

## NEGOTIATIONS UPDATE

# District sends misleading negotiations information to all faculty; AFT provides clarification

On Monday, October 17, Vice Chancellor Kathy Blackwood sent out an email to all faculty which suggested that the AFT had made false “claims” about the District’s contract proposal and then provided what she called “factual information” (apparently suggesting that the Union was providing *inaccurate* information.) In fact, a significant amount of the so-called “factual information” that Kathy presented in that email were *new* proposals and information that was *not* presented during negotiations. (The fact that the District was essentially presenting new proposals directly to the faculty rather than to AFT negotiators is a blatant unfair labor practice.) Since that email, along with other District actions, such as the proposals brought to the Associated Student Senates in support of more faculty evaluations (see box at right), seemed intended to sow more confusion and distrust than to really enlighten faculty, the AFT would like to provide a response to clarify some of the points presented in that message.

## Salary proposals

The first paragraph of Kathy’s message ends: “we just want to ensure that you have all of the facts about the District’s proposal.” The information in that e-mail certainly does not provide all of the facts about the District’s proposal; it doesn’t even give full information about the four topics that were discussed.

When Kathy states: “All faculty could receive an evenly distributed **4.02% salary increase**,” that is a totally new District proposal! Using the District’s last actual proposal before declaring impasse, it is impossible to get to a 4.02% salary increase for all faculty. Apparently, they are offering more money in order to get to 4.02%. Although more than the District previously offered, the 4.02% for total compensation is still lower than the 4.77% (applied entirely to salary) which we would have received under the old formula. Also, under the District’s new “total compensation” bargaining method, the 4.02% figure would be further reduced when increases for medical benefits are deducted. In our previous contract negotiations medical benefits, as well as any other monetary improvements, were negotiated sepa-

rately, but the District now wants to deduct those benefits from their total offer.

In 2015-2016, property tax revenue in San Mateo County increased by 7.64%, and faculty received a 4.78% salary increase (in addition to other benefits). The increase in property tax revenues in 2016-2017 was almost identical to the prior year’s: 7.62%. The District now wants to

*continued on page 2*

## Student Senates asked to support District’s proposal on evaluation of faculty

The AFT was surprised to learn that a resolution explicitly supporting the District’s contract proposal for increasing faculty evaluations has been circulated to the three colleges’ Associated Student Senates. The proposal calls for evaluations of faculty by students to be conducted in every class, plus “conducting classroom observations every three years and including observations from the Dean/Responsible Administrator and the other faculty members who serve on the Evaluation Committee.”

The resolution, which the Associate Chancellor and Chief Negotiator presented to the CSM Student Senate, and which he’s on the calendar to present to the Cañada Student Senate in early November, refers directly to a contract proposal which is part of Negotiations. The entire contract, including the District’s proposal on faculty evaluation procedures, which requires increased student evaluations, is currently in the legal process called Fact Finding.

Asking students to approve a resolution that refers directly to a District proposal that is part of negotiations is pitting the students against faculty on contractual issues that directly impact faculty working conditions.

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- 4 Faculty come out to support a fair contract
- 6 The “responsible employee” and Title IX
- 8 Cañada faculty & students support tenant rights
- 9 Prop. 58 ensures quality bilingual education
- 10 Retiree’s Voice: Susan Petit on life after CSM
- 11 College scholarships available to AFT members
- 12 CFT recommendations for state ballot measures

San Mateo Community College  
Federation of Teachers  
AFT Local 1493, AFL-CIO  
1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.  
San Mateo, CA 94402  
CSM Building 17, Room 131  
(650) 574-6491  
aft1493.org  
facebook.com/AFT1493

### Editor

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x4177

### Editorial Board

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x4177  
Dan Kaplan, x6491

### President

Monica Malamud, Cañada, x3442

### Co-Vice Presidents

Katharine Harer, Skyline, x6491  
Joaquin Rivera, Skyline, x4159

### Secretary

Teeka James, CSM, x6390

### Treasurer

Anne Stafford, CSM, x6348

### Chapter Chairs

Paul Naas, Cañada, x3330  
Michelle Kern, CSM, 650-558-2699  
Paul Rueckhaus, Skyline, x7186  
Rob Williams, Skyline, x4368

### Executive Committee Reps.

Salumeh Eslamieh, Cañada, x3227  
Doniella Maher, Cañada, x3513  
Sandi Raeber, CSM, x 6665  
Shaye Zahedi, CSM, x6240  
Nina Floro, Skyline, x4414  
Janice Sapigao, Skyline,  
sapigao@aft1493.org

### Part-Timer Reps.

Leighton Armitage, CSM, x 6373  
Meegan Rivera, Skyline, 7301x19406  
Jessica Silver-Sharp, Skyline, x4312

### Chief Negotiator

Joaquin Rivera, Skyline, x4159

### Executive Secretary

Dan Kaplan, x6491, kaplan@aft1493.org



## Negotiations Update

*continued from page 1*

keep a bigger cut of the increase in property tax revenue and pass on to faculty a much smaller portion of the new funds.

Kathy's message says "the AFT has proposed to allocate the \$3.6 million of new funding in a manner that would provide some faculty with an additional salary step resulting in a 6.21% increase for these faculty, whereas other faculty would receive a 3.21% salary increase." The AFT negotiating team has never been presented with a proposal that allows it to allocate anywhere close to 3.6 million of new funding. Since the District did not offer a 4.02% salary increase, the AFT certainly could not have allocated those figures when that amount was not offered in the first place.

The AFT has proposed a new salary step to be added to the top of both the full-time and part-time schedules. This has been proposed because our faculty at the top step rank lower compared to other districts than those at lower steps. (This can actually be seen in the salary comparisons included in the attachment in Kathy's email.) The 6.21% vs. 3.21% figures, however, also are new District numbers that do not come from actual negotiations.

## Salary rankings

Kathy writes that "the District's faculty are among the highest paid and rank first in overall compensation in the Bay 10", but the comparisons she refers to (in her attachment) do not give a full picture for a number of reasons. First, those comps do not include part-time faculty, who constitute roughly 2/3 of our faculty members.

Also, very importantly, now that we are a "basic aid" district, comparing ourselves with other Bay Ten districts is not necessarily the appropriate comparison group anymore. Within the Bay 10, only College of Marin and, just recently, San Jose/Evergreen and West Valley/Mission are "basic aid" districts. Revenues for "basic aid" districts are generally significantly higher than "revenue limit" districts. SMCCCD became a "basic aid" district in Spring 2012. From the 2011-12 academic year to the current 2016-17 academic year, our District's total projected revenue has increased over 53%, an average of over 10% per year! It is reasonable that a fair share of those revenue increases go to employee compensation. It is also reasonable to look at how our faculty salaries compare to other districts around the state. If we look at the data from the annual "Statewide Study

*continued on the next page*

## The Advocate

*The Advocate* provides a forum for faculty to express their views, opinions and analyses on topics and issues related to faculty rights and working conditions, as well as education theory and practice, and the impact of contemporary political and social issues on higher education.

Some entries are written and submitted individually, while others are collaborative efforts. All faculty are encouraged to contribute.

*The Advocate's* editorial staff, along with the entire AFT 1493 Executive Committee, works to ensure that statements of fact are accurate. We recognize, respect, and support the right of faculty to freely and openly share their views without the threat of censorship.

## AFT 1493 discourages full-timers from taking on excessive overload

The following resolution was passed at the April 13, 2011 AFT 1493 Executive Committee meeting:

Whereas economic instability and budget cuts are affecting the employment status and livelihoods of part-time faculty in the SMCCCD,

Be it resolved, that the AFT 1493 Executive Committee recommend that full-time faculty members **seriously consider refraining from taking on excessive overload in situations where part-time faculty will be displaced from courses to which they would have otherwise been assigned.**



*In 2015-16, property tax revenue in the county increased by 7.64%, and faculty received a 4.78% salary increase (in addition to other benefits.) The increase in property tax revenues in 2016-17 was almost identical to the prior year's: 7.62%. The District now wants to keep a bigger cut of the increase in revenue and pass on a much smaller share to faculty.*

*continued from previous page*

Comparisons" developed by the All Faculty Association of Santa Rosa Junior College, the 2016 "[Salary Study Summary](#)" which shows the ten top-ranked districts in the state, SMCCCD is *not* among those top-ranked districts.

## Proposal on evaluations

Moving to the District's faculty evaluation proposal, the AFT feels that it is inappropriate that after a 3-year process of revising the procedures led by a Performance Evaluation Task Force which included faculty and administration representatives, with extensive opportunities for input from faculty and administration, the District would now propose major changes to our evaluation procedures. While Kathy says that "The increased feedback will likely confirm what we already know: the District's students rate 80% of the faculty as 'excellent' or 'good,'" this new push from the District to increase the frequency of classroom evaluations as well as the number of evaluators will both require significantly more work from more faculty (and administrative) evaluators as well as being more disruptive of the teaching process. Additionally, research does not support the idea that student evaluations are the best (or even a good) measure of faculty performance. Finally, the District's proposal to carry out all student surveys online, in light of the dismal response rate and the existing problems with our current online system, is simply irresponsible.

## Flexible Flex

Kathy's reference to the District's proposal on flexible flex begins: "Flexible flex will be unchanged," but then, almost comically, after "with the exception of," goes on to explain how their proposal would change flexible flex to be significantly less flexible: "requiring faculty to seek prior approval for alternative activities in advance of a Flex Day" (which could be months before an activity that a faculty member wants to attend.) Kathy's next sentence begins, "In addition", which makes it sound like "all part-time faculty would be compensated at the 'special rate' for participation in Flex Day activities" is an improvement. The special rate would actually be a significantly lower rate than what part-time faculty currently get when flex days occur on days they

are already scheduled to work, which are the days part-time faculty are most likely to be available to attend. The AFT fully supports the idea of paying part-time faculty at the special rate if they are able to attend any additional flex activities outside of their regular scheduled days.

## Workload Equity

The fourth and final item that Kathy's message addresses is workload equity, asserting that "the District proposal calls for the formation of a committee with representatives from the AFT, Academic Senate and the administration to gather data from faculty and develop a comprehensive plan to address faculty workload issues." This proposal was not made during negotiations. All the District said was that they could not negotiate on this issue because they needed data. AFT said that the data existed, in the form of a survey conducted by AFT a few years ago, with very high faculty participation, plus all sorts of documentation which contains data on duties performed by faculty, such as committee memberships and minutes of meetings (including attendees) – for hiring committees, evaluation committees, a multitude of participatory governance committees-- program review documents, records of curriculum development, etc. The District negotiators responded that meeting attendance doesn't show if faculty members really participate in those meetings! The District never responded to the AFT's proposed language which attempts to provide an actual mechanism that addresses the inequities of faculty work beyond their primary duties, such as teaching for instructional faculty or counseling for counselors.

While the four main items that Kathy focused on are key issues, there are also many other unresolved issues as well.

## Next Step: Fact Finding

So where do we go from here? Our case has been referred to Fact Finding, which means that a public hearing will take place in which representatives from the District and the AFT will present their positions to a Fact Finding panel, including a representative from each side and a neutral chairperson. The chairperson will then make recommendations for a settlement to the District Board of Trustees. Because we do not have binding arbitration in our contract, the Trustees can choose to either follow the recommendations from Fact Finding or they can decide to implement the District negotiators' last best offer. While we currently do not know when the Fact Finding hearing will take place, it is most likely to be some time in December. We will inform faculty when we know the date of the hearing.

If you have any questions about negotiations issues, please contact either Joaquin Rivera, AFT 1493 Chief Negotiator, at [rivera@aft1493.org](mailto:rivera@aft1493.org) or Monica Malamud, AFT 1493 President and Negotiating Team Member, at: [malamud@aft1493.org](mailto:malamud@aft1493.org).

# Faculty comes out in force to demand a fair contract!

## Nearly 500 faculty sign workload equity petition, including 75% of all full-timers

By Katharine Harer, AFT 1493 Co-Vice President & Strategic Campaign Initiative (SCI) Organizer

Last May, 60 faculty members jammed a Board of Trustees meeting to stand behind their colleagues who made presentations on the need for Workload Equity. As of this October, the union had gathered, and submitted to the Board of Trustees, nearly 500 faculty signatures on a petition demanding that the District negotiate improvements in the language specifying faculty workload in Appendix D of the Contract. 500 signatures = 1/2 of faculty working in the District, and 75% of all full-time faculty signed.

**What did the District do?** They refused to negotiate any Workload Equity language - period. They said they needed more data, more evidence, to demonstrate that the burden of non-teaching duties has grown exponentially for full-time faculty.

**What now?** The negotiations process is moving into Fact Finding after the District declared Impasse and a mediator wasn't able to bring our two sides together. There's a reason for that: because the District's proposals are all "Take Backs", decreasing raises by calling for changes in the way faculty compensation had previously been calculated, limiting our ability to make our own flex day choices and changing faculty evaluation procedures. And Workload Equity? Off the table.

**What did the union do?** We invited faculty to come to open forums on October 18, 19 & 20 on all three campuses to learn more about the contract dispute and talk about what we can do – not what the union leaders can do, but what faculty acting together, united, can do. Below are reports from each of the campus meetings.

### CSM Forum Report

by Michelle Kern, CSM Chapter Chair

On Tuesday, October 18th, AFT held the first of the three campus forums at CSM in College Vista. The meeting quickly ran out of chairs and faculty leaned on walls and sat anywhere that they could.

Monica Malamud and Joaquin Rivera, from the AFT negotiation team, first took the opportunity to point out to faculty that only the union is the exclusive bargain-

ing representative for faculty and can provide complete and factual information. On that note, faculty were eager to hear the updates on the District's proposed take-backs.

The first proposal reduces our share of the formula by pushing costs usually absorbed by the District onto faculty into a package they call "total compensation," out of which any remaining money would then be available for a much smaller raise than the previous contract. The second proposal requires approval of flexible Flex activities and would pay part-timers who participate in Flex activities a lower rate than previously. The third proposal would do away with the three-year process that included the AFT, Senate and administration in the creation of a new evaluation procedure. Also discussed was the failure to seriously address the union's Workload Equity proposal that would attempt



CSM forum

to quantify the duties performed by faculty, and create a system to attempt a more equitable work/life balance.

Those present then had a lively discussion on the particulars of these proposals and what the response should be from faculty, given that these proposals were very unsatisfying and do not honor the work that faculty contribute to the District.

Faculty brainstormed on strategies to create a visible response in reaction to these items, in a brisk and energetic exchange of creative ideas. Several faculty signed up to help communicate with colleagues or various other tasks to help keep our academic family informed of how they can help in the process. If you would also like to be a part of our campaign for a fair contract, please email Michelle Kern, CSM's Chapter Chair: [kern@aft1493.org](mailto:kern@aft1493.org)

continued on the next page



## Skyline Forum Report

by Rob Williams and Paul Rueckhaus

It was 1:55 p.m. on Wednesday, October 19, and as Skyline Faculty began to trickle in to Room 2305 to learn about the



*Skyline forum*

latest bargaining updates from the AFT Negotiating Team the buzz was palpable. By 2:05 there were well over 50 faculty members in attendance, from a wide range of divisions: Automotive, Math, Language Arts, Dance, Athletics, Science, Counseling and more.

They were here to find out about the District's proposed take-backs, as detailed in the September issue of the Advocate. AFT Co-Vice President Katharine Harer welcomed faculty into the meeting, handing out AFT T-shirts and Count-Me-In Cards. Facilitating the meeting was Skyline Chapter Co-Chair Paul Rueckhaus, joined by his Co-Chair, Rob Williams, and Advocate Editor, Eric Brenner, and EC Co-Rep., Nina Floro. Vice President and Chief Negotiator, Joaquin Rivera, and AFT President and Negotiating Team Member, Monica Malamud, discussed the proposed take-backs: Raises reduced from 4.77% to 2%, Increase in the volume and frequency of evaluations, the elimination of flexible flex, and workload equity.

As Malamud and Rivera laid out the latest round of contract negotiations, including the news about Fact Finding, frustration and agitation was evident in the amount of hands raised with questions and comments. The bottom line is that our Union and the District did not reach an agreement during the last mediation session.

After the negotiation report Katharine Harer and Paul Rueckhaus asked the audience for input on what faculty can do to support the AFT to win a fair contract. These suggestions, which were written on posters, included: attending a Board of Trustees meeting, wearing our red AFT 1493 shirts in solidarity, pushing for more flex opportunities that relate to our particular field of interest, letter-writing, making our students aware/getting our students involved, and, if necessary, Work to Rule.

By the end of the meeting, the feeling of agitation in the room had morphed into one of solidarity and determination.

## Cañada Forum Report

by Doniella Maher and Jessica Silver-Sharp

Over thirty faculty members met at Cañada Vista on October 20th to discuss the state of current negotiations along with potential solidarity actions to show support for our negotiating team and reinforce their positions and responses to the latest District proposals.

Faculty overwhelmingly maintained their support for fair salary increases during this unprecedented period of rising property values, which make staying in the area exceedingly difficult. Monica Malamud explained misleading points made by Kathy Blackwood in a recent all faculty email, emphasizing that when looking at higher steps on the salary scale and at part-time salaries, the District does not rank at the top of the Bay Ten.

Monica also explained how the District's proposed changes to "flexible flex" benefits would actually eliminate flexibility by requiring faculty to seek their Dean's approval to attend outside professional development opportunities many months in advance. Faculty voiced strong support for maintaining "flexible flex" as it stands.

Faculty also voiced support for the current, recently adopted peer evaluation procedures.

Faculty had an opportunity to ask questions about their contract. Many requested information about the outcome of previous negotiations and Fact Finding efforts. The overriding question, "How bad is it?", became a call to action as it was revealed that District-Union relations are in fact quite strained.



*Cañada forum*

**Conclusion:** Around 120 faculty members participated in the open forums at the three colleges. They listened to members of the AFT Negotiating Team, asked questions and made comments. Numerous faculty reacted to the presentations with the conclusion: "The District's proposals are all take-backs!" At each forum, the group discussed specific actions they would be willing to take to help the union to win a fair contract. Faculty agreed that they need to act in order to show our District how strongly they feel about the issues under dispute. Many even suggested a Work to Rule action, which is unprecedented in our District.

# The “responsible employee” and Title IX: What is a faculty member really responsible for?

by Robert Bezemek, AFT 1493 Attorney

Recently several community college districts have attempted to subtly increase the workload of faculty by adding a new duty - indicating that academic employees should serve as a “responsible employee” under Title IX of a federal law, the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. Just what that means, and its implications, is important.

The current notion of a “Title IX responsible employee” stems from events in 2013-2014 around the issue of sexual violence on college campuses. It comes from the 2013 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, including the Campus

Sexual Violence Elimination Act, and actions by the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education, part of OCR’s initiative to curtail or remedy sexual harassment, misconduct or violence towards students. OCR came up with the term “responsible employee” to delineate academic employees who would receive complaints from students, and then report those complaints to the college. (The term is also found, without its current weight, in OCR’s January 2001 Revised Sexual Harassment Guidance).

## *Faculty were not specifically designated as “Title IX responsible employees”*

When OCR created this new requirement of the “responsible employee,” it did not specify exactly which faculty should be designated as a “Title IX responsible employee.” Faculty can become “responsible” for “reporting,” only if they fit within one of three categories - two of these, discussed below, rarely involve faculty. The one which might is this: faculty who have been expressly delegated those responsibilities. Since being given these additional responsibilities is a significant change in faculty working conditions, any effort to impose this “Title IX responsible employee” requirement must be negotiated.

OCR derives its authority to issue such “rules” governing complaints from the Department of Education’s authority over colleges which receive federal funds, either directly or indirectly through student tuition. But there is a huge gulf between what OCR has dictated, and what colleges are doing. You see, no rule or law decrees that all faculty should be “responsible employees,” though many colleges have felt dif-

ferently. Title IX, while increasingly referenced by colleges, is not always easy to understand, because it is mostly enforced by administrative actions of the Department of Education.

Title IX actually provides only this general command:

“... no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any edu-

cational program activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Title IX encompasses 10 key areas with respect to women’s educational opportunities including access to higher education, athletics, and sexual harassment.

This simple, general rule affords the Department of

Education, and hence OCR, considerable authority.

If an employee has been delegated the duty of serving as a responsible employee, then the employee must be alert to whether any student has complained about sexual harassment, misconduct or violence. This is because OCR expects that the “responsible employee”, upon realizing that the student is about to confide information about sexual violence, misconduct or discrimination, must tell the student to “STOP,” and then must promptly warn the student, before the student has told their story, that their “complaint” cannot be kept confidential by the “responsible employee,” and that the instructor will be reporting their complaint to the District or college’s Title IX “officer” regardless of whether the student wants it reported. How’s that for stopping a conversation?

Equally of concern is that if an employee receives a sex-based complaint from a student, and chooses not to report, the faculty member would potentially be subject to disciplinary action by the District, for violating a college rule. This is another reason why being so designated cannot be taken lightly. And would a college have an incentive to discipline such faculty? Yes. This is because OCR also has concluded that a college receives putative notice of such misconduct whenever a “responsible employee” knew, or in the exercise of “reasonable care” should have known, that harassment/violence/misconduct occurred. If a faculty employee chose not to report, or did not report because they concluded there had been no sexual misconduct, it’s entirely possible that the college has reason to put all the blame on the faculty employee who kept the matter quiet.

*continued on the next page*

**Faculty can become “responsible” for “reporting,” only if they are expressly delegated those responsibilities. Since being given these additional responsibilities is a change in faculty working conditions, any effort to impose this “Title IX responsible employee” requirement must be negotiated.**



*continued from the previous page*

## ***Why should faculty have an unconditional duty of reporting?***

Anyone who thinks it's no big deal to make all college employees into "responsible employees" should by now recognize the opposing viewpoint. But if the potential for disciplinary action weren't enough, it is not that easy to decide whether someone is about to, or has actually articulated, a complaint of sexual violence, misconduct or discrimination. This is a judgment that does not necessarily come easily for trained investigators. So why should faculty have this unconditional duty of reporting? After all, faculty generally have no authority to remedy such complaints; faculty cannot ordinarily undertake the investigation to decide if the complaint is valid. As for student expectations, a college can notify students in the college catalog or class schedule that certain designated individuals, not academic employees generally, are responsible for reporting sexual misconduct, etc. to college officials.

## ***Designation of faculty as "responsible employees" can harm student-faculty relationship***

By now it should be apparent that the designation of all faculty as "responsible employees" would seriously change, if not harm, the relationship between students, particularly adult students, and their instructors or other academicians. Which is why this topic has inspired considerable debate at colleges across the U.S.

## ***3 conditions define a "responsible employee"***

When OCR created this new requirement of the "responsible employee," the federal agency was not particularly clear on who constitutes the "Title IX responsible employee." OCR defined a "responsible employee" as satisfying any of three conditions:

1. An employee who has the authority to take action to redress incidents of sexual harassment / misconduct.
2. An employee who has been given the duty of reporting incidents of sexual harassment / misconduct or any other misconduct by students to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate designee.
3. An employee whom a student reasonably believes has this authority or duty. (See OCR "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence," issued April 29, 2014.)

As is evident, items 1 and 3 would not ordinarily include non-supervisory academic employees. Thus, faculty ordinarily can become "responsible" for "reporting" only if they are affirmatively delegated such responsibilities.

## ***Some employees must be designated as "responsible employees" but this process must be negotiated***

There is no doubt that colleges are obliged to treat student reports of sexual misconduct, discrimination or violence seriously. Owing to several notorious examples of sexual violence, harassment or misconduct at several universities around the country, and a growing recognition that this problem has not been fully addressed, the DOE, acting through its Office of Civil Rights, decreed that every college and university accepting federal funds must adopt a policy on sexual violence, and that this policy required some college employees to be considered "responsible employees."

OCR decided that colleges have to do something to make it simpler for victims of sexual violence to report and receive remedies for sexual misconduct. Thus, OCR concluded that colleges and universities are required to redress instances of sexual violence, harassment or misconduct, whenever it knows, or should have known, that sexual harassment, violence or misconduct occurred.

To address these issues, faculty need to be vigilant, and insist that any college effort to impose this "Title IX responsible employee" requirement will be negotiated.

# ***the Advocate***

*award-winning newsletter of AFT Local 1493*

*in our 40th year of proudly representing  
the interests of the faculty of the  
San Mateo County Community College District*



**NOVEMBER 2016**

***the Advocate***

## TENANTS' RIGHTS

# Cañada Faculty Fight for Tenant Protection Measure

By Kristen Parks, Cañada, Political Science

## Housing Crisis Affects Faculty and Students

What is the most important issue affecting your community? This is a question I have been asking my Political Science students for years. More and more often I am hearing that housing affordability is the answer. I also hear personal stories from my students—one who stopped attending class after getting evicted from his home; another who had to move in the middle of the semester after her landlord raised her rent by \$1,000.00 per month.

The lack of affordable housing in San Mateo County pushes faculty and staff farther away from their workplaces, resulting in long commutes. Our district took action by constructing below-market rate housing for faculty and staff at Cañada and CSM. These developments are hailed as an effective solution, but with just over 100 units and a waitlist nearly as long, they're really just a drop in the bucket.



Cañada College instructor Kristen Parks

## Measure R Protects Burlingame

Under current law in Burlingame and San Mateo, landlords can raise rents however much they want, whenever they want. I have experienced a 20% rent increase over the past few years. My neighbors are afraid to ask our landlord for repairs because they are afraid of additional rent increases or eviction. As a renter and an educator, I am deeply concerned by the growing displacement of our community members.

I support Measure R, a ballot initiative for rent stabilization and just cause eviction in Burlingame. Measure R establishes consumer protections for renters to prevent unlawful evictions and predatory rent increases. Under Measure R, the Burlingame City Council would appoint a city commission to review complaints and petitions brought by tenants or landlords. I am proud to volunteer for the Measure R campaign, along with some of my former students and fellow faculty members.

## Wealthy Special Interests Fight Back

The California Apartment Association (CAA) and the San Mateo County Association of Realtors have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in opposition to Measure R. They have produced television ads, yard signs, and deceitful mailers. Voters should follow the money--the CAA represents the interests of wealthy property owners, management corporations, developers, and real estate investors.

As union members and educators, our concern is for the human beings who are being displaced. We prioritize people over profits and I am proud that AFT 1493 has endorsed Measure R.

For more information, visit: [yesonburlingame.com](http://yesonburlingame.com)



SMCCCD students at Renters Day of Action on September 22  
(Photos by Stephanie Leonoudakis-Golder)





# Proposition 58 will reverse 18 years of bad policy

By the CFT English Language Learners Committee, including Committee Co-Chair, Monica Malamud, AFT 1493 President

In 1998, Proposition 227 essentially ended bilingual instruction in California schools. It forced English learners into one year of "sheltered English immersion," hindering their ability to learn academic English and achieve at grade level. Many continued in those classes or were then placed in regular classrooms to sink or swim. The CFT strongly opposed Proposition 227.

Additionally, Prop 227 required parents who want their child to continue in a bilingual setting to sign a waiver stating that their child already knows English, has special needs, or would learn English faster through an alternate instructional technique. As a punitive measure, Prop 227 allowed a parent to sue for enforcement of the measure's provisions, holding school board members, administrators, and teachers personally liable.

This annual waiver requirement placed a cumbersome administrative burden on schools. That burden, compounded with the potential threat of lawsuits, moved many districts to dismantle successful bilingual education programs. Nevertheless, California employers continue to seek workers who are fluent in more than one language.

Now, 18 years later, voters can reverse this ill-informed law. **Proposition 58** preserves the requirement that public schools ensure students become proficient in English, yet authorizes dual-language immersion programs for both native and non-native English speakers and allows families to select a language program that best suits their child.

Prop 227 replaced effective bilingual education programs with sheltered English immersion under the incorrect

assumption that developing a student's home language prevented the student from learning English, or that spending time acquiring two languages hinders progress in either one.

In fact, after only one year of English instruction, most students with limited English cannot be expected to develop the proficiency required to meet rigorous academic content standards in English. Furthermore, students taught and proficient in their first language are able to carry that proficiency to additional languages.

**Proposition 58** will require districts and county offices of education to provide programs that lead to both English proficiency and academic achievement at grade level. Programs may include:

- » **Dual-language immersion** with academic instruction for native English speakers and native speakers of other languages, with the goal of bilingual and biliterate students;
- » **Transitional or developmental**, that provide instruction in English and a student's native language to meet state standards;
- » **Structured English immersion** in which most instruction is provided in English but the curriculum is designed for students learning English.

The first steps to closing the achievement gap are providing English learners with effective instruction and appropriate English acquisition programs. Native English speaking students will also benefit from increased language-learning opportunities. And parents can be unhindered in choosing an effective program to provide their children a multilingual education to meet the demands of the 21st century.

## Vote Yes on Measure T in the Jefferson Elementary School District

To continue improving student achievement, the Jefferson Elementary School District Board of Education has placed a \$68 parcel tax on the November 8, 2016 ballot. The Jefferson Elementary School District (JESD) is one of the lowest funded elementary school districts in San Mateo County.

Funding from Measure T could be used to:

\*Attract, retain and train highly qualified teachers

\*Protect core academics in math, science, technology, reading and writing

\*Maintain dedicated reading instruction for struggling students

\*Expand hands-on science programs

\*Keep schools safe, clean and well maintained

\*Protect after-school and summer learning opportunities to keep students engaged in positive activities & on the right track



THE RETIREES' VOICE

# Susan Petit: "There is life after CSM"

by Susan Petit, professor emerita, CSM, English and French

*Susan Petit began teaching at CSM in 1968 and was active in the college, district, and state academic senates. When her late husband, John Gill, retired, he volunteered with the Friends of the Palo Alto Library and published on E. E. Cummings.*

It's hard for most people to imagine retirement when they're still working, but in time most of us will retire, and when we do we have to decide how to re-order our lives. When I retired in 2008 from teaching English and French, I decided to use abilities I already had and develop new ones, to exercise both mind and body, and to meet new people. Before I explain two of my somewhat unusual activities in those categories, I will say that I also volunteer as a stocker at an East Palo Alto community closet, work out at the local YMCA, continue to publish reviews of and articles about contemporary fiction (the novelist Marilynne Robinson is my current interest), and travel yearly to London to see plays. I may have ignored the good advice I got upon retiring not to commit myself to too many things.

Since retiring I have taken on a new kind of writing that connects me with the community: I produce program copy for the Pear Theatre in Mountain View. This innovative professional theater founded in 2002 and located near Shoreline Amphitheatre has just moved to a slightly larger but still intimate space where its dedicated leadership brings a vibrant theatrical experience to the Peninsula on a tiny budget. In each of the more than forty short essays I have written so far for the Pear programs I have tried to include useful information and thought-provoking ideas about the play and its author. These essays vary widely, as the Pear stages plays from a broad range of genres and periods. For example, its next production, Shaw's *Major Barbara*, will be followed by a romp about zombies and computer nerds written by a local playwright.

Because of this variety, to write my copy I have had to research playwrights including Shakespeare, Corneille, Chekhov, Maugham, O'Neill, and Williams as well as contemporary dramatists including Tom Stoppard, Lynneottage, Sam Shepard, Harold Pinter, Katori Hall, and Tracy Letts. Doing this research is like taking a short course in the playwright and the play. I like that, but the best payoff is seeing audience members reading what I've written. In contrast to the profound silence that follows publication in an academic journal, the rustling of program pages and a look around the auditorium tells me that I've found a readership.

Also, I believe that I'm contributing to the cultural life of my community, albeit in a small way. This kind of community service uses academic skills and provides me with brain exercise.

The new retirement activity I chose in order to develop new skills and get physical exercise is line dancing. This may conjure visions of people in boots and cowboy hats, but line dancing has evolved since the 1990s. You can see the current styles on Line Dance Dallas's YouTube videos, where

graceful young women—most of them seem to be Chinese and Chinese American—demonstrate a huge variety of dances. Each has its own unique sequence of steps, so dances have to be learned individually, and the styles include salsa, cha cha, waltz, Charleston, two-step, foxtrot, hip hop, hustle, tango, and polka. What an exercise of mind and body! And how good it feels to dance after working at a keyboard. Besides taking lessons, I go to local dances, where I have a new social experience that involves moving in synchrony with perhaps 40 or more other people. It may not be community service, but it is communal activity.

Retiring means, or should mean, finding activities that help oneself and others and, preferably, that bring one into some type of community. My mix does that well for me, and I wish the same for every retiree and future retiree. As a former colleague told me, "There is life after CSM."



*Susan Petit speaking against budget cuts at CSM in 2010*



*Susan Petit circa late 70's, early 80's  
(photo from the PHLIP project, CSM Library)*



# College scholarships available to AFT members' children

## CFT Raoul Teilhet Scholarship Program

The CFT offers scholarships to high school seniors and college students who are children or dependents of CFT members in good standing. Students enrolled in four-year courses of study are eligible for \$3000 scholarships; those enrolled in two-year courses of study are eligible for \$1000.

### About the program

The CFT Raoul Teilhet Scholarship Program began in 1997 when delegates to the CFT Convention voted to establish scholarships that could help children and dependents of members achieve their higher education goals. The program was named after inspirational CFT leader Raoul Teilhet, pictured above, circa 1972. Teilhet served the organization as president from 1968 to 1985. In 2003, Convention delegates extended eligibility to continuing college students and dependents of deceased CFT members.



Teilhet died in 2013; [you can read about Raoul Teilhet's life](#) and contributions to the union in his obituary. Since the program was established in 1997, [the CFT has helped hundreds of students](#) achieve their higher education goals by awarding them Raoul Teilhet Scholarships.

Scholarship eligibility

Award selection is based on academic achievement, special talents and skills, participation in extracurricular activities, community service, financial need, and a 500-word essay on a social issue of the applicant's choice.

Scholarships are awarded for any one year of higher education.

Students must be listed as a dependent on their parents' or guardians' tax return to be eligible for this scholarship.

Parents or guardians will be asked to have their local union president verify union membership.

Students who received scholarships as high school seniors are not eligible for another scholarship during college.

### How to complete and submit your application

Go to: [cft.org/member-services/scholarships/raoul-teilhet-scholarships.html](http://cft.org/member-services/scholarships/raoul-teilhet-scholarships.html)

The scholarship applications contain complete instructions for submission; please read them carefully. Note: The applications are fillable pdf documents. Please complete the applica-

## National scholarships for members and dependents

More scholarships and professional grants are available to members and their dependents through the AFT and the AFL-CIO.

### Robert G. Porter Scholarship Program

The AFT awards four \$8000 scholarships to high school seniors who are dependents of AFT members, as well as 20 continuing education grants of \$1000 to AFT members. Application deadline: March 31. To learn more, email [porter-scholars@aft.org](mailto:porter-scholars@aft.org) or go to the AFT Web site.

### Union Plus Scholarship Program

The AFL-CIO offers scholarships ranging from \$500 to \$4000 to union members, their spouses, and their dependents who are enrolled at an accredited institution of higher education. Scholarships are also available to graduate students. Application deadline: January 31. Learn more from the Union Plus website.



tion electronically. This will ensure that you are able to fill out, make changes, save, and print your completed application.

For more information, or to get a hard copy of an application mailed to you, please email Liz Soto ([esoto@cft.org](mailto:esoto@cft.org)), or phone our Costa Mesa Field Office at 714-754-6638.

Raoul Teilhet Scholarship deadlines:

- For High School Seniors  
Deadline to submit applications: January 10, 2017
- For Continuing College Students  
Deadline to submit applications: July 1, 2017



The measures with yellow backgrounds reflect our progressive positions on the trio of criminal reform measures on the ballot. On ballot measures not listed below, the CFT has no position.

- 53 NO Stop attack on local control**  
 Asks voters to approve certain state revenue bonds that exceed \$2 billion and requires a statewide vote even for some local infrastructure projects. Funded by a wealthy individual with an agenda.
- 54 NO Billionaire attack on legislative proceedings** Prohibits the Legislature from passing a bill not published online at least 72 hours before the vote. Sounds good, but funded by a billionaire with an agenda.
- 55 YES Maintain taxes on the wealthy to keep education funded**  
 Continues the current income tax rates Proposition 30 established for the wealthiest Californians — individuals earning \$250,000 or more and couples earning \$500,000 or more — and extends them for another 12 years. Generates up to \$8 billion annually and allows schools and colleges to restore programs lost during the Great Recession.
- 57 YES Parole for nonviolent felony convictions**  
 Authorizes parole consideration for people with non-violent convictions who complete the full sentence for their primary offense and provides incentives for rehabilitation.
- 58 YES Allow multilingual education in schools**  
 Allows the use of non-English languages for instruction in public schools by repealing most of Proposition 227. Preserves requirement that public schools ensure students become proficient in English, yet authorizes districts to establish dual-language programs for both native and non-native English speakers, and allows families to select the program that best suits their child. See article on page 9 for more information.
- 59 YES State resolve to overturn Citizens United**  
 Asks state officials to urge amendment to the U.S. Constitution in order to overturn the SCOTUS decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*.
- 62 YES Repeal the death penalty**  
 Repeals the death penalty and replaces it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole.
- 63 YES Background checks to purchase ammunition**  
 Requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition and prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines.
- 66 NO Expedites death penalty appeals, executions**  
 Changes state law to expedite death penalty appeals and executions, and houses death row inmates in non-death row prisons, requiring them to work and pay restitution.

# VOTE

## NOVEMBER 8

For a complete voter's guide from the California Federation of Teachers and local unions, go to:

[cft.yourvoter.guide](http://cft.yourvoter.guide)

**The Educators Choice**

for Nov. 8

cft.yourvoter.guide

See pages 8 and 9 for information on **Measures Q & R** (tenants' rights) in San Mateo & Burlingame and **Measure T**, parcel tax for the Jefferson Elementary School District

## AFT 1493 Calendar

**AFT 1493  
Executive Committee/  
General Membership  
Meetings:**

Wednesday, November 9,  
2:15 p.m.  
Skyline, Room 6-203

Wednesday, December 14,  
2:15 p.m.  
CSM, Building 10, Room 401  
(City View)