE 5

**Tenure Granted**  
PAGE 5

**Contradiction in the Contract Initial Step Placement for New Faculty**  
PAGE 6

**Personal Note Sad News**  
PAGE 7

SPRING TWO

[www.fa-aft6157.org](http://www.fa-aft6157.org)

213 Student Center  
San José City College

1-205 Acacia  
Evergreen Valley College

(408) 288-3106  
fax (408) 295-7482

2100 Moorpark Avenue  
San José, CA 95128

**EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS**

**PRESIDENT** Mark Newton x3989  
**VICE-PRESIDENT** David Yancey x6605  
**FISCAL OFFICER** Linda Ferrell x3231

**EVC REPRESENTATIVES**

**FULL-TIME** Frank Espinoza x6581  
**FULL-TIME** Teck Ky x6877  
**ADJUNCT** Jeffrey Kirkbride x2019

**SJCC REPRESENTATIVES**

**FULL-TIME** Bob Wing x3945  
**FULL-TIME** Mai Le Ho x3863  
**ADJUNCT** Nabeel Atique x3779

**EX-OFFICIO**

**GRIEVANCE** Patrick Butler x3943  
**NEGOTIATIONS** Marc Sola x6617  
**NEGOTIATIONS** Deborah DeLaRosa x6606  
**NEGOTIATIONS** Jesse Votaw 298-2700 x304

**COUNCIL OF DIVISION REPRESENTATIVES**

**SAN JOSÉ CITY COLLEGE**

**COUNSELING**  
 Zee Gibson x3749

**MATH AND SCIENCE**  
 John Song x3997

**HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
 Ciaran McGowan x3891  
 Jesus Covarrubias x3885

**APPLIED SCIENCE**  
 Pat Space x3782  
 Bob Reininger x3939

**BUSINESS/SERVICE CAREERS**  
 Clem Lundie x3985

**LANGUAGE ARTS**  
 Ron Levesque x3870  
 Dan Haley x3779  
 Virginia Scales x3870

**INSTRUCTIONAL TECH/LEARNING RESOURCES AND ATHLETICS/PE** - no reps at this time

**EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE**

**BUSINESS, APPLIED TECHNOLOGY**  
 Mark Gonzalez x6506

**COUNSELING**  
 Elaine Ortiz-Kristich x6680  
 Rick Wagner x6632

**LANGUAGE ARTS**  
 Phuong Barhoumi x6672  
 Maggie Fieler x6697

**TECHNOLOGY/INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES**  
 Carol Bristow x6510

**MATH/SCIENCE**  
 Lenny Wolff x6674  
 Bill Lakatos x6578

**NURSING**  
 Rozanne Lopez x6604

**SOCIAL SCIENCE/PE**  
 Minerva Duke x6663  
 Paul Fong x6579

# Know Your Rights!

## What Happens When a Class is Cancelled?



by **Barbara Hanfling**  
 Executive Director, Faculty Association, AFT 6157

We just went through probably one of the toughest periods of very careful class monitoring at SJCC and EVC and how and when classes should be canceled. Monitoring is not always a bad thing, but when it is automatic without input from the faculty members who know their students, it will have a detrimental impact on our growth. In December, the SJCC Academic Senate passed a motion to stem the tide from canceling classes weeks before the semester began. We know our students and understand that many of them wait until the first day to register, show up etc.

I heard a very telling story from a faculty member who said he informed his dean that a certain class should not be canceled 3 weeks before the semester because it only had 6 students. On the first day of classes 26 students showed up for the cancelled class with an enrollment maximum of 30 students. As a result, we lost all the FTES for that class.

**It is Not Necessary to Overload Classes With Extra Students.** It is clear that we want efficiency in the classes we offer. We also understand that there will be times when we need to offer classes without reaching the campus' goal of 20 students or 80% of class size (e.g. 2<sup>nd</sup> semester requirements for a transfer, English Literature classes, vocational follow up classes etc.). However, it is NOT NECESSARY ever to overload—add extra student into your class from the temporary

agreed upon class size—in order to make up for classes that go with fewer enrollments. The FA, AFT 6157 has heard that deans are telling their faculty that if they are going to offer some classes below the class maximum, then faculty need to overload their other classes. This is not acceptable.

The FA, AFT 6157 and the District are currently bargaining class size. The District clearly wants to increase class size and the FA, AFT 6157 wants to keep faculty recommended class size in order to provide the most positive learning and teaching environment for our students. However, bargaining class size remains an arduous process because we are having difficulty both discovering and then ultimately agreeing on the current class size. If faculty overload their classes, then that will be the “next agreed upon class size” as the District will say: *“Well the class has gone with 50 students for the last 3 years, so the faculty recommended class size of 40 is obviously too low.”*

**Article 12.8 and 12.9** are the two most important articles in the contract that deal with class cancellation-how and when it can happen and what are full time faculty members rights if a class cancelled. Keep in mind the new magic number 20 is not something that has been bargained with the FA, and the contract may override that number for class cancellation.

—Continued on page 6

### FACULTY ASSOCIATION, AFT 6157, EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS — SPRING 2005

Date	Time	Location
Friday, Feb 11	10:00-12:30pm	SC Community Rm, SJCC
Friday, Feb 25	9:30-12:30pm	Gullo, Conference Rm, EVC
Friday, Mar 11	9:30-12:30pm	SC 104, SJCC
(Council of Division Reps)	1:00-3:00pm	SC 104, SJCC
Friday & Saturday, Mar 18-19	(CFT Convention)	Manhattan Beach Marriott
Friday, Apr 1	9:30-12:30pm	Sequoia Rm 219, EVC
Friday, April 15	9:30-12:30pm	SC Community Rm, SJCC
Friday, April 29	9:30-12:30pm	Sequoia Rm 219, EVC
Friday, May 13	9:30-12:30pm	SC Community Rm, SJCC
Friday, May 27	9:30-12:30pm	Sequoia Rm 219, EVC

# The Governor's Radical Retirement Plan

by Mark Newton

President, Faculty Association, AFT 6157

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger recently told the editors of the *Sacramento Bee*, "We don't want to feed the monster... We want to want to feed the private sector and starve the public sector." Towards this end, Schwarzenegger wants to address California's budgetary woes, in part, by reducing the retirement benefits for all state employees including teachers and professors. It is important to recognize that **the Governor's plan is far more radical than President Bush's plan** for social security – more radical than any other state plan in the United States. Only the most right-winged ideologues and the Libertarian Kato Institute had previously promoted this plan. Now, it is staring us right in the face, and its consequences would be severe.

**Current retirement plans.** Currently, retirement plans come in two forms: 1) defined benefit plans, and 2) defined contribution plans. Your 403B account and most of the adjunct faculty members' retirement plans are examples of the latter, where pre-tax dollars or district contributions are invested in stocks and bonds. Theoretically, your management of these investments will reward you with great returns; however, these assets are at risk if you retire during a financial down cycle, and some individuals pay exorbitant management fees that diminish these accounts.

The former plan (defined benefit) is the much more secure traditional pension plan, which pays you a portion of your highest three years of income. In the California State Teachers Retirement System (CalSTRS) you might earn 2.0 to 2.3 percent (depending on age) per year you taught (e.g.  $2.3 \times 25 \text{ years} = 57.5$  percent of your high income); there is also a provision to help prevent inflation from eroding all of your purchasing power. It makes sense, I think, to have your retirement nest egg in both of these baskets along with some cash and the appreciated value of your family home.

**The Schwarzenegger plan.** The Governor's plan is simple if he gets his way. Starting on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 all new state employees will lose the chance to participate in a defined benefit plan, and will be enrolled in a defined contribution plan. Employees already in the defined benefit plan could choose to transfer their funds to the defined contribution account. The state's obligation of two percent of the pay would be shifted to the school district, which could then bargain that the employee must absorb this cost as well.

At first glance you might think that this plan is just paralleling President Bush's efforts to modify social security. If social security is altered as the President wishes, at least two-thirds of the contribution will stay in the defined benefit program as guaranteed payments to the recipients. (In other states with retirement reform, employees are given an option as to which program they prefer; the vast majority of employees stay in the defined benefits plans because it is more secure.) Without guaranteed benefits, retirees will receive less retirement income and have a more challenging time planning their rate of spending. What is worse, there will be no safety net, and individuals could outlive their retirement assets.

Will these changes help the state get out of the budget mess it has been in since the stock market went south? Unfortunately, it appears the answer is no. The Governor's proposal will cost more money for the next 17 years; a CalSTRS consultant put a \$5.9 billion price tag on the first 10 years of the new program.

**Reaction to the plan.** The California Public Employee Retirement System (CalPERS) issued a statement in late January opposing the defined contribution plan. They called it risky, more costly, and potentially crippling to the state's economy because CalPERS invests almost \$20 billion dollars in this state. Our CalSTRS board considered the viability of the proposed retirement plan in late January/early February. A nonpartisan analyst warned the Board that these changes could



Glenn Ferguson  
www.aboutfaceentertainers.com

spell ruin for the pension plan. Without new teachers paying into the system it appears that there will not be enough money to pay for the retired teachers.

On February 3<sup>rd</sup>, the STRS board then voted to oppose the Schwarzenegger plan by a margin of 10-2. Trustee Carolyn Widener said, "This is a nightmare. This would turn (retirement) planning on its head and into a joke." The CalSTRS website posts this reaction from Board Chair Gary Lynes, "This proposal has serious implications for the future stability of our retirement system and our members' benefits. The state has supported its teachers' retirement benefits since 1913. Now is not the time to stop." On February 10<sup>th</sup> the Governor fired four individuals that he had nominated to the STRS Board because they did not vote to support his privatization of the retirement plan.

**How will Teachers be affected?** Here is the kicker! Teachers will be affected more than any other state worker. Typically, faculty do not pay into social security, and therefore new faculty will have no defined benefit plan. Even if you do pay social security (or have paid), there is federal law that severely discounts your social security benefit because you are a member of PERS or STRS, (see article *Faculty Action Needed to Repeal Social Security Offsets* - page 1).

—Continued on page 8

# Adjunct Faculty Voices



**Faculty Matters** is very interested in having a column in our newsletter that deals with adjunct faculty concerns. This column has two letters to **Faculty Matters** that were received by the FA, AFT 6157. Although we prefer signed letters, we will publish unsigned letters that are sent to us via email. We want positive, negative and neutral feedback on what it feels like to be an adjunct in these difficult times.

## To Faculty Matters:

In these times of need, low enrollment and class cancellations, it is insensitive on the part of any educational establishment to let part-time instructors solely take the brunt of the difficult financial situation our colleges go through.

Besides the fact that the whole system that discriminates against part-timers is exceedingly unfair, things can be done to alleviate, at least partially, the injustice done to this category of second-class citizens on our campus. The simplest, most effective, and fairest solution would entail the following: for each spring and fall semester full-timers would be offered a full load and part-timers with SRP two classes (40% load). The rest of available classes would remain unstaffed until one week (or ten -14 days) before the beginning of a semester. These unstaffed classes would then be distributed to both full-timers and part-timers as overload or 60% teaching load according to seniority, going down the list and then starting again at the top.

In this way any suspicion of discrimination or favoritism would be eliminated as well as the unfair and confusing "bumping" system that allows at present full-timers to bump part-timers and other full-timers but doesn't allow part-timers to bump anybody. The tutoring hours at Labs would be allotted to the faculty in need (due mostly to class cancellation). The remaining classes—if such still exist—would go to part-timers without SRP, again according to their time of serving SJCC as instructors.

**Respectfully,  
Concerned part-time instructors**

**Dear Faculty Matters,**

My boyfriend was recently hit by a car right in front of our own house. One hour and \$4,000 later, he was released from Good Samaritan having suffered a concussion. While I remained sympathetic, I couldn't help but think, "Whew! Better him than me."

I don't have health insurance. This incident has materialized the "anything can happen" that lives in the back of my mind as I drive my rounds between college campuses 6 days a week, and it has refreshed my anger at the system. After 7 years of college, thousands of dollars invested, and 7 more years gaining professional experience toward my passion for helping people, I am finding that a full-time job is near impossible for me and many, many others who have chosen this path. Oh, but wait! I *do* work full-time! In fact, I work *more* than full-time—just not at one campus.

This is beyond outrageous. It is the equivalent of being hired on at Hewlett Packard and being told, "We'll give you 40 hours a week, but we're gonna go ahead and spread those hours out over 3 or 4 locations so we don't have to pay you benefits, ok? Oh, and by the way, you will not be given an office or a computer. You'll have to use the trunk of your car to haul your work around in." And when one responded meekly, "But, but...I'm an educated professional with years of experience," she would be told, "Yes, well, there are hundreds of you, so do want this job or not?" This would not fly for one millisecond. Why on earth should it be happening in our community colleges?

We who teach a load of 100% or more, regardless of the total number of campuses this involves, deserve to be given full health care coverage. It is a blow, both professionally and personally, to feel so dispensable and downright used, like a farm animal.

How dare they expect us to scrape up an extra \$200 a month for an insurance plan, most of which have enormous deductibles anyway? This is absurd, and I repeat, would not fly *anywhere* else. What's going on? Please help us.

**Sincerely,  
Amanda Morgan  
ESL/ English/ Reading Instructor  
SJCC, Mission, West Valley, Foothill**

**Mortgages Tailored  
for Union Members**  
800/981-3798



Monday-Friday, 8:30 a.m.-7 p.m. (EST)  
Se habla español  
[www.aftplus.org](http://www.aftplus.org)  
Equal Housing Lender

**aft** A Union of Professionals  
**AFT PLUS**  
The Benefits of Belonging

3/05

# Leveling the Playing Field for Writing Courses

by William Silver  
English Instructor, EVC



English instructors in our district have a heavier teaching load than their counterparts at other community colleges—on average one writing class more each semester. This inequity occurs because of a practice called differential loading, which typically adds 5% to the teaching load of each writing class. Foothill, DeAnza, West Valley, Mission, San Mateo, Canada, Skyline, Cabrillo, Chabot, Las Positas, Contra Costa, and CCSF are among the colleges with differential loading. SJECCD is one of the few districts in the area that has not adopted the practice, hence the heavier teaching load.

To succeed in writing courses, students must write a lot, up to 8,000 words each semester, or 32 double-spaced typed pages per student.

In fact, the amount of writing is mandated by articulation agreements with the University of California. Writing a lot is important, but not enough, according to several decades of empirical research on successful writing instruction. Writing teachers must give students frequent individual feedback on their writing if students are to improve their skills. And, of course, giving that feedback to students takes time.

A typical writing instructor in our district teaches four writing classes and 130 writing students each semester (80% of his/her assignment). That adds up to lot of time reading essays—2,000 to 4,000 typed pages each semester—in addition to other class preparation. When instructors also read rough

drafts or revised versions of students' essays, that adds even more grading time. Any writing program that wants to succeed has got to include opportunities for students to revise their work.

English teachers at universities like SJSU usually teach no more than one or two writing courses each term because literature courses are a large part of the overall instructional program. By contrast, our district's two English programs place a major emphasis on writing instruction. In order to level the playing field for our faculty and our students, the FA has made the differential teaching load of writing courses an objective in contract negotiations.

## Tenure Granted Congratulations to the Following Faculty Members

The following 26 faculty members have been granted tenure, a landmark in their progress as faculty members, after having completed a rigorous and intensive tenure review process. Their names have appeared on the February Board of Trustees Agenda with an effective date of tenure at the end of this academic year. This is quite an accomplishment for these faculty members, so be sure to congratulate them when you see them. The reason the number is so large is because 2001 was the year that the District needed to use Partnership for Excellence money to create new positions. The following faculty have passed their mark and received tenure.

**Sravani Banarjee-EVC, English**  
**Elizabeth Bianchino-EVC, Counseling**  
**Valerie Bolaris-EVC, Reading**  
**Leticia Clark-EVC, ESL**  
**Celia Cruz-Johnson-SJCC, English, ESL**  
**Cheryl Ferris-EVC, Health Services**  
**Chris Frazier-SJCC, Math**  
**Mari Elena Gressel-EVC, Counseling**  
**Mai Le Ho-SJCC, Asian-Amer Studies**  
**Bob Knight-EVC, Math**  
**Elaine Kristich-EVC, Counseling**  
**Lyun Lazik-SJCC, Chemistry**  
**Gary Ledesma-SJCC, Counseling**  
**Rich Longacre-EVC, ESL**

**Eric Narveson-EVC, History**  
**E Nancy Pawlyshun-SJCC, Journalism**  
**Patricia Perkins-EVC, Counseling**  
**Leslie Rice -SJCC, ESL, English**  
**Soledad Santos-EVC, BIS**  
**Tina Shaner-EVC, CIT, Business**  
**Anuradha Soman (Ann)-SJCC, CIT**  
**Ken Tarquinio-EVC, CIT**  
**Janice Toyoshima-EVC, Biology**  
**Angela Tran-SJCC, Math**  
**Jose Valentin-EVC, Chemistry**  
**Scott Wilson-EVC, English**

—Continued from page 2 (What Happens When a Class is Cancelled)



**When Can a Class Be Cancelled without the Consent of the Faculty Member**

1. Within thirty days before class starts if the enrollment is less than 60% of the class maximum, but a class with 30 students maximum cannot be cancelled if it hasn't reach 20 students.
2. During the first two weeks of instruction if enrollment is less than 80% of class maximum.

Classes **may not** be cancelled after the second week of instruction without the consent of the faculty member. If these conditions exist, then the College may cancel the class.

**Full Time Faculty Members Rights**

If a class is cancelled and it brings a faculty member's load to under 100%, the faculty member has a number of rights.

1. First if there is cumulative load on the books, it shall be used to increase the working load of the faculty member.

2. If there is still a negative load, (under 100%) then the faculty member, with agreement with his/her dean has the right to the following:

- a. Fill a class with no faculty assigned.
- b. Bump an adjunct faculty member
- c. Bump a full time faculty member with overload
- d. Agree to an under load for that semester and work on a plan to make it up in the next semester.
- e. Use an FSA in another area (assuming the faculty members have one outside their original FSA) and exercise bumping rights. However this option only applies if there are no available classes in the faculty members' original FSA.

3. Please keep in mind that the resolution of the under-load is by mutual agreement: the faculty member and the Dean must agree. The Dean cannot make the assignment without the approval of the faculty member whose class has been canceled. And of course, vice versa, the faculty member cannot make a unilateral decision without the agreement of the Dean.

**Adjunct Faculty Members Rights:** The criteria for class cancellation are the same for adjunct and full time faculty. A class cannot be canceled after the second week without the adjunct faculty member's permission.

The hardest issue in the case of adjunct faculty members arises when an adjunct's class is canceled or a full time faculty member's classes are canceled and an adjunct gets bumped from a class. Generally after full time faculty members take their classes, the Dean will fill all the available sections with adjunct instructors. This means, there are rarely any classes left unstaffed at the beginning of the semester. Therefore losing a class often means a less than 40% load and in some cases, no load at all.

Adjunct faculty members have no rights to bump. Seniority rehire preference (SRP) is available for original assignment to classes. However, once adjunct faculty with SRP have been assigned their loads, if they lose a class, there is no right to bump. SRP gives adjuncts the right to at least 40% in original assignment, but does not allow adjuncts to bump other adjuncts when their class is canceled or they are bumped from a class. For some interesting ideas, please read the letter on this issue in our adjunct column.

Adjunct faculty should let their dean know that they would like to be assigned more than a 40% load, as we would like to see our adjunct make an almost living wage which is impossible with only 40% (especially since adjunct are paid only around 65% per hour of full time faculty). Therefore faculty with SRP are guaranteed a 40% load, but we hope that where available they will receive a greater load. That could be used as a buffer in case a full time faculty member bumps the adjunct faculty, or one of the adjunct's classes is canceled.

The FA, AFT 6157 is always open to suggestions and ideas on how to be sure all faculty are better protected when classes are being cancelled as they were this semester. Please feel free to write a letter to **Faculty Matters** with any of your ideas.

**Interpretation of the Contract  
Initial Step Placement for New Faculty**

A newly hired faculty member has brought a contradiction in the language of our contract in Article 8, Full-time Faculty Salary, to the attention of the FA, AFT 6157. Article 8.5 discussed original step placement for new faculty as follows:

**8.5.2 Minimum Step Placement:** Step 4 will be the highest step placement for newly appointed faculty members...

**8.5.3 Full-time Education Service Experience:** For step placement, year-for-year credit will be allowed on the basis of one (1) increment of verified experience...not to exceed a total of nine (9) years.

Article 8.5.3 could easily be interpreted to mean that new faculty could begin at Step 9, which is not the current agreement nor the practice between the District and the Union. Please ensure that newly hired faculty members are aware that 8.5.2 reflects the current practice between the District and the Union.

—Continued from page 1 (Adjunct Faculty Issues)

honor to fill. Before I address this year’s specific adjunct faculty bargaining issues, please allow me to be candid about a few preconceived notions I had prior to becoming involved with the faculty association and the reality observed.

Initially I perceived an inherent conflict between the interests of part-timers and full-timers. Natural or not, I believed that the different faculty constituencies would have a tendency to lean towards bettering their own lot. Now that I have witnessed the dynamics at the bargaining table, I can tell you that my notions were unfounded and far from reality. The full-time faculty negotiating team members, Mark Newton (FA President), Debbie DeLaRosa, Marc Sola, and the Executive Director of the FA, Barbara Hanfling (chief negotiator and spokesperson) tirelessly champion adjunct faculty rights. Indeed they are the advance guard advocating on behalf of all faculty while playing offense and defense simultaneously.

The current year’s opening proposal from the FA to the District includes the following adjunct faculty issues that would add to or modify pertinent sections in Article 9.

1. Salary schedule increase effective July 1, 2004
2. Part-time equity money on the salary schedule
3. Seniority Rehire Preference – change to the following:
  - a. Granted if worked 33% or higher load
  - b. Covering 3 semesters over a 3 year period, not consecutive
4. “Part-Timers Bill of Rights” in the contract

The first item above, part of the broader economic proposal-discussed in the last issue of **Faculty Matters**-will no doubt be addressed further as negotiations continue to unfold.



The fiscal year 2004-2005 marks the fourth year that part-time equity money has been provided by the State of California as a special funding allocation. As a bonus each year, the district has paid these funds out to faculty who are paid per the adjunct salary schedule. Now that parity has been defined as 100%, we are currently negotiating language that will add the part-time equity money to the salary schedule (rather than as a bonus), subject to the continued funding by the state.

**Seniority Rehire Rights** has been added as section 9.12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. It currently provides that adjunct faculty who teach a 40% or more load for three consecutive semesters with positive performance evaluations will have seniority rehire preference rights over less senior adjunct faculty within their division and respective Faculty Service Area (FSA). While this is an important achievement, it inadvertently left out long-time faculty who teach a five-unit course with a corresponding 33.3% load. Since adjunct faculty are prohibited from teaching more than a 60% load and two 33.3% loaded classes would exceed this limit, these faculty members are effectively precluded from ever obtaining SRP. In addition, if the faculty member teaches a course that is only offered once a year, the instructor again is precluded from obtaining SRP due to the three consecutive semester requirement. Our proposal, currently being negotiated, will lower the SRP threshold to 33% and for classes that are only taught once a year, change the three consecutive semester requirement to three classes over a three-year period.

The final adjunct issue, “**The Part-Timers Bill of Rights**,” is actually now contained in section 87482.8 of the Education Code. It was signed into law as one of the last acts of former Governor Gray Davis before he left office in 2003. Our proposal is simple: add the language of Education Code Section 87482.8 to our Collective Bargaining Agreement. One would think that since the Part-Timers Bill of Rights is already part of the state Education Code, adding the same language to our contract would be a no-brainer. Surprisingly, it has proven to be a contentious issue as the district is unwilling to recognize rights of adjunct faculty where it involves the possible expenditure of resources. Adjunct faculty have long been an under-compensated but much utilized resource for the attainment of the district’s goals. Does it make sense to recognize adjunct faculty, as a valuable resource to the district, by providing comparable resources available to full-time faculty? The State of California agrees; why can’t we?

Sitting at the bargaining table can be at times frustrating, to put it mildly, when faced with an unyielding adversarial position. (I’m sure that is true for both sides of the table.) Nonetheless, we have reached tentative agreement on some issues, are close on some more, and we still have a distance to go on others. Regardless of the various positions each side of the table may take, I suspect that somewhere a common thread exists that ties our positions together in a way that benefits the two colleges and faculty alike.

From this process, I personally have gained an immense respect for the hard work and dedication of the Faculty Association, AFT 6157, and especially my fellow negotiations team members, on behalf of all faculty members.

## Personal Notes

### Sad News

Robert Goudy, an art instructor who retired from San Jose City College in 1987, passed away on December 22, 2004 at the age of 80.

—Continued from page 1 (CFT Emergency Response)

The outline of topics covered in this meeting will give you a fairly clear picture of what Mary was saying, and what challenges education now faces. Remember, I can't make this stuff up.

- 1) The Governor's proposed state budget;
- 2) The Governor's broken promise to restore Proposition 98 funding;
- 3) The Governor's proposal that the state no longer contribute to STRS;
- 4) The Governor's plan to replace new state employee's defined benefit retirement plan with a defined contribution plan (similar to our 403B plan) starting in 2007;
- 5) The Governor's desire for a spending cap that will empower him to mandate across the board funding cuts (mid-year cuts in schools – raising havoc) if the state budget is out of balance by \$ 250 million (about ¼ of one percent of the budget);
- 6) The Governor's repeal of limits on school and college district's ability to contract for work done outside of the bargaining units (move work away from unions);
- 7) The Governor's insistence that teachers compete for merit raises;
- 8) The Governor's belief that eliminating tenure or making it a ten-year process will fix education;
- 9) The Governor's campaign to prevent public employees from making certain political contributions; and finally,
- 10) The Governor's attempt to redistrict the state early ala the state of Texas.

Because the Democratically controlled Legislature has not warmed to many of Governor Schwarzenegger's proposals, he has already declared that he will bypass the lawmakers using the initiative process. About this effort, the *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 12<sup>th</sup>) quotes the Governor as saying,

**“The unions and the special interests will fight us, but...we're going right there where all the evil is. This fight is going to be a great battle”.**

Evil?! My goodness, teachers are bad people for wanting to be able to retire in California. I wistfully remember last year when Schwarzenegger was going to be a champion for education, and how grateful he was for his community college experience.

CFT has joined with several other groups to form the California Education Coalition. This group is currently working on a strategy to respond many of the items listed above and the Governor's pledge to raise \$40 to 50 million. Things are getting very serious folks. You will be hearing a lot about this topic, and your voice must be heard both in the community and in Sacramento.

—Continued from page 3 (Governor's Radical Retirement Plan)

This retirement plan change will not just affect new members. Nobody knows precisely how current teachers and retirees will be affected. Conventional wisdom suggests that districts will have less money and that retirement benefits for those in the defined benefit plans will be reduced. It appears that the fund should stay stable for a while, but the longer you are from retirement the more you will be damaged. Total privatization of the fund means that new payments to the fund will dwindle as individuals retire. At the point where our youngest faculty want to retire, the STRS account would have little capital and no new money being paid into the fund. Presumably, the solution to this problem will have to be reduction in benefits or a bail out by the California taxpayers.

**The fight begins.** Everyone understands that California has serious financial problems that need to be fixed. I understand that many of you probably voted for Mr. Schwarzenegger, given the choice we had. I did not vote for him, but I never imagined he would join forces with a group that deems a decent retirement plan to be an unaffordable luxury. The Governor is dead wrong on his so-called retirement reform. His plan is not a solution that will immediately slash state spending. He does not seem to care that he is imperiling the retirement of a huge number of citizens, and perhaps leading them to poverty when they are elderly. He does not seem to mind the damage he would be doing to education by reducing the total compensation package to teachers.

Governor Schwarzenegger's planned revision of the various state employee retirement plans is not going to pass the state legislature, and he has already declared that he will bypass the Democratically controlled legislature using the initiative process. The Governor and his cronies have declared that this is going to be a national battle and he has pledged to bring in \$40-50 million to push his initiatives through the voters. He has brought a fight over retirement benefits right to the doorsteps of teachers and all state employees. We cannot just walk away from this fight; we have to win this one.

FACULTY MATTERS  
PRODUCTION TEAM

Lead Writer Barbara Hanfling  
Editor Sterling Warner  
Layout/Editor Christopher Mathenia

Content Contributions and Guidance from  
the FA, AFT 6157 Executive Board  
and Faculty Members