

PRESIDENTS' PERSPECTIVES

What's Happened to Our Contract Negotiations? A Review

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



We want to briefly review what has happened up until now with our contract negotiations with the District. There has been a lot of information presented to you in the last several weeks from us and from the Chancellor, and, in turn, we have received a great deal of support as well as questions from many of you. We want to thank those of you who have expressed your concerns about the issues involved, especially to the approximately 100 of you who came to the April 24 Board meeting, and to all of you who have written letters to the Chancellor and to the Board. We also want to try to address some of your questions.

What brought about this serious delay in settling the contract?

The AFT negotiating team, working with the District team in the Interest-Based Bargaining mode, began in October to look at options for distributing the Part-Time Equity funds on the hourly schedule. We examined various ways of working with the schedule, from adding columns to adding steps to paying by load rather than by hour, and we were waiting for some pertinent data from the District before deciding which option to go with. There was never any question about that money going to the part-timers.

We then turned to the compensation package. We were working with the District's offer (to all units) of 7-3-3, try-

ing to move the 3 in the third year up to 4 or 5 as we knew our faculty needed more competitive salaries than this offer would bring. The AFT team felt that the process was working fairly well, and that by late March or early April a strong settlement would be ready to bring to faculty for a vote. Approximately a month ago, the AFT team learned for the first time of the District's plan to use the Equity money to pay for the 7% raise for Part-Timers. After trying to persuade the District that this use of the funds was illegal and improper, the Union withdrew from interest-based bargaining and called for an impasse to be declared.

Why haven't we brought the 7-3-3 offer from the District to the membership for a vote?

The most critical stumbling block to a settlement is the District's refusal to use the part-time Equity funds legally. We cannot agree to any proposal that uses any of the Equity money for anything other than "making part-time faculty salaries more comparable to full-time salaries for similar work". This means that all of this targeted money must be given to part-timers as a supplement to the salary increase that all faculty receive. We cannot even consider bringing an offer to a vote if it is illegally using state-mandated money.

Beyond the issue of the part-time

continued on page 4



**San Mateo Community College
Federation of Teachers
AFT Local 1493, AFL-CIO**
1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.
San Mateo, CA 94402
(650) 574-6491

Editor

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x 4177

Editorial Board

Eric Brenner, Skyline, x 4177
Dan Kaplan, x 6491

Co-Presidents

Katharine Harer, Skyline, x 4412
Joaquin Rivera, Skyline, x 4159

Vice President

Bess Chandler, Skyline, x 4286

Secretary

George Goth, Skyline, x 4390

Treasurer

Anita Fisher, CSM, x6383

Chapter Chairs

Bess Chandler, Skyline, x 4286
Pat Deamer, Skyline, x 4217
Romelia Thiele, Cañada, x3211
John Searle, CSM, x6607

Executive Committee Reps.

Nina Floro, Skyline, x 4414
Rick Hough, Skyline, x 4193
Anne Nicholls, Cañada, x 3293
Karen Olesen, Cañada, x 3415
Mary Valenti, CSM, x 6194
Linda Vogel, Skyline, x 4289
Shaye Zahedi, CSM, x 6240

Part-timers Reps.

Carol Hansen, CSM, x 6677 x 9267
Paddy Moran, CSM, x 6677 x 9245

Chief Grievance Officer

John Kirk, CSM, x 6386

Executive Secretary

Dan Kaplan, x 6491



GRIEVANCE REPORT *Chancellor Denies Instructor Was in Danger*

Way Over the Line Revisited

by John Kirk, AFT 1493 Chief Negotiator



John Kirk

This is an update of the article, "Way Over the Line", which appeared in the March issue of *The Advocate*. That article described a

case in which a student threatened a CSM instructor, yelled obscenities at her in front of the class and knocked the instructor's purse across the room. Since that article was written, a hearing was held before the Chancellor.

The Chancellor was required by the contract to respond in writing to the grievance within 15 working days. The hearing was held on 2-12-02 and the Chancellor's response was dated 4-17-02.

In his denial of the grievance, the Chancellor made a number of serious mistakes.

1. "You did not present a compelling argument for "Imminent danger of harm."

The Chancellor wrote:

"The second occurrence of disruptive behavior with the student occurred at the end of the class session. While unpleasant, the student's behavior was not physical towards any individual—yourself or other students."

In her report of the incident, the instructor wrote:

"...the student "moved in front of my table, put his hands on it, and yelled into my face, "You better watch your face, bitch, because I'm going to be following you!" I believe he then yelled, "You stupid bitch!" again, violently sweeping my purse off the table as he did so."

A student witness wrote:

"Several of us were at the front, when another student told him that he needed to calm down, and he turned on her and told her "get out of my face, you stupid fucking bitch or I'll whoop your ass." The disrupting person then approached (the instructor's) desk and threw her purse on the floor and continued cursing at her in a threatening manner right up in her face."

Another student witness wrote:

"This situation was extremely serious, not only did it threaten my well being and security, it also disturbed (the instructor)...I'm currently not enrolled in any classes because I'm scared for my safety...I'm shocked and appalled that he is still walking the campus after he made a serious attempt in attacking (the instructor) and myself. If I remember correctly in high school if this kind of incident occurred not only was the student arrested but was also expelled from the district. Why isn't this the case here."

Carefully read the Chancellor's response again:

"While unpleasant, the student's behavior was not physical towards any individual—yourself or other students."

2. "The student behavior in question does not meet the test of "good cause" for suspension or expulsion."

The Chancellor cited a number of Education code sections to support his position. In particular he cited Education Code §76032. Ap-

continued on next page

Grievance Report

continued from previous page

parently, the Chancellor meant to cite Education Code §76033. That section of the code states that a “good cause” for suspension or expulsion is:

(b) Assault, battery, or any threat of force or violence upon a student or college personnel.

We think that the facts in this case meet this test of “good cause.”

He cites Education Code §66017, which permits an immediate suspension when “required in order to protect lives or property.” That same section of the Education Code also states:

“The chief administrative officer of a community college...shall take appropriate disciplinary action against any student...who...has been found to have willfully disrupted the orderly operation of the campus. ...The disciplinary action may include, but need not be limited to, suspension, dismissal, or expulsion.”

We think that the facts in this case meet this test of willful disruption of the orderly operation of the campus.

He cited Education Code §76030 which states that the suspension or expulsion of a student must be for “good cause”...when the presence of the student causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the student or others.”

We think that the facts in this case also meet this test.

3. “The offer was made to give you an in-person apology in the presence of the Vice President of Student Services or a letter of apology, which you refused to accept.”

In fact, the instructor did accept the letter of apology from the student.

4. “It is my decision that you and the Union do not have a right to review the student’s records in this matter and that the student discipline was appropriately handled.”



The Chancellor is confusing a request to see a student’s records with a request to know what disciplinary action the administration took against the student for his abusive and violent behavior. §76243 of the Education Code states:

“(a) A community college or community college district is not authorized to permit access to student records to any person without the written consent of the student or under judicial order except that access may be permitted to the following:

(b) The alleged victim of any sexual assault or physical abuse,...or threat or assault, or any conduct that threatens the health and safety of the alleged victim, which is the basis of any disciplinary action taken by a community college, shall be permitted access to that information. For the purposes of this subdivision, access to student record information shall be in the form of notice of the results of any disciplinary action by the community college and the results of any appeal, which shall be provided to the alleged

victim within three days following that disciplinary action or appeal. The alleged victim shall keep the results of that disciplinary action and appeal confidential.”

We believe that the instructor is legally entitled to know what disciplinary action the administration has taken in this case.

A group of faculty at CSM prepared and circulated a petition which read:

We, the undersigned CSM faculty members, are profoundly disturbed by the administration’s handling, as reported in the March 2002 “Advocate,” of a student’s violent behavior in a classroom last fall. This is a critical issue of workplace safety.

We do not accept that such behavior can possibly be tolerated. Presumably, the terms of CSM policy are intended to ensure a safe workplace for faculty, staff and students. By not expelling this student, the College has completely undermined our confidence that this policy has any meaning.

This incident reveals that the College does not share our understanding of what behavior is unacceptable. Clearly, there must be a formal discussion between administrators, faculty and staff to clarify our standards, and specifically, to clarify grounds for expulsion, and to restore a sense of “community” to our community college.

Over 100 CSM faculty signed the petition, and as a result, a number of meetings have been held between faculty and administrators to attempt to clarify the issue of workplace safety.

The Chancellor’s decision to deny the grievance has been appealed to the Board of Trustees, and we are waiting for the Chancellor to set a date for the Board hearing.

Negotiations Review & Update

continued from page 1

equity money, we have made several proposals to the District on our salary compensation. We have most recently proposed a two-year agreement of 7-3 as well as a three-year deal of 7-3-3 with an agreement to increase the third year over 3% if our District receives a specified growth increase from the state. We have also proposed that a new top step (Step 27) be created to benefit those faculty who are nearing retirement to improve their retirement benefits. Step 27 would be \$10,000 above Step 26 and any faculty member who has been at Step 26 for two or more years could opt to be moved to this step for one year only. Reminder: *With 7-3-3, our salaries will still be in the bottom third of Bay Area districts at the end of the third year.*

On health benefits, we have proposed that we be brought up to the same level as the other employee units because currently our faculty's benefit package is slightly behind the other units. Although the District has offered the same percentage increase as the other units agreed to, the actual monetary figures for faculty would be below the other units. We are also concerned about the fact that even if we are brought up to the same cap as the other units, in the last two years of the agreement faculty members with families will have to pay a significant amount above the cap to keep up with the rising costs of health plans.

Finally, we have also made a very modest proposal to continue our sabbatical program that we started last year on a one-year trial basis. Reminder: *We are the only district in the Bay Area that does not have an on-going sabbatical program.*

Can we substantiate that District revenues can support an increase beyond the 7-3-3 offer?

We recently sent two flyers to faculty that were both titled "The Real Facts and Figures" which showed how the District has millions of dollars in the budget that are available for salary increases. Since the two flyers looked very similar to each other, some people did not look at both and we want to reiterate the information presented in those flyers. The District has a long history of underestimating their revenues and overestimating their expenses. The result: every year the District ends up with more money than was projected when the budget was originally approved.

Academic Year	Revenues underestimated by:	Expenditures overestimated by:	Amount in excess from the approved budget:
1996-97	\$ -567,156	\$3,082,320	\$2,515,164
1997-98	2,557,144	1,291,800	3,848,944
1998-99	2,882,363	3,243,614	6,125,977
1999-00	1,922,836	4,064,970	5,987,806
2000-01	883,546	6,825,065	7,708,611

(Source: CCFS-311. Amounts shown are for unrestricted general fund.)

For example, as you can see in the table above, in 2000-01, the District received \$883,546 more than they budgeted, and spent \$6,825,065 less than

continued on page 5, column 1

What the Faculty are Saying

Dozens of faculty have written to the Chancellor, the Board and AFT 1493 to express their thoughts and concerns about the state of negotiations. We have excerpted selections from a variety of these letters below:

Seven percent for this first year is a good start, but 3% in the second and third years is not enough... I must also say that you are mistaken if you think that closing the gap between full-time and part-time salaries is not of great concern to faculty. As someone who taught as a part-timer for ten years, I am acutely aware of how underpaid part-timers are for the teaching they do. And as someone who is now full-time, I recognize more clearly than ever the need to involve ALL faculty more fully in department, division, and college work. When part-timers are paid a fairer salary, they can be expected to contribute in ways that are currently unreasonable to ask of them, and in fact, impossible in many cases.

Anne Stafford, CSM

* * * * *

There is a significant faculty view that many previous Board members and prior Chancellor representatives have not been sympathetic to the plight of faculty regarding salaries for many years. In fact, as you pointed out, faculty salaries have slipped (standard of living and inflation index) for 10 years or more, and we are now in a place that most faculty see as insulting, and an embarrassment to this profession. Most faculty understand that the previous deficits can not be corrected in one negotiation year. However, it seems to me that this is a tremendous opportunity for you (as the new Chancellor) to bridge this repetitious pattern of what faculty perceive as sacrificial salary negotiations.

Michael Standefer, Skyline

continued on page 5, column 2

Negotiations Review & Update

continued from page 4

they budgeted. When you add the two amounts, the District actually had at the end of the year \$7,708,611 more than they anticipated at the beginning of the year. All of that money is carried over into the next year's budget.

The District also consistently ends each year with an ending balance well in excess of the required 3% reserve (the 3% reserve is an amount equal to 3% of the total expenditures which districts must maintain for economic uncertainties). All of that money is carried over into the next year's budget. This money available for a fair raise. A 1% raise for faculty, including benefits, costs the District \$420,000. Although the District may claim that this money is "encumbered" for other purposes, we want to reiterate that the issue is one of *priorities*. If the District truly believes that a fair compensation for faculty is a top priority, they should act on that conviction when they set their budget priorities and allocate enough resources to give faculty a fair raise.

Academic Year	Ending Balance	Required 3% reserve	Amount in excess of the required reserve
1995-96	\$5,831,253	\$2,062,675	\$3,768,578
1996-97	6,775,095	2,125,004	4,650,091
1997-98	6,570,312	2,347,142	4,223,170
1998-99	8,180,859	2,447,909	5,732,950
1999-00	8,079,954	2,605,510	5,474,444
2000-01	8,166,079	2,771,009	5,395,070

(Source: CCFS-311. Figures shown are for total general fund.)

Why did we agree to an "interest-based" method of negotiations which prevented us from discussing the progress of negotiations as we went along?

The District proposed using the "interest-based" method as a means to negotiate in a more "collegial" and collaborative manner, theoretically allowing contract negotiations to progress more smoothly and quickly to an agreement than with traditional "positional" bargaining. We agreed to "interest-based" at the time because we believed that the District earnestly wanted to work with us to improve our faculty's low position in comparison to other Bay Area districts. One of the guidelines imposed on both sides using the interest-based method is that specific "options" discussed during bargaining be kept inside the room as none of them are official proposals yet. The theory is that constituents can have their expectations raised and lowered and this can cause confusion and put unnecessary pressure on the bargaining process. We were willing to go along with this guideline because we felt we were very close to a very good contract settlement. However, when we learned of the District's plan to inappropriately use the Part Time Equity funding and when we were not able to convince the District that this was a mistake, we decided to opt out of interest-based bargaining. Given the way the District has acted, we are not likely to agree to interest-based bargaining in the future.

continued on page 6, column 1

What are Faculty Saying?

continued from page 4

I also teach at City College of San Francisco and at College of Marin. When I saw the pay scale for part-time instructors, I was appalled at the difference between pay for the same job at other districts. I believe that the cost of living in San Francisco and in Marin could not possibly be that different from San Mateo. After 10 years with CSM, my pay would be about 60% less than the same time at CCSF. In the interests of attracting and keeping highly qualified teachers and having the part-time instructors participate in the committees at CSM, I ask that you increase salaries to the level of the districts in San Francisco and Marin.

Kate Charlton, CSM

* * * * *

I have seen six of my colleagues in the math department leave for other districts. Others willing to stick it out, struggle to live far away where housing is not so expensive while commuting one to three hours per day, adding to the exhaustion that we all face as teachers. What frustrates, and frankly infuriates me, is that for 25 years it has been nothing but talk! While chancellors come and go, and new board members get elected, still the steady degradation of our salaries continues. We were shown 7-3-3 and told this is a valiant attempt to make a difference, and that we should loudly cheer our good fortune. This jagged step forward followed immediately by two feeble stumbles back does not meet the needs of our faculty.

Rick Hough, Skyline

* * * * *

Using the equity money properly would make some progress towards alleviating the financial stress our part-time faculty endures. The State

continued on page 6, column 2

Negotiations Review & Update

continued from page 5

Why don't we hire a professional negotiator?

There are a number of reasons we haven't opted to go with an outside negotiator. First of all, we've checked with most of the other unions in the state and from what we've heard, the districts who have tried to use professional negotiators have had mixed experiences at best, while most of them report negative results. Chabot currently uses an outside negotiator and reports from faculty are that they are very unhappy with the situation. For one thing, professional negotiators are not as closely involved with our issues and, although they can be educated about our unique circumstances, they don't have the same dedication to students and personal understanding of our living and working conditions that an SMCCCD faculty member has. Furthermore, professional negotiators don't have to live with the consequences of the agreements they facilitate. They can move on to another district and never look back. Years ago our district used a "hired gun", as they're often referred to, and during that time the tone of negotiations was both hostile and negative. These are just some of the reasons that we have not gone in that direction.

If you want equal pay for part-time instructors, does this mean they will be required to do all the same work that full-time instructors do?

To answer this question, we can look to the example of City College of San Francisco. AFT 2121 and the CCSF district recently agreed to set the pay for part-time faculty at **85%** of full-time pay. In contrast, **part-time faculty in our District are currently paid 50% of full-time pay.** The March 2002 issue of *Union Action*, the voice of AFT 2121, explained why their pro-rata figure was set at 85%:

"85% is very close to the ratio of duties that part-timers are paid to perform as opposed to full-time tenured faculty. Part-time instructors have traditionally been responsible only for preparing for and teaching classes. Duties outside the classroom that full-timers are expected to perform include holding office hours (CCSF credit part-timers have had the option of holding paid office hours for the last few years), attending department meetings, serving on evaluation and tenure review committees, and serving on departmental and college-wide shared governance committees."

continued on page 7, column 1

What are Faculty Saying?

continued from page 5

has set aside this money for them; it is theirs. It is wrong of the District to use the equity funds in place of other District funds to increase part time compensation in line with full-time faculty. By doing so, the salary gap between part-time and full-time faculty remains, and this stasis is unacceptable. I agree that it is imperative that the District be guided with fiscal responsibility, but given the thrift of the District in past years, it seems it has overestimated its financial obligations and has ended up with a healthy rainy-day fund. Surely the District can honor the intention and letter of the law and use the equity money to make strides towards part-time faculty parity.

Teeka James, CSM

* * * * *

We hear rumors of other underlying factors affecting negotiations, if this is true, then what are they? This is very important for faculty to know and understand... It is the opinion of many faculty members that we don't want to follow in the path of the people who invested in many of the dot.com companies who are no longer in business. This means we need to know all of the facts so we can make our decisions based on the facts and not on the speculation of our negotiation team. Playing on people's emotions that they deserve more money needs to be substantiated by facts and not beliefs.

Richard Escalambre, Skyline

* * * * *

I fully support the AFT Union in its insistence that the state equity funds be used appropriately and legally. I fully support the Union in its stance that we are at an impasse in negotiations until you are ready to negotiate the use of the equity funds for adjunct faculty above and beyond a wage increase that first applies to all faculty. I fully support the Union in its efforts to bring our wages to a place where we become competitive with other community colleges in the Bay Area.

Betty Lindgren-Young, Skyline

The district's proposal does nothing to narrow the gap between part- and full-time faculty salaries, yet by law this is precisely what the equity funds

continued on page 7, column 2

Negotiations Review & Update

continued from page 6

The article went on to explain why AFT 2121 will push for 100% pro rata in future negotiations:

“Beyond the vision of fatter paychecks in part-timers’ pockets looms a broader goal: for demanding full pro rata for part-time instruction implies that they be treated as equivalent in all ways to their full-time counterparts, which includes performing commensurate duties along with accepting equal compensation. The long-term effect of part-timers’ receiving full pro rata pay in exchange for performing a full complement of faculty duties and responsibilities would be to correct the fracturing of the faculty into two tiers and the resulting deprofessionalization of the majority of community college faculty jobs.

“Who are the losers under the present two-tier faculty system?”

“...By demanding full pro rata pay, AFT recognizes that part-time instructors will be expected to contribute to the college outside the classroom by performing the same kinds of duties that full-time faculty are expected to do proportionate to the teaching load they carry. The expectation is that the two-tier system currently in place will eventually disappear as part-timers move closer to being paid as equals, as they begin to integrate fully with their colleagues in performing faculty duties at the college and as they attain the level of respect that their participation as equals demands. And, of course, the percentage of full-time faculty at CCSF should begin to grow significantly as the financial advantage to hiring part-timers recedes.”

Where are we in the Mediation process?

We have held two lengthy mediation sessions and have a third scheduled for May 17th. As we stated earlier in this article, the District has not made any offers that use the Part-Time Equity funds properly. Between sessions we have been working through the Mediator, Paul Roose, to float some ideas to the District and they have done the same. Unfortunately, once again, none of the District’s offers propose to use the equity funds properly nor do they propose any increases in our benefits cap. They have continued to offer 7-3-3 for full-time faculty but have not been interested in adding a growth formula in the third year that would share growth revenues with faculty. There has also been some backsliding on the sabbaticals issue on the part of the District.

We will continue to try to work toward a settlement that is legal and fair for all faculty. We realize that this process is frustrating, especially because it is so late in the school year. We are also frustrated and ready for it to be solved. We would all like to leave for the summer knowing that a good settlement has been reached, and we are doing everything in our power to try to make this happen.

What are Faculty Saying?

continued from page 6

were to be used for. I wish to express my extreme disappointment that the district would try to cheat its part-time faculty in this way, especially when we are already compensated less than 50% of what our full-time colleagues make.

CSM part-time instructor since 1998

* * * * *

I wrote you a few weeks ago about my experience on the CSM Math Dept. screening committee. My fears have been realized: our candidate took a job at deAnza at much higher pay.

Rick Kavinsky, CSM

* * * * *

The 7-3-3 offer does barely anything to increase our low salary rank among Bay Area colleges. During negotiations, this was the stated intention of the District’s new Chancellor. Additionally, the folding of funds specifically designed for improving part-time equity into the salary increase seems an outrageously improper gesture—one that is also illegal.

David Laderman, CSM

* * * * *

Why is it that the top salary for teachers at Foothill/De Anza District is \$18,000.00 more per year than the top salary in our district?

Jim Promessi, Skyline

* * * * *

Your memo characterized part-timer equity pay as if part-timer interests were opposed to ours. But part-timer equity is an issue for all of us. Their salaries must be brought into line with ours, and their obligations to the institution expanded too.

Madeleine Murphy, CSM

Affirmative Action: A Response to a Response

by Paul Roscelli, Cañada

In the fifth grade I ran for Vice President of my grammar school. In a speech to my classmates I promised I would get my grammar school a Coke drink machine (a promise, by the way, I never fulfilled). That promise set off a hailstorm of abuse that I have not seen the like of again—that is, not until I wrote an article for the November 2001 *Advocate* about race, gender and Prop 209.... It just goes to show you what gets people's dander up and their pens a writin'.

Fairness demands that I point out the factual errors and logical inconsistencies in the article, "Creating a Climate of Non-Discrimination in a Post-Affirmative Action Era" in the March 2002 *Advocate* penned by ten of my colleagues.

Affirmative Action No Longer Exists: According to my colleagues, the *Connerly* decision holds that "affirmative action [per se] will no longer be a part of the hiring practices..." In fact, its holding, as it relates to public colleges, was limited to "affirmative action practices which use race and gender preferences" in government hiring and public school admissions. It held these polices violated both Prop 209 and the federal Equal Protection Clause. Nothing in the *Connerly* decision prevents community colleges from employing race and gender-neutral forms of "affirmative action." In fact, a current web search of most any California public university or state college will prove my point. Visiting the UC Berkeley home page one is but a few mouse clicks away from a plethora of "affirmative action programs," programs that are alive, well, flourishing—and, crucially, race and gender-neutral.

What is meant by the phrase "affirmative action?" George Orwell, author of *Animal Farm* and 1984, warned of a future society that uses language to create rhetorical "swindles and perversions." My colleagues' ar-

ticle uses the phrase "affirmative action" nineteen times. In contrast it uses the phrase "race and gender preferences" only three times. Why the preference (no pun intended) for the former? Is it because my colleagues



know that opinion polls show the public (and I am sure academia too) is far more sympathetic to the phrase "affirmative action" than to the phrase "race and gender preferences?" In poll after poll, large majorities, on the order of two-thirds or more, of all racial, ethnic and gender groups in America demonstrate a strong distaste for granting individuals hiring or admissions preferences based on race or gender. To test this hypothesis, try the following: Take my colleagues' article and substitute the phrase "race and gender preferences" each time you find the phrase "affirmative action." Does the piece still retain its moral authority—is it still as persuasive?

My colleagues argue that it is both "false and misleading" for me to compare the discrimination faced by Blacks due to Jim Crow laws to the discrimination faced by whites (and in some cases Asians), due to today's race and gender preferences. Fair enough, especially inasmuch as the burden produced by the Jim Crow laws far exceeded the burden created by current race and gender preferences. With all due respect however, this issue of "how much one group has suffered" misses much of my (and the legal community's) point. The courts don't usually look at the magnitude of past discrimination when deciding if more

recent "compensating" discrimination is permissible—especially when it's race based. The Law requires a compelling reason to allow any form of race-based preference—regardless of the size of the previous harm or the remedy's compensating nature. Such a test is extremely difficult to meet. Moreover, the Courts have a real problem with legislative solutions for racism which allow the benefits to flow to those who were not directly the recipient of the harm while attaching the burden to those who, using my colleagues words, "are not slave owners or descendants from them..." Courts are concerned with good reason; past societal discrimination, absent a finding of specific harm to a specific individual, is not a compelling enough reason to burden an entire group for the sins of its fathers and mothers. America is a country founded on the idea of individual rights and individual responsibilities.

My colleagues believe that my lumping of the experiences of Blacks under Jim Crow with that of whites under race and gender preferences for purposes of comparison is like comparing apples to oranges. At the same time, they seem untroubled by their own uncritical lumping of Asian and Latino discrimination with that of Blacks for purposes of characterizing present day discrimination as broad, pervasive and ongoing. I mean no disrespect to the faculty of Asian and Latin descent, but I have real trouble with my colleagues' analogizing the experiences of Asians and Latinos to a group who were bought, sold, chained and separated from their families by force. And I am not alone. Michael Barone, a political historian and author of a recent bestseller entitled *The New Americans*, makes a similar

continued on the next page

Affirmative Action

continued from the previous page

and compelling case for analogizing the Asian experience to that of the Jewish experience of the early 20th century and the present Latino experience to that of the Italian experience of the same time frame. Discrimination, Barone argues, did exist for these groups—just not on the magnitude suffered by Blacks. He argues that treatment of Blacks was a uniquely shameful experience in American history and should be viewed as such.

Despite our differences, I am heartened by my colleagues' desire to discuss this topic and I hope it will go further. Currently two colleges have vehicles that, if they wish, could serve as a possible place for further discussion. Cañada has its Title V forums and CSM has its President's Lecture Series, Diverse By Design. Perhaps in the future these forums will invite those with a diversity of thought to speak. For instance, these forums could host several prominent local academicians such as Stanford's Shelby Steele and Thomas Sowell, and UC Berkeley's John McWhorter. Each of these men (of African American ancestry) brings a diverse, and as yet unrepresented, perspective to the table. I understand this suggestion has been made to Cañada's Title V program in the past—hopefully it (and they) will be welcomed.

Affirmative Action: A Brief Response to Roscelli

The authors of the article to which Paul Roscelli is responding would like to refer readers to our original article, which can be found at <http://aft1493.org/advo.html> (March 2002 issue). We believe that our original article adequately addresses the issues he raises in this one.

But we do concur with Roscelli that this important issue should be discussed at all campuses, perhaps via forums and speaker series. Let the dialogue continue...

In unity,

Karen Wong (Skyline English), Jen Helton (Cañada History), Rachel Bell (Skyline English), Derrick Williams (Cañada English), Sandra Nieto (Skyline Math), Jennifer Castello (Cañada ESL), James Carranza (CSM English), Jane McKenna (Cañada Librarian), Nancy Kaplan-Biegel (Skyline English), Jaunita Alunin, (CSM English)

CSM Faculty & Students Hear Noam Chomsky Discuss Aftermath of September 11

by Dave Danielson, CSM

On March 22, 2002 several College of San Mateo faculty members and students attended a talk by Noam Chomsky in Palo Alto. Professor Chomsky, an MIT linguist and long standing social/political critic gave a talk entitled "Looking into the Abyss."

Chomsky spoke on a range of topics focused upon September 11th and following. These topics included examining the definition of terrorism, exploring the history of terrorism and the United States, the role the media plays in portraying the events since September 11th, the Nuclear Posture Review and missile defense system, the US and world courtis decisions, and what the future holds regarding these topics.

Of these the most important, in my opinion, was the analysis of US media reporting and the lack of full comparison for comprehension. Chomsky began by asserting that the events of 9/11 were huge atrocities. (In other places he has said that this atrocity was probably the worst in the modern history outside of war.) How the events were reported and assessed outside of the US is very instructive and necessary for the citizens of the United States to understand.

The foreign press rightly condemned the attacks, yet many reminded their readers that others have also suffered from earlier terrorist attacks. Some of these attacks have come at the hands of the United States. He named Panama and Nicaragua as case examples. Another specific example of media issues concerned a newscast lauding the changes in Afghanistan following the end of the Taliban rule regarding the Afghan people being allowed to traditionally celebrate New Year. At the same time similar repression was stepped up in Turkey, a recipient of huge amounts of US military aid, against their Kurdish population. No news agency reported this discrepancy. (Since his talk it was reported in the Chronicle on 4/20/02 that Turkey will take over leadership of the peacekeepers in Afghanistan from Britain.) Chomsky argued that the selective reporting gives the people of the US an importantly distorted view of world events.

Anyone interested in reading a full version of my notes from the talk can find them on the union web site (AFT1493.org) by clicking on *The Advocate* link.

Space Allocation, Renovation and the Facilities Master Plan

John Searle, CSM Chapter Chair



John Searle

In the November 2001 *Advocate*, I reported on the Master Plan as it applied to the CSM science facilities. This article is an update, based on an interview with

CSM's Bob Loeffler, who is handling the job and responsibilities of Nancy Morrissette: a job going under the title of temporary Dean of Administrative Services. Presently the College is seeking a full-time replacement. Bob Loeffler's major role is orchestrating the CSM space allocation program in response to "The Bond". In brief, his job is to coordinate the elaborate game of musical chairs, where the players (programs) are known but the chairs (buildings) are subject to change on a daily basis.

In January of this year groups of faculty were assigned to a dozen different focus groups to decide on program and space needs. In the Sciences, the dean assigned one faculty per discipline to meet weekly. In February, a committee (similarly chosen) was assigned the job of interviewing architect companies for the job of designing the Science Building. The tAP company (architects of the original Master Plan) won the prize. Space allocation involves deciding which program moves into which new buildings. For example, Building 18 will be renovated so the displaced program and people (the first wave of refugees) will move into a modular portable village.

Bob Loeffler indicated that all the rooms and buildings at CSM are to be renovated using the Bond Money. The discussion of CSM program needs is scheduled to be completed by May 2002, when the architects go to work on the raw data (our requests). In the case of the Science Building, this will continue until October '02, building design to be completed by October '03, and building completion by November '05.

The future look of the CSM campus will include a newly reconfigured "main entrance" with buildings 5 & 6 renovated to house all the needs of the students, described as a "one stop shop" in the Facilities Master Plan. A second "North Campus Entrance" is anticipated to compete with this main entrance and will be integrated with the new Science Building situated on the hillside below building 18 and 19.

To create space for this North Campus Entrance and Car Park, Buildings 25, 26, 27 are planned for demolition. Obviously, science faculty (presently occupying 10, 11, 12) can't move until the new Science Building has been completed and ready for habitation (estimated date November 05). Faculty are told the Science Building has a \$21 million tag on it, a figure determined using a complex formula provided by the State Chancellor's Office that includes consideration of such factors as college size and age, student body demographics, etc. Unfortunately, using modern day values for square footage, our

perceived needs cost out at \$35 million. To stay on target time wise we have to par this value down to the allotted \$21 million by the end of May!! Bob Loeffler was uncertain whether that includes money for equipment and instrumentation. This author notes that the Board Report in July 01 identified moneys for CSM construction, and separately and specifically \$40 million GO Bond for Technology and Equipment.

There are some ongoing uncertainties. On March 18, buildings 21-23 were on the hit list for demolition; a day later, a focus group meeting decided instead to renovate them (for among other occupants, the nursing program). Although it has been decided that Occupational Technology and Communication (presently located in buildings 21-27) will be relocated to buildings 10-12, it is undecided whether these buildings (10-12) will be extensively renovated, or simply demolished and rebuilt, a decision to be based on a cost analysis. A new "Information and Technology Center" identified on the Master Plan to be located in the region of 20-23 is presently an unfunded dream.

I welcome an update from other focus groups: my worry is that all of the focus group planning is being done in isolation from one another.

Skyline's Tony Jackson: Standing Up for What He Believes

by Linda Vogel, Skyline

First they came for the Communists and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist.

Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew.

Then they came for the trade unions, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Catholics and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant.

Then they came for me, but by that time, no one was left to speak up.

—Pastor Martin Niemoeller,
Nazi Germany

Enter psychology professor Tony Jackson, frequently seen gliding swiftly and gracefully cross campus as he races to one of the many Skyline activities he supports.

I first had a chance to work with Tony through Title III. When we introduced ourselves with a descriptive phrase—something unusual about ourselves— Tony said, “I’m fearless.” That he may be, and it takes courage to fight for just causes, but he also has a warm, giving, caring, and committed side which is consistent with his life’s work.

“I was definitely inspired by my mother. I spent the first six years of my life in New Orleans, LA, but my mother had a dream of a better life for herself and her family, so she brought my brothers and me to South Central Los Angeles where she worked and went to school. I remember as a youngster in grade school saying, ‘My name’s Paul Jackson, and I love everyone.’ That attitude later changed as I had trouble accepting Caucasians because of the area I was living in and the police activities.”

With the support of family, he did well in school and sports, and went on to become the first of his family to go to college right after high school. He briefly considered the field of electronic engineering, but eventually decided on psychology at Cal State at Dominguez where he joined a research team and majored in applied psychology. That background led to California School of Professional Psychology where he continued his research on

what would become germane to his doctoral thesis: creating interventions for young black men who have a history of violence.

Now a full-time psychology instructor at Skyline for three years (after 6 years of part-time teaching at Skyline and 3 years at College of Notre Dame), Dr. Jackson says, “I want to help students think for themselves.”

However, teaching is but a small part of all he does. Another adage he shares is, “Don’t let school interfere with your education.” The variety of activities he cares

about reveals his interest in the psychological well being of the whole person.

He’s active as a campus recruiter and supporter of Afro-Americans, ASTEP mentor, and AASA—Afro-American student group—sponsor. Currently, he spearheads a program to help faculty and staff communicate and support cultural events. And he has just started working with the Athletic Scholarship Fund to help fund the education of deserving athletes. Tony works hard to bridge the gap between athletics and academics and believes faculty support for athletic events is getting better.

Then there are the political organizations he works with: the *October 22nd Committee* which serves to raise the level of awareness of police brutality and police murder as well as give support to victims of police violence, and *Refuse and Resist Organization* that fights against unjust criminalization laws. “More and more, I’m getting back to the community work I love.” Whether it’s on campus or in the community, Tony Jackson stands up for the right thing.



Tony Jackson

Part-Time Faculty Eligible for Unemployment Insurance Benefits

All Part-timers should remember that you are **eligible for unemployment compensation benefits over the summer break**, unless you are working another job over the summer and you are earning more than your unemployment grant would be. As soon as you give your last final exam, you should contact the local Employment Development Dept. (EDD) office and file a claim, or reactivate the one you have from last winter (if you applied between semesters). If it is a new claim, you will have a one-week waiting period before benefits start, so do not delay. You can also claim for the period between regular terms and summer school.

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 summer 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 fall or you will be disqualified. According to the Cervisi decision of the State Court of Appeals, part-timers, 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.

Have you checked out the award-winning AFT 1493 website?

AFT1493.org

- * Get the latest negotiations updates
- * Compare our contract & salaries to others throughout the state
- * Read the current & back-issues of The Advocate
- * Much more

AFT 1493 Calendar

AFT National Convention: July 14 -19, Hilton Hotel, Las Vegas, NV

CFT Union Leadership Institute (ULI): August 4 - 9, U. C. Santa Cruz:

For anyone interested in getting more active in the union, this is a fun and highly-regarded training opportunity to learn all about the union. Contact the union office at (650) 574-6491 if you are interested.

AFT 1493 Elections

As all members of AFT Local 1493 know, we are in the middle of the election process for determining who will be on the AFT Local 1493 Executive Committee for 2002-2004.

The election will be by secret mail ballot. All AFT members will receive their ballot in campus mail, with the ballots going out around May 13. Please remember that all ballots should be received in the AFT office at CSM (15-131) by May 31, 2002.

Please participate in the election of the leadership of your union!

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- 2 Greivance Report: Chancellor Denies Instructor Endangered**
- 4 - 7 What Faculty Are Saying About the State of Negotiations**
- 8 Affirmative Reaction: A Response to a Response**
- 9 CSM Faculty & Students Hear Noam Chomsky**
- 10 Space Allocation, Renovation & the Facilities Master Plan**
- 11 Skyline's Tony Jackson: Standing Up for What He Believes**