

The Advocate

FACULTY GROUPS PUSH FOR \$50 MILLION FOR PART TIMER EQUITY; BOG REFUSES TO SUPPORT EQUITY PROPOSALS

The Board of Governors (BOG) of the California Community Colleges met in November and had a discussion of the proposed budget that will fund the Community Colleges in California for fiscal year 2000-2001. This discussion of budget priorities for the community college system was contentious, with faculty representatives unable to convince management groups to make any changes in their proposed system budget. The faculty present at the BOG meeting argued forcefully that if equity for part-time faculty in the community colleges was to be achieved only from the funds that districts now have in their current budgets, that achieving any real progress in treating part-time faculty fairly would be next to impossible.

Write Letters to Support \$50 Million for Part Timer Equity. See Page 9 for Details

Faculty present at the BOG meeting argued that substantial additional funding must come from the State and be explicitly identified in the system budget as money that was to be used exclusively for improving the salary and working conditions of part-time faculty. To this end, the California Federation of Teachers (CFT), the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), and the California Part-Time Faculty Association (CPFA) are asking the Governor to include a \$50 million line item in his January State budget to fund part-timer equity in the California

continued on page 8

An Interview with the Measure A Campaign's Advisor

Why the District Bond Measure Lost

On November 2, Measure A was narrowly defeated when it failed to receive a yes vote from two-thirds of those voting in San Mateo County. Measure A would have provided the San Mateo County Community College District with \$148 million in bonds to improve their facilities. Measure A lost by around 850 votes (around 1% of the vote) in an election that saw around 80,000 people voting. About 65.25 % of the voters said yes, while 34.75% said no.

In the same election that saw Measure A narrowly defeated, the three incumbents on the Board of Trustees, all strong supporters of Measure A (and all endorsed by AFT Local 1493's Committee on Political Education chapter) were re-elected to serve another term in office. Karen Schwarz received 41,752 votes, or 22.51 percent. Patricia Miljanich received 37,335 votes, or 20.13 percent. And Tom Constantino received 36,789 votes, or 19.84 percent.

Citizens for Higher Education, the campaign committee that sponsored Measure A, worked closely with political consultant Ed McGovern, a principal in the firm of Public Affairs Associates. The Advocate recently interviewed Mr. McGovern in an attempt to understand why the bond measure was defeated.

Advocate: What is your analysis of why the Bond campaign failed?

McGovern: Failure is a relative term, it's hard to say we failed when we got more than 65% of the vote, but nevertheless, that's our system currently.

First, the campaign did poorly where there were other bond measures on the ballot. In the City of San Mateo, the Library received 72% and the College Bond measure only received 65%. On the Coast, the bond got 58% in the same area as the Cabrillo School District bond, which got only 56%. When the difference is only 850 votes, every little bit hurt.

Second, there is still probably some left over voter angst in the San Mateo Union High School District from their two failed bonds. In every city in that district, the College Bond did not receive the 2/3rds vote necessary - San Mateo, Foster City, Millbrae, Burlingame, Hillsborough and San Bruno. And, our Measure A had the support of many of the leaders who opposed the High School District bond.

continued on page 7

IN THIS ISSUE

District's Electronic Surveillance Plan Opposed. . .	page 2
Part Timers Are Professionals Too	page 4
Reflections on Online Education Conference	pgs. 4-6
Write Letters to Governor for Part Timer Equity . . .	page 9
College Reports from Skyline & Cañada	page 10

San Mateo Community College
Federation of Teachers
AFT Local 1493, AFL-CIO

Editor:

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x 4177

Editorial Board:

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x 4177
Dan Kaplan, AFT Office, x6491

Co-Presidents

Katharine Harer, Skyline, x4412
Joaquin Rivera, Skyline, x4159

Vice President

Bess Chandler, Skyline, x4286

Secretary

George Goth, Skyline, x4390

Treasurer

Allen Wolfe, CSM, x6491

Chapter Chairs

Bess Chandler, Skyline, x4286
Sondra Saterfield, Cañada, x3288
John Searle, CSM, x6607

Executive Committee Reps.

Rick Hough, Skyline, x4193
Mo Macdonald, Skyline, x4128
Anne Nicholls, Cañada, x3293
Karen Olesen, Cañada, x3415
Shaye Zahedi, CSM, x6240

Part-timers Reps.

Kathleen Feinblum, Sky, 6889x9367
Carol Hansen, CSM, x6677x9267
Ann Longknife, CSM, x6677x9273
Patricia Palmer, Sky, x6889x9418

Chief Grievance Officer

John Kirk, CSM, x6386

Part Time Faculty Coordinator

Kathleen Feinblum, Sky, 6889x9367

Executive Secretary

Dan Kaplan, AFT Office, x6491

AFT

College of San Mateo
1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.
San Mateo, CA 94402
(650) 574-6491

AFT & Senate Oppose Administration's Plans for Electronic Surveillance

by Katharine Harer &
Joaquin Rivera,
AFT 1493 Co-Presidents

Many of us in attendance at the November 1st District Governing Council meeting were disturbed by a draft of a

district policy on "Use of Communications Systems" that was circulated for our approval. The policy contains

photo by Jeanne Angier

Katharine Harer

vague references to rules and regulations that are not readily available to faculty, but even more dangerous, directly undermines our academic freedom and right to privacy in its policy on "random monitoring" of faculty electronic communications. It was decided to hold off on approval or revision until more discussion could take place.

The AFT has consulted with our lawyers and received a preliminary response to the district's policy draft. The district's stated right to random monitoring is, in fact, a direct violation of academic freedom and privacy rights. These policies should come under the purview of contract negotiations. If implemented, they could lead to an unfair labor practice. We've sent a memo to the district recommending that the policy draft be taken off the agenda of the next Governing Council meeting and be referred to the bargaining table.

CSM Academic Senate Calls for Revision of District Plans

Furthermore, Kate Motoyama, Academic Senate President at CSM has drafted a concept paper, "Proposal to Revise

Policy on Use of District Communications System: An Academic Senate Perspective", which was unanimously approved on November 23rd by CSM's Academic Senate. This proposed

revision states emphatically that the principles of academic freedom uphold the privacy

Joaquin Rivera

of electronic mail users and that no routine inspection, monitoring or disclosures of electronic mail should take place without the user's consent. It also recommends that "the AFT be consulted to ensure contract language that creates and implements due process that deals with confidentiality and the effects of technology on privacy."

Other Colleges Dealing with Same Issues

At least two other Bay Area community colleges are struggling with similar policies, San Jose City College and Santa Rosa Junior College, where faculty computers were actually "broken into". One of the most obvious questions that this policy brings to mind is: what's the difference between traditional paper-based mail and e-mail or voice mail? Why is our privacy respected in the first area and not in electronic communications? Needless to say, we'll continue to block this new policy and to work with our local Academic Senates to create a fair and respectful policy for all faculty and staff. No electronic surveillance!

In Unity.

photo by Jeanne Angier

Part-Timers and Professionalism Do Mix

by Kathleen de Azevedo Feinblum,
AFT Part Time Faculty Coordinator

Last semester, an ex-student of mine wanted to make sure I was indeed teaching the next level of English class as

listed on the class schedule. She told me I was an exception to most part-timers who in general were "not good

Kathleen de Azevedo Feinblum

teachers." She came to this conclusion because a friend of hers had taken a class with poor results, a class that happened to be taught by a part-timer.

In truth, one has as much chance of running into a poor class taught by a part-timer as by a full-timer. But when students sense that part-timers are being treated as second class teachers by their own district, all it takes is one bad experience to color students' perceptions. Faulty inductive reasoning, yes, but still there is a perception that part-times are not as good or as conscientious as full-timers. Unfair administrative policies and general apathy toward part-timers contributes to this pervasive attitude.

For all the talk of high standards in teaching, there is very little done to maintain these high standards. No one likes to be evaluated, but it is an essential process in not only the growth of a teacher, but in making students aware that their school cares about the quality of instruction. The official SMCCCD evaluation procedures states that a part-timer be evaluated once every 6 semesters. This is three years of teaching behind closed doors, three years of not being able to procure student comments, even positive ones, except for the few

sweet notes some give at the end of the semester. And if that lucky day comes, after 3 years, when a part-timer does get evaluated, one can only pray for a good semester of prime time classes full of sturdy students, and not a semester of "oddball hour" classes which tend to attract the late enrollees and the bewildered.

The repercussions are enormous. Those of us who are applying for full-time jobs, or even jobs for other part-time pools, find it hard to get letters of recommendation. Our student evaluations are old, as if we've fled the country for a couple of years. Students can go through community college without ever evaluating a teacher. The argument is that full-timers, who usually do the evaluations, are overextended. True, they are overextended with a lot of administrative duties, many of which seem to take precedence over the most important work done in the classroom.

The appearance of the word "staff" in the course schedule puts off a lot of students as well as teachers. I have seen improvement in getting class assignments early and having our names appear in the catalog. I also realize that "staff" is needed in some cases where there is no one assigned to the class. But when students see "staff" they see a non-entity. "Staff" has a vacuous connotation, somewhat like an unmarked grave. Students who want to take a class taught by their favorite part-timer are often not able to do so, thus, robbing the instructor of feeling like a "real teacher."

The very nature of part-time work does not allow us to be visible when it comes to professional development. Often, though courses are available to us, our schedules make it impossible to attend. Or, many of us do educate ourselves on the run, but who sees us? Who sees our shelves of books when many part-timers don't even have dependable office space? Who knows if we are studying the

Spanish Renaissance in our spare time?

Professional respect is a must. We need to come across professional in order to convince the powers-that-be that we deserve equal pay for equal work. Part-timers are fully able to reach high standards, but we must have the opportunity to prove our capability. In the latest CPFA Pro-News (that appeared in your mailboxes recently) Chris Storer, chairperson of the California Part-time Faculty Association (CPFA) claims that our "fundamentally immoral" two-tiered system undermines the "high philosophical goals of teaching," and the camaraderie and unity among all the teachers. What students see, is an uncaring system where the majority of their instructors seem to spend more time on the road than they do on their classes. This, in turn, reflects not just on the professionalism of the teachers, but on the integrity of the whole system.

Mark Your Calendars: State Part-Timer Leader to Speak at Flex Day

We are going to have a special flex day activity on Jan. 18 at 9 am at CSM in Room 18- 187. Chris Storer, CPFA chairperson, will be addressing professionalism in all its gritty detail. I will be putting flyers in your mailbox before the holiday rush. Clip the flyer and hang it on a wall of your overcrowded apartments! I haven't had a good turn out at our past flex day sessions. We're pushing harder with this one, hoping we can get some response. Otherwise, it will be harder to get other guest speakers in the future.

Kathleen de Azevedo Feinblum
(650) 358-6889x9367
azevedo@pacific.cnchost.com

**PART TIMERS ELIGIBLE FOR
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS
- SEE PAGE 9 -**

Reflections on the Conference on Online Education

by Dan Kaplan,
AFT 1493 Executive Secretary

I want to offer a personal commentary on two related themes that I heard articulated frequently at the CSM Conference on Online Education: 1) the decision to employ and then accelerate the use of online education in California Community Colleges has not been faculty-driven, that the origins of this public policy comes from somewhere else; and 2) that in the implementation of this shift in educational/pedagogical policy, administrators have often used various forms of coercion, especially in relation to part-time faculty who have no security of employment.

There was a certain sentiment that I heard often expressed at the Conference—even by faculty who articulated different points of view on the various issues being discussed—that the impetus to use online education did not come from the ranks of

the faculty. What are the driving forces promoting learning at a distance? No one at the Conference—certainly none of the featured plenary speakers—offered an analysis that expressed disagreement with the hypothesis that David Noble presented at the Conference, and has written about extensively. That is, that extremely powerful corporations (including software and hardware corporations, but

not limited to just these) have targeted American higher education as a potentially huge new market that they want to expand into. This is not to say that no one at the Conference disagreed with Noble's analysis. But it is to say that those who disagreed with his argument

the curriculum of higher education (before there has really been any serious discussion among most faculty in the State about the value of these technologies, while the serious research is very inconclusive and question-begging) because they want to improve the quality

of higher education? Or is it because the very reason for a corporation to exist is to achieve profit maximization. As Henry Ford said, he was not in the business of making cars. He was in the business of making money. He made cars simply as a means to this end. It is not very difficult to extend the analogy to online education and the many corporations that support its rapid expansion immediately. As David Noble said at the Conference, corporations have already transformed healthcare in

Wide Range of Faculty Attended Conference

The **Conference on Online Education**, held at CSM on October 9, was truly a California Community College state-wide event. The Conference was sponsored by AFT Local 1493 and the Community College Council of the California Federation of Teachers. Faculty attending the Conference came from the California/Oregon border all the way down to just before Mexico begins. There were faculty from **52 of the 71 community college districts in the state.**

In addition to the geographical diversity of the faculty in attendance, there were a **large variety of different disciplines** represented at the Conference. The following disciplines were represented: English Departments (33 faculty in attendance), Business (15 faculty), Math (12), Counseling (8), Computer Information Systems (8), Library (6), Chemistry (6), Nursing (5), Political Science (4), History (4), ESL (4), Philosophy (3), Biology (3), Humanities (3), Music (3), and Multimedia (3). There were also many other disciplines that were represented by 1 faculty member each.

Part-time or adjunct faculty played an

active role in the Conference. In terms of paid registrations to the Conference, **22% of the faculty in attendance came from the ranks of the part-time faculty.** This was a most impressive representation of part-time faculty in the California Community College system.

The **Conference website** is being continued as a place where faculty can continue the discussion of the many issues related to online education in California community colleges. To this end, we now have set up a discussion board where you can post a comment or read a review of the Conference. You can also now listen to the audio of the presentations of the featured plenary speakers, as well as the remarks of other Conference speakers, including the report-back summaries of the discussions that took place in the breakout sessions. To participate in this continuing dialogue, please visit the Conference website at: <http://www.smccd.cc.ca.us/smccd/faculty/confer>. A videotape of the Conference plenary sessions may also be borrowed from AFT Local 1493. Call the AFT office at 650-574-6491 for more information. -D. K.

failed to present an alternative analysis, or to even engage Noble in a discussion of their differences.

Do Corporations Want to Improve Education or Increase Profits?

Why do these corporations want to do this? Do they want their new educational technologies to be rapidly integrated into

this country with the rise of HMO's. Now they are trying to achieve similar results in higher education with the creation of what Wall Street is calling EMO's—Educational Maintenance Organizations!

It is important to consider what is motivating the rapid increase of online

continued on the next page

VIEWPOINT: Who's Pushing Online Education and How Does It Effect Faculty?

continued from the previous page

education throughout higher education. If faculty were not the driving force in advocating for this—the people who actually do the teaching and who should therefore be centrally responsible for changes in pedagogy—isn't there something wrong with this picture? In fact, how could such a situation come about? How could a major change in what constitutes higher education be introduced into the curriculum without the faculty in control of the process?

If the drive toward online education is not faculty-initiated, then precisely where did this public policy come from? How public policy is developed in the United States has been the subject of much original research by U.C. Santa Cruz Professor of Psychology and Sociology, G. William Domhoff. This research employs the class dominance paradigm, a particular theoretical approach to studying how wealth and power are structured and operate in American society. Domhoff describes how public policy is developed through the efforts of “(1) a small social upper class (2) rooted in the ownership and control of a corporate community that (3) is integrated with a policy-planning network and (4) has great political power in both political parties and dominates the federal government in Washington.”

Policy Planning and Power Elite

I believe that Domhoff's approach best explains how public policy is made. Without in any way wanting to play down the importance of the other three component parts of Domhoff's research paradigm, let me focus on the role played by the policy-planning network in the construction of public policy. This network consists, as Domhoff writes, “of (1) foundations, (2) think tanks, (3) specialized research institutes at major universities, and (4) general policy discussion groups, where members of the upper class and corporate community meet with experts from the think tanks and research institutes, journalists, and

government officials to discuss policy, ideology, and plans (PIP) concerning the major issues facing the country.” Domhoff argues that “the policy-planning network is, in fact, the programmatic political party for the upper class and the

Trustees Praise AFT 1493 on Conference

Board President Karen Schwarz complimented AFT 1493 on the Online Education Conference in the letter below. -ed.

October 27, 1999

Joaquin Rivera
Katharine Harer
Dan Kaplan

Dear Colleagues,

On behalf of the Board of Trustees, I would like to extend our congratulations on the recent AFT-sponsored, highly successful conference on on-line education. Those of us who were able to attend were treated to professional, energetic presentations and breakout sessions that addressed a gamut of issues. It is always enlightening to observe and participate with education professionals who are clearly dedicated to their work.

Our thanks for the opportunity to participate.

Sincerely,

Karen Schwarz
President
SMCCCD Board of Trustees

corporate community, a major element in the power elite.” And that “the think tanks in the network are highly specialized research groups that produce the PIP that are argued about in the policy discussion groups.”

Think Tanks, Foundations & Institutes That Incubate Policy

Let me say quite explicitly that this policy-formation network is not in any sense a conspiracy. Rather, what Domhoff is presenting is really an institutional analysis of the structure of power in American society, of how it is organized and controlled by the upper class and corporate community, acting through their power elite, the most politically active members of the dominant class in society.

In the case of the rise of online education, I think this policy has been promoted by corporate-funded think tanks most active on matters related to public education in general, and higher education in particular; foundations concerned with community colleges; research institutes at elite universities in the State working on distance education, and various elite policy discussion groups active in the State on education policy issues. It is in these kinds of policy arenas where there has already been serious discussion of why online education should be promoted, what the goals to be achieved by the expansion of online education are, as well as alternative policy proposals concerning how best to implement online education in the California higher education system. This is where policy, ideology and plans (PIP) are discussed thoroughly. This is where and how public education policy is made. Faculty, especially from the community colleges, are not typically part of this policy-making process. Yet, this is the public policy process in general terms that culminated in the institutional decision to promote online education in California community colleges. It was a new policy that the most powerful groups in the State—economically, politically, and socially—wanted to see implemented, whatever their reasons might be. In other words, public policy in the U.S. typically develops without real input from the public, traditional democratic understandings of American society

continued on the next page

VIEWPOINT: Online Education Policies Are Affecting How Faculty Are Hired

continued from the previous page

notwithstanding.

Part Timers & Job Applicants Affected by Online Ed. Policies

Faculty who are full-time and have tenure, of course, are able to ignore the whole issue of teaching online if they choose to do so. This is the main reason, I think, why so many faculty have not yet thought about many of the issues related to computer-mediated instruction. No one is going to require tenured faculty members to adopt a pedagogical approach that they have no interest in. But the situation facing part-time faculty in California community colleges, some 30,000 men and women, is not so simple when it comes to the question of teaching classes online. The situation facing faculty who want to be hired to teach full-time at a California community college is also now complicated by issues related to online education. There was quite a bit of discussion at the Conference concerning both sets of issues.

Horror Stories from Part Timers

I heard more than a few horror-stories from non-tenure track faculty at the Conference concerning various forms of coercion that had been applied by an administrator, probably a Division Dean, who wanted to launch a new class section online and couldn't find anyone interested, competent to do so, or interested in learning how. The person responsible for assigning you classes each semester wants you to learn how to teach online. What if you have simply no interest in teaching your class with a computer? Lots of part-time faculty feel this way. Some part-time faculty even leave teaching because they feel their chances of obtaining a full-time position are minimal given their lack of interest in online teaching. One faculty member told the story of how he left teaching. He then tried out technical writing, but found it boring. But he then was able to obtain a full-time teaching job because of his new technical background! Ironically,

this faculty member is once again not interested in teaching online!

But when part-timers get that rare opportunity to interview for a full-time teaching position, invariably they are asked if they have an interest in teaching online, if they have ever designed and/or taught a class online. To express no interest whatsoever in putting together an online class almost always turns out—when the final selection is announced—to be a bad career move. Yet I heard from most part-time faculty that there was usually no compensation available to design an online class, no money to purchase any software, no release time possible to take a class to learn the new technology. Often, there is very little or no technical support. And some part-time faculty spoke about the experience of designing a class, paying for it out of their own pocket, and then the class was not in the end offered. Or it was taught by someone else, in the most horrible version of the story.

How Are Online Requirements Added to Job Announcements?

Finally, there was another very serious issue that several faculty members raised in different Conference sessions. Tenured faculty who are sitting on faculty hiring committees in all sorts of disciplines are now regularly finding that the job announcement contains language concerning the desirability of being able to teach online, of being able to convert your classes to the online format, of being an enthusiastic proponent of online education. But the faculty members on the hiring committee did not make the determination that this was a most important and necessary qualification for a full-time teaching position in their particular discipline. This language came from the administration, and it was thought to be a management right to include this language in the materials put together for recruiting for faculty positions. In other words, the faculty as discipline experts responsible for curriculum and faculty hiring and

evaluation, is now being eroded. I heard often from faculty at the Conference that almost all new faculty job announcements contain language promoting the use of online education. Rarely were the faculty on the hiring committee responsible for the inclusion of this language.

Online Ed. Conference Run by Faculty With No Vendors Allowed

I would like to end by noting that the most gratifying comments that I heard from faculty attendees at the Conference on Online Education concerned two related observations. The first was that one of the most interesting aspects of the Conference was that it was organized by faculty (under the auspices of a faculty union, AFT Local 1493) for faculty! The other observation that I heard from many faculty members, including from plenary speakers, was how unusual (and even refreshing) the Conference was in that there were no vendors there selling their wares. Apparently at all of the conferences that are held related to online education, corporations active in the computer industry are in attendance, viewing the event as a marketplace where business can be conducted. The Conference planning committee consciously decided early on that the Conference was to be a forum where different points of view would engage in serious discussion, and that it would be inappropriate for those wanting to sell various educational technologies (the value of which would be a topic under discussion at the Conference) to do so at our event. That this common sense decision was thought by many to be unusual or different is no doubt a sign of our times.

**Visit the website on
Online Education in
California Community
Colleges at:
[www.smccd.cc.ca.us/
smccd/faculty/confer/](http://www.smccd.cc.ca.us/smccd/faculty/confer/)**

Why the District Bond Measure Lost: Interview with Consultant Ed McGovern

continued from page 1

Third, while we raised a significant amount of money - \$160,000 - it was \$40,000 less than we had originally planned. That additional money would have been used to persuade some likely opponents and increase turnout in our strong cities - specifically Daly City and Redwood City.

Advocate: What are your thoughts on the timing of the bond campaign? The bond was on the ballot at the same time that there was a Board of Trustees race also on the ballot. This made it possible for someone to run a campaign against the bond under the guise of seeking a seat on the Board of Trustees.

McGovern: First, the need exists now and the County had a scheduled election last November even though it did have the Trustees election at the same time. It was discussed prior to placing the measure on the ballot and decided that the positives outweighed the negatives. Yes, we did end up with opponents who used the Trustee election as a platform, but it also allowed the Trustees who supported the bond and some Trustee candidates who also supported the bond, to campaign for the bond throughout the County.

Our opponents would have waged a campaign against the bond whether the Trustee election was at the same time or not.

Advocate: What are your thoughts now on the general conception of the bond campaign? That is, the approach the bond campaign adopted was to run an "under the radar screen" type of campaign. But can this be done at the very time when there is a Board of Trustees race happening?

McGovern: For both tactical and a logistical reasons, we ran the only campaign we could have run. The strategy was to identify 20,000 supporters who are occasional voters (would not necessarily vote in November) and get 50% - 75% of them to vote. The cam-

paign spent 60% of our funds on those individuals. We got them to vote, turnout was almost 30% when traditionally the turnout is below 25% in these elections. Each 1% turnout means an additional 3100 people voted. We had no money and no tactical need for signs. We spent about 10% of the budget on newspaper ads. If we could have raised the additional money, it would have been spent on persuasion of probable NO voters and increasing turnout in our geographic strongholds.

Advocate: Contrast the successful bond campaign in the Foothill/DeAnza District with the failed campaign here in the San Mateo District. If I am not mistaken, there was no Trustee race at Foothill/DeAnza on November 2.

McGovern: The difference in Foothill/DeAnza is simple. They had \$250,000 to spend persuading a district less than half the size of San Mateo County. They had 202 precincts; we had 522 precincts. They spent \$250,000; we spent \$160,000. Their foundation gave \$160,000 to the campaign; San Mateo's Foundation gave \$40,000 to the campaign. They got 35,506 Yes votes; we got 56,989 Yes votes. They ran their complete campaign; we did not.

Advocate: Could you say something about the bond campaign's failure to raise the targeted \$200,000? Why was the campaign in the end \$40,000 short in its fundraising?

McGovern: The fundraising effort was outstanding in terms of outreach, organization and follow through. We had tremendous leadership. We had tremendous support among individual administrators in the district. We had terrific support among the unions representing the faculty and the staff.

I was disappointed in the response from the business community in the county. We did receive some very generous support and help from San Mateo County companies such as Genentech, AMD, a number of Construction companies, some

local banks, the County Realtors and individual venture capitalists. Overall however, the response from the San Mateo Business community was weak. Considering the variety of training programs that exist with individual companies, the response was very disappointing.

Advocate: Do you have any thoughts on what the future approach of the District should be in terms of getting a facilities bond passed by the San Mateo County electorate. Certainly the District's needs haven't gone away.

McGovern: The district's needs have not gone away. In fact, they will only get worse as time goes on. There are several things to consider. One, there was tremendous support generated for Measure A - the endorsement list of local elected officials, Chambers of Commerce, and others was unprecedented. There is a great deal of momentum built up. Second, the district needs to consider the prospect of the passage of Prop 26 in March 2000. If Prop 26 is approved, bond measures will only require a simple majority to pass. Certainly, anything they do should be done after March 2000 but done quickly, because every district has tremendous facility needs and if Prop 26 passes, the floodgates could open.

Advocate: Do you have any final comments that you would like to make concerning the bond campaign?

McGovern: The leadership demonstrated by the Trustees and the Chancellors office could not have been better. They worked tirelessly and skillfully in trying to pass this measure. The leadership of the unions was also very helpful. And the leadership and energy among the students was very helpful as well. Everyone was very conscious of not crossing the line and violating campaign laws on campus. But they did as much as they could legally to inform people, both on and off campus, of the need for the bond. I believe it is a great foundation that should be encouraged to continue.

"Consultation Process" Breaks Down as Management Groups Reject Faculty Proposal of \$50 Million for Part Timer Equity

continued from page 1

Community College system.

In recent years, the various State community college faculty groups have met together with the CEO's in the community college system, the Trustees in the system, the Board of Governors and the Community College Chancellor in a "consultation process" to exchange views in an attempt to achieve consensus on policy matters affecting all the constituencies in the California Community College system. The idea was that no group would act on its own, and that only those policy proposals that had been agreed to by all members of the consultation process would be advocated for in the Legislature. But in the last six months or so, the management groups refused to support any of the faculty proposals, in particular those around AB 420, the part-time faculty bill of rights. Instead, they recommended to the Governor and Legislature policies that the faculty groups have been strongly opposed to.

As can be seen in the following two commentaries by CFT Community College Council President Tom Tyner and CPFA Executive Council Chair Chris Storer, the consultation process has now virtually broken down altogether. For example, the management groups have refused all suggestions that in those districts that have not yet achieved the goal (put into law in AB 1725 over a decade ago) of having 75% of all classes taught by a full-timer, that there should be a requirement that Partnership for Excellence funds be used to hire more full-time faculty in those districts in order to reach that goal. Similarly, management groups in the community college system have refused to agree to the faculty proposal that local Academic Senates should approve of the process used to determine in each district how Partnership for Excellence monies are spent.

When it proved impossible to reach consensus on the faculty proposal to create a \$50 million part-time faculty equity fund (in the aftermath of the battle over AB 420), the faculty groups decided to take their case for ending the exploitation of part-time faculty directly to the public and the Legislature, outside of the consultation process altogether.

From CCC President Tom Tyner:

At the BOG meeting in Modesto, the Board reaffirmed its approval of the 2000-2001 system budget as presented in September, continuing to omit the \$50 million for part-time faculty equity. Faculty leaders spoke long and passionately for two days on the need for the proposal to be included. I couldn't even get the faculty trustees to make a motion on the second day to include the \$50 million for the sake of board discussion.

We have now officially split from the system on budget priorities for 2000-2001, with any chance for system unity dashed, and we will chart our own budget and legislative course. While it is too bad that we can't present a system lobbying front to the legislation and governor, it would be even worse to support a system budget that ignores the concerns of faculty. Beyond the \$50 million part-time faculty proposal, our attempts to get a full-time faculty hiring requirement in PFE for non-75% districts and to get a senate check-off on the district PFE budget process being followed were both squelched. 0 for 3.

While system unity would have been useful, there's also greater freedom in turning our lobbyists loose to work our issues with legislators and cut our own deals. We tried very hard to reach a budget agreement with the Chancellor and CEO's, and we now owe the system nothing in terms of supporting their budget agenda. We've got our own.

From CPFA Executive Council Chair Chris Storer:

I have just returned from the Board of Governors November meeting. Chancellor Nussbaum and staff, following the lead of CEOs and Trustees, recommended that, in spite of faculty pleas that they and the Board take a leadership position in seeking a compromise between faculty and administrative groups, the board remained with the divisive budget passed in September over faculty objections.

Faculty argued forcefully for the needed mid-course correction on the Partnership for Excellence with an Academic Senate signoff that a collegial process had been followed in determining how PFE funds were to be spent at the local level, and faculty remained committed and united in arguing for a \$50,000,000.00 Part-time Faculty equity line item in the budget to send a message to the Governor and the Legislature that the system was prepared to deal with this pressing problem. CEOs and Trustees argued that the Sept. budget was fine, gave them needed flexibility, that there was only small indication of misuse of PFE funds which could be handled by existing processes, and that the system should wait for the CPEC study before acting on part-time equity issues.

Faculty leaders met briefly after the Board voted and agreed that we were now fully free to take the issues to the legislature, the Governor, the press, and the people. This will probably take the form of a faculty-amended budget for the system, as well as a legislative package to address faculty's professional concerns about the lack of direction in the BOG's System Budget.

For more information on statewide part timer issues, see the CPFA website at www.cpfpa.org & the CFT/CCC website at: www.cft.org/ccc-n/

WRITE LETTERS TO GOVERNOR DAVIS TO ASK FOR FUNDING FOR PART-TIME FACULTY

Equity for part-timers in the community colleges will be a slow and frustrating process if districts are required to provide funds from their current budgets. Substantial funding must come from the state. The California Federation of Teachers and other faculty advocacy groups are asking Governor Gray Davis to include \$50 million for part-timer equity in his January community college budget.

Please write to Governor Davis and encourage him to support part-time faculty with a \$50 million equity fund in his forthcoming budget. A sample letter follows. Personalize the letter as you like, but please keep it short. Letters do not need to be typed.

You can also fax your letters to the Governor at: 916-445-4633.

[your address]
[date]

Governor Gray Davis
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Governor Davis,

I urge you to include \$50 million for part-time faculty salary equity in your January budget for community colleges.

According to statistics from the Chancellor's Office, part-time faculty make less than 40% of the salary of full-time faculty doing the same teaching work. You can help end this huge disparity and help solve one of the biggest public employee problems in the state by including the \$50 million line item in your January community college budget.

Thank you for your support of the 30,000 part-time faculty who make up two-thirds of the community college teaching workforce. Their educational contribution to the community college system and its student is invaluable. They must be treated fairly.

[your signature and printed name]

cc: Secretary of Education Gary Hart
1121 L Street, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95814

Part Time Faculty Eligible for Unemployment Benefits Between Semesters

All part-time faculty should remember that you are eligible for unemployment compensation benefits over the break between the Fall and Spring semesters, unless you are working another job over the semester break and you are earning more than your unemployment grant would be. As soon as you give your last final exam, you should go to the local Employment Development Department (EDD) office and file a claim, or reactivate the one you have from last summer (if you applied over the summer break).

If it is a new claim, you will have a one-week waiting period before benefits start, so do not delay. When applying, tell them about all your jobs, since your benefit is based on all your income over the previous year. When they ask if you have a job to go back to after winter break, you should answer, "Not with reasonable assurance. I only have a tentative assignment contingent on enrollment, funding, and program needs." This is important. Do not just tell them that you have an assignment for Spring semester or you will be disqualified.

According to the Cervisi decision of the State Court of Appeals, part-time faculty, as a class, do not have "reasonable assurance" of a job and hence are eligible for benefits between terms. If questioned further, mention the Cervisi case. Be sure to fill out all job search forms correctly, and appear as directed in person or by phone or mail. You should not have any problems, but if you do and are denied for any reason, call the AFT office as soon as possible and the Union will advise you on how to file an appeal. Don't be reluctant to file. This is your right, not charity.

EDUCATORS' TAX GUIDE AVAILABLE

The AFT will have the *Educators' Tax Guide*, 2000 Edition, published by the Educational Tax Publications Services, available at the special rate of \$4.95 per copy. Call the AFT office at x6491 if you would like to reserve a copy.

The Advocate
is now available on the Web at:
www.smcccd.cc.ca.us/smcccd/faculty/brenner/advol

Skyline Report: Lots of New Projects & Monies, Lots of Work for Faculty

by Rick Hough,
Skyline Executive Committee Rep.

Reeling from the loss of Proposition A, we at Skyline College step back and take a look at all of the new projects and monies on campus. Although our buildings and facilities are still in desperate need of refurbishing, or demolishing in some cases, there is a lot of "new construction" of a different kind on campus.

Partnership for Excellence, among other things, has continued to bring us many new full-time faces, and the hiring committees are still looking for more. Title III, in its second of five years, is

providing computers, software, and invaluable training in both technology use as well as collaborative learning techniques to nearly half of the faculty with the hope that the ideas at least will spread to all. Accreditation, though it brings no money, gives us a chance to look deeply into our daily practices and policies and is an opportunity for us to fine tune our service to the students. The MESA program, focusing on transfer students in science and math based majors, gives students more support, with tutors, their own counselor, a study center, and workshops to fine tune the study skills they need to succeed in their science and math classes.

While riding this emotional roller coaster, from the low of Prop A to the highs of the aforementioned grants, we must also consider the price for all this activity. Accreditation and hiring committees are huge time and energy commitments with no compensation and, though having more full-timers benefits students and faculty alike, over the short term of the tenure process, evaluations add one more burden to already overworked teachers. All of this takes its toll on our ability to give our students the attention they deserve and contributes to teacher burnout, something no teacher should have to fear. If only we still had sabbaticals to look forward to!

Cañada Report: So Many Committees, So Little Faculty Time

by Sondra Saterfield,
Cañada Chapter Chair

Cañada College faculty face many challenges before the books are closed to this century. Earlier this year our second college president of the decade resigned to take a job at San Luis Obispo Community College district, a trend that the college presidents at our sister colleges followed shortly thereafter. We now have an interim president, the third one since 1990, Rosa Perez. A presidential search committee is underway to select a new president. Selection committees will soon be established to fill a dean and vice president of instruction positions.

The college recently prepared for a matriculation site visit and the review team made 18 recommendations to meet standards. Faculty members are currently engaged in an accreditation self-study for the Fall 2000 team visit and many college programs are going through program review. In addition, faculty evaluation committees are well underway. Faculty members have voiced concerns about the expected level of their participation in committee work on the accreditation, matriculation, selection, faculty evaluation and program review committees.

Interim President Rosa Perez is no stranger to our district. A few years ago

she was Dean of Counseling at Skyline College and comes to us from the Chabot College District. She has a strong background in student services, an area in which our college needs help desperately. She is the first person of color to ever hold the job of CEO at Cañada.

Several faculty members at Cañada who attended the AFT conference "Online Education in California Community Colleges" recently set up a discussion group to continue a dialog of the issues brought up at the Conference. For a report on the first meeting and dates of any possible future meetings, please contact Karen Olesen at 306-3452.

AFT 1493'ers Attend CFT Community College Women's Conference

by Katharine Harer,
AFT 1493 Co-President

Women from community colleges around the state joined together at the Westin Hotel near the San Francisco Airport on October 22nd and 23rd for the third annual CFT/CCC Women's Conference. AFT Co-President, Katharine Harer, and AFT Part-Time Coordinator, Kathleen Feinblum, were part of the intimate, but enthusiastic, gathering. Once again, the conference put a different twist on the "delivery" of information; for example, in one session about twenty-five women

sat shoulder-to-shoulder at a round table exchanging ideas and experiences from the "battle-lines" of the negotiating table. It was informal enough to be open and comfortable while focused enough to be useful. There was laughter, sighing, a few victory cries and almost everyone had something to say. Other workshops included "Time Management Strategies", a very hands-on session to help those of us who regularly smother in post-its and never get to the bottom of our "things to do" lists and workshops on sexual harassment in the workplace and empowerment for women.

The Women's Conference has been ably organized for the last three years by Susan Conrad, President of S. F. City College AFT, Local 2121. She has created a warm and inclusive atmosphere and, at the same time, an opportunity to learn valuable new skills. As Susan is retiring at the end of this school year, we want to thank her for initiating the conference and "womaning" it so well. We'll let you know about the dates and agenda for the next one, which will take place in the fall of 2000.

