

PRESIDENTS' PERSPECTIVES

Budget issues heating up as May revise looms

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



With less than a month left of classes, budget issues are still simmering on the front burner, but until the May budget revise no one knows if we're going to get badly burned or if we'll remain on simmer until next year's budget crisis flares up. A letter writing campaign is in full swing, and if you haven't sent your letters or gotten your students involved yet, you can send a "form letter" in five minutes by going to: www.keepthedoorsopen.org

District budget planning

All three of our colleges have been asked by the District to design

contingency budgets in case there is a need for further deep cuts next year. AFT Co-President, Katharine Harer, sits on the Skyline College Budget Committee (CBC), a representative body that includes faculty from all divisions, managers, classified staff and student reps. Skyline's CBC has decided to recommend a one-time-only "fix" in order to come up with approximately \$600,000 in cuts. This "magic" plan

consists of paring and scraping funds from a wide spectrum of areas. The good news is that no staff will lose positions and no programs will be either downsized or eliminated in the process. After about 120 part-timers were sliced from the District rolls last year, Skyline's committee felt strongly about not making any more systemic cuts so that students would

continued on page 2

Counting administrators: Chancellor responds to questions

by Ron Galatolo, Chancellor, SMCCCD



(Advocate - April 2004).

It was disappointing to read Professor Suzuki's article entitled, "Why do we have so many administrators?"

Although I encourage an atmosphere that welcomes a candid exchange of opinions, the misinformation presented in his article undermines public support for our District - especially during this austere economic period where Legislators are making tough choices about our future.

Throughout these challenging

continued on page 6

We're in the red: Why our dues structure needs overhauling

When the annual AFT Local 1493 budget was constructed this year for the period of September, 2003 through August, 2004, it was discovered that we will be in the red by \$50,725 by the end of this period. Our financial difficulty is largely the result of the laying off of over 100 part-time faculty in this district, and the resulting loss of dues income for the Local. Our dues income decreased by 19.35% from the 2002-03 budget to the 2003-04 budget! Although we have instituted rigorous belt tightening and decreased our expenses by 4.35%, this is not close to enough to solve our financial problems. (See Table 1.)

Table 1 - Dues income down 19% after 100+ part timers are laid off

Year	Dues Income	% Dues Decrease	Total Income	Total Expenses	% Expense Decrease
'02-'03	\$394,744		\$450,649	\$446,285	
'03-'04	\$318,330	19.35%	\$376,127	\$426,852	4.35%

Our dues are low & inequitable

We have done an analysis of our dues structure compared to most of the other AFT community

college locals in the state in order to try to figure out how to deal with this budget deficit and we have realized that there is a more under-

continued on page 4

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- 3 84% of our full-timers hired from our part-time faculty
- 5 In memorium: Jerry Messner
- 7 Cañada College Academic Senate Report
- 8 What is a grievance and what is arbitration?

**San Mateo Community College
Federation of Teachers
AFT Local 1493, AFL-CIO**
1700 W. Hillsdale Blvd.
San Mateo, CA 94402
(650) 574-6491
aft1493.org

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

Ernie Rodriguez, Cañada, x 6785

Secretary

Kathleen Feinblum, Skyline, x 4477

Treasurer

Anita Fisher, CSM, x6383

Chapter Chairs

Chip Chandler, Skyline, x 4286
Teeka James, CSM, x6390
Yaping Li, CSM, x6338
Romelia Thiele, Cañada, x3211

Executive Committee Reps.

Nina Floro, Skyline, x 4414
Rick Hough, Skyline, x 4193
Anne Nicholls, Cañada, x 3293
Karen Olesen, Cañada, x 3415
John Searle, CSM, x6607

Part-timers Reps.

Victoria Clinton, CSM, x 6492
Jenny Saarloos, Skyline, x6889x9249

Chief Grievance Officer

John Kirk, CSM, x 6386

Executive Secretary

Dan Kaplan, x 6491
kaplan@smccd.net

PRESIDENTS' PERSPECTIVES

continued from page 1

not suffer any further losses in class sections and no part-time faculty positions would be expended. At CSM, the budget subcommittee of the College Council has been asked to draw up a worst case budget scenario, but they really haven't begun this process yet because of the numerous uncertainties that will be clarified by the May 15 revise. The problem, then, is that most faculty will be gone at the end of the semester. When will the budget decisions be made? And who will be making them?

The District Budget Committee has been busy evaluating new models for allocating funds to the three campuses. The model currently used is based on calculating a percentage of enrollment established *five years ago!* Skyline receives an inequitable amount of funding using this model, and the District appears to be open to changing the allocation system.

The hopeful news reported by Marty Hittelman, CFT Community College Council President, is that the latest word from Sacramento is that the state COLA is expected to be increased from 1.84 to 2.4%. This increase will obviously give our upcoming contract negotiations a bit more spark! We hope to begin negotiations in May, meet during the summer and, ideally, finish up in the fall. Look for AFT forums on your campus to discuss contract issues during the first part of the fall semester.

No cuts to retiree benefits

Just recently the EEOC announced a new ruling that gives employers in the public sector the legal option to stop paying retiree health benefits to new retirees. The argument is that when an employee reaches age 65, Medicare picks up the burden of providing benefits. Many employers in the private sector have opted to cutting retiree benefits as a way to save millions of dollars, and some school districts have also looked in this direction as a quick

solution to budget deficits. In fact, the majority of public school districts in the nation do not currently provide retiree health benefits. Our district has done the right thing up until now, and it is encouraging to note that the district's initial contract proposal does not include any cutbacks to retirees. Furthermore, we want to assure you that your union negotiating team will *not* be persuaded to go down this path. As faculty members we give a substantial piece of our lives to this district, and we deserve to look forward to retiring with a decent level of support from our employer. Period.

Bookstore decision imminent

Deliberations over whether to privatize our campus bookstores continue with plenty of input from faculty and student reps on the Bookstore Committee. On Thursday May 6th this committee will meet to make their recommendation on whether to go with Barnes & Noble, Follett, or to stay with our independent bookstores. This recommendation will then go to the District Shared Governance Council for approval and from there to the Board of Trustees. The AFT is officially part of the consensus-making process by which decisions are made at DSGC and we are 100% in favor of staying with our bookstores. We recognize that improvements are needed; we feel that the district must give the bookstore management the support they need in order to upgrade their services and facilities and, at the same time, to make our bookstores as cost-effective for students as possible.

AFT membership meetings

As many of you know, the Executive Committee of the AFT meets once a month, rotating meeting sites from campus to campus. We have always extended an open invitation to all faculty members, and we have benefited greatly from

continued on next page



84% of our new full-time faculty come from our own part-timers

In 2000-01, the San Mateo Community College District hired 25 new full-time faculty members. 21 of these new faculty hires (84%) came from the ranks of the part-time faculty within our District. In 2001-02, 15 of the 19 new full-time faculty members (79%) hired by the District came from within the ranks of the adjunct faculty already teaching in the District. In 2002-03, 16 of the District's 18 newly hired full-time faculty members (89%) had held part-time positions in the District.

In total, over the previous three years, the District's hiring committees have chosen 84% of their new full-time faculty colleagues from within the ranks of the District's part-time faculty! This is an impressive achievement in terms of the fair treatment of the part-time faculty who teach in this District. The faculty hiring committees, the Academic Senates, AFT, and the administration should all be credited with helping to produce these results in the last three rounds of full-time faculty hiring. □

Presidents' Perspectives

continued from previous page

those who have sat in on our meetings and participated in our discussions. In order to emphasize the message that our door is indeed open, we've decided to transform the official name of our meetings from EC to EC/General Membership Meeting. We are hoping that this change will encourage more of you to attend and participate. We are all either union members or agency fee payers. The union represents ALL of us. Let the AFT office (x6491) know if you'd like an email copy of the meeting agenda.

Sabbaticals announced

Finally, congratulations to Linda Vogel (English Dept., Skyline) and

A QUESTION TO PART-TIME FACULTY:

Are you happy with the "equalization of pay-checks" as implemented by the District last year?

Please respond by writing us at: kaplan@smccd.net or call us at the AFT Office at x6491.

"What do you think?" is a new Advocate feature: In each issue we'll ask faculty for input on a variety of significant issues. Please respond and let us know what you think! -ed.

Alert: Cost to buy STRS Credit to jump July 1

The cost to buy permissive service credit (PSC) will rise substantially on July 1, 2004 (by 68% if you are age 60 or over and by 13% if you are under 30). If you were planning or thinking about purchasing permissive service credit, you need to act soon.

Permissive Service credit is added to your regular earned service credit. It can be used to qualify for the career factor, one-year final compensation or the longevity bonus (e.g. with 30 years of service credit you receive an extra \$200/mo.). To be eligible to purchase PSC you need to be in the STRS Defined Benefit program and have performed certain non-CalSTRS activities, such as part-time or substitute teaching in California public schools, maternity or sabbatical leave, or certain active U.S. Military Service.

For more information, call the union office x6491. □

Elaine Burns (Counseling, CSM) for receiving sabbaticals for next year. Linda will be taking intensive Spanish language classes and carrying out fascinating research for a book project set in Costa Rica. Elaine will be working on learning communities. As always, plan ahead and you too could take some time away from classroom, office and meeting room to rejuvenate your teaching and your soul! □

It's time to vote for your union leaders... & maybe run for office yourself

As all members of AFT Local 1493 know, we are in the middle of the election process for determining the elected leadership of the Local and who will be on the AFT Local 1493 Executive Committee for 2004-2006.

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 Tuesday, June 1, 2004.**

Would you like to get involved in making some positive changes for faculty in this District? Have you ever considered taking an active role in the Union? If you are a member of the Union, it's not too late to run for a position in AFT 1493.

Union office entails various different kinds of tasks and responsibilities, ranging from representing the AFT at the negotiating table to working as a grievance officer, as well as doing organizing projects for the Local.

The Executive Committee conducts the business of the Union at its meetings, and makes recommendations regarding policy to the membership. If you are interested in taking an active role in the decision-making process for the Local, this is the place to do it! These meetings are open to all AFT members and all faculty are encouraged to attend and participate in the meetings.

During a two-year term as a member of the Executive Committee, a faculty member would have a good chance to develop or improve their leadership skills and become informed about many of the ins and outs of how our District is run. They would also have a chance to get to know a group of committed, concerned, and friendly people!

It takes many people to make this Union work well. Please consider running for a Union position, and together let's make this a better Union and a better place to teach and work. □

Our dues structure needs to be reformed

continued from page 1

lying problem. Our dues are one of the lowest of all AFT community college locals in the state and, because of a dues cap (which we will discuss below), our more senior faculty have not been paying an equitable share of dues for many years, while our newer faculty and part timers have been paying at a more reasonable rate. Based on our analysis, we have developed a proposal for restructuring our dues in a fair and simple way that will put the local back on a sustainable financial footing. In this article we'll briefly explain the history of our current dues structure and how this structure compares to other Locals around the state, and then we'll present our proposal for restructuring our dues.

AFT 1493 has not changed the dues rate for its members since the Fall 1998 change from a fixed rate system to a percentage system. The concept behind the percentage method assumes that as we achieve salary increases for our faculty (and we have been very successful at that!), we will be able to keep up with inflation because we will be receiving a percentage of a higher figure as salaries rise. The maximum dues paid by anyone in our local, however, is \$629.30 (\$62.93 tenthly) and it is among the lowest dues rates of all AFT community college locals around the state.

The cap means faculty income over \$50,000 is not assessed

The reason that our dues are low is that, although our salaries have certainly increased over time, any salary earned over \$50,000 is not assessed because there was a cap—set at \$50,000—on the amount of salary that is assessed. The reason for this cap goes back to the spring of 1997 when our membership voted to change our dues structure from a fixed rate (i.e. all full-time faculty paid the same dues amount, no matter where they were on the salary scale) to a percentage of salary, which is a fairer way to assess dues.

Beginning with the Fall 1998 semester, full-time faculty were assessed 1% of their gross salary (up to the \$50,000 cap) plus a pass-through amount. The pass-through is set by any dues increase the CFT or AFT approves at their Conventions. Part-time faculty paid dues at the rate of 1.2% of their gross salary. This percentage was set higher than for full-time faculty because the District was unable to create a two-column deduction system for part-timers to allow for both the base percentage and the pass-through. Part-time faculty are therefore not assessed a pass-through, but instead pay the higher rate of dues. There is also no cap set on the earnings of part-time faculty — all their earnings are subject to dues deductions.

The full-timers' cap was instituted because the change from a fixed rate to a percentage would have meant that

faculty near the top of the salary scale would have had a particularly large increase in dues. At the time, a relatively small percentage of faculty had salaries much over \$50,000, so the cap primarily protected those at the highest steps from having excessive jumps in their dues. Since then, of course, our salaries have increased to the point that virtually all full-time faculty (anyone above step 3) make over \$50,000 a year. In effect, this has meant that full-timers' dues are once again at a fixed rate for everyone from step 4 to the top of the scale.

Salaries have outpaced dues increases

Despite the cap, there have been some increases in full timers' dues each year because there have been annual increases in the pass-through amount, but these increases have not kept up with faculty salary increases. (See Table 2.) The Local has also incurred increased expenses. Over the last several years, the \$71,855.94 that AFT Local 1493 has spent in legal fees to defend the due process rights of faculty in this district has put quite a strain on our budget. We have also had significant increases in employee-related costs, such as a considerable rise in premiums for Workers' Compensation Insurance and Health Insurance.

Table 2: Dues increases compared to salary increases

Year	Maximum Dues	Pass-thru Increase	FT Dues Increase	FT Salary Increase	PT Salary Increase
1998-99	\$528.40				
1999-2000	\$541.20	\$12.80	2.4%	2.9%	3.33%
2000-01	\$560.30	\$19.10	3.5%	5%	5%
2001-02	\$580.60	\$20.30	3.6%	7%	*
2002-03	\$614.00	\$33.40	5.8%	3%	13.07%
2003-04	\$629.30	\$15.30	2.5%	3%	7%
'98/'99-'03/'04			17.8%	23.16%	30.66%

* distribution of parity funds provided by the State

In our analysis of the dues structure of AFT community college locals around the state, we have found that our dues rate is one of the lowest of all locals. Those paying fixed rates range from \$670 to \$977. Those paying percentages of gross salary range from 1% to 1.27%, and only one other local, Glendale CCD (AFT 2276), has a cap. One local, Los Angeles CCD, assesses a pass-through in addition to a 1% assessment, and no cap. We have also found that teachers in the nearby Sequoia Union High School District, who are in the CTA union, pay \$906 dues. So the cap has made our dues rate for full-time faculty—at 1% to a maximum of \$630—among the lowest in the state.

Full-timers should pay same rate as adjuncts

Our current dues structure is not only among the lowest in the state, but there is also an inherent unfairness in

continued on next page

In memorium: Jerry Messner

by Ken Kennedy, CSM

On March 23rd the district lost one of its most valued and important faculty members. Jerry Messner died while at work at Cañada College. Few individuals at any level in the history of our district have had as much impact and been as well known at all three colleges as Jerry. He began his career in the district at CSM and moved to Cañada at its opening. He spent the remainder of his storied career as a faculty member, administrator, and leader at Cañada, though he also served several terms as District Academic Senate President and served briefly at the district office. He will be mourned by all three colleges and the district office.

Jerry was first a peerless teacher and fine author. Throughout his career he succeeded with the widest range of students, never diluting his classes, but also never leaving the unprepared and unmotivated behind. His goal was always to inform and improve every student who came his way. As a faculty member he was also an innovator, creating courses which to this day are mainstays of the curriculum in English departments. Late in his career, as blindness struck him, he continued to innovate and challenge himself to the utmost by creating and teaching a class on great films. He never gave in to unhappy fate, but succeeded brilliantly with a class in this most visual of mediums.

Jerry was also a gifted and compassionate administrator. As the then Director of the Language Arts division he continued to be an innovator creating the "Found Time" program at Cañada College. We will remember his period

of division leadership as a "golden age" of drama and music at Cañada College. Impressive productions were presented regularly with great skill. Full orchestra concerts and yearly choral presentations were mainstays of college life. And through it all, Jerry assisted and guided the fine English language faculty through their great successes, never standing apart from the faculty, but as one of them.

Jerry was additionally one of the most important leaders in the history of the district senates. While always a strong union member, he concentrated his formidable leadership skill in the senate. He was the embodiment of the virtues he so ably encouraged in senators, virtues of cooperation, innovation, equality and collective governance. He served multiple terms as Cañada Senate President and District Academic Senate President. His skill working together with his colleagues on the faculties, administration, and board was legendary.

Finally, even at the end of his life Jerry was challenging the district and the college on issues of course assignment and treatment of the disabled. Typically, it was with good humor and cooperation that Jerry was assisting the union in bringing these issues to the fore.

We reserve the word "irreplaceable" for a select few who grace our lives and profession all too briefly. For all of his union brothers and sisters and indeed for all who work in our profession, Professor Gerald Messner was a true giant and deserves the appellation **irreplaceable**. Farewell to our friend and colleague.

Our dues need to be sustainable & equitable

continued from previous page

the current dues structure, since most full-timers are paying the same amount of dues regardless of income. By contrast, part-timers' dues have remained fair, simple and sustainable for the Local. They do not have a cap, nor do they pay a pass-through, but they are instead assessed at a slightly higher percentage of their income than are full-timers (1.2% instead of 1%).

A fair and simple way to restructure our full-timers' dues would be to have full-timers pay at the same rate as part-timers: eliminate the cap and the pass-through assessment, and set the dues rate for all AFT 1493 members (full-timers and part-timers) at 1.2% of their gross income. Examples of what the resulting annual dues would be at varying steps on the current full-time salary scale are outlined in Table 3.

This proposal was discussed most recently at the AFT 1493 Executive Committee (EC)/Membership meeting on Wednesday, April 28, 2004 and it will be on the agenda again for further discussion at the May 12 EC/Membership meeting (2:15 pm at Skyline, room 5131). We encourage any faculty who would like to express their opinions on this

Table 3: Full-timers' dues increase at 1.2%

<u>Salary Step</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Annual Dues at 1.2%</u>	<u>Monthly Increase at 1.2%</u>
6 w/M.A.	\$54,309	\$651.71	\$2.24
6 w/Ph.D.	\$61,522	\$738.26	\$10.90
10 w/M.A.	\$63,909	\$766.91	\$13.76
10 w/Ph.D.	\$71,126	\$853.51	\$22.42
15 w/M.A.	\$71,111	\$853.33	\$22.40
15 w/Ph.D.	\$78,327	\$939.92	\$31.06
20 w/M.A.	\$73,516	\$882.19	\$25.29
20 w/Ph.D.	\$80,732	\$968.78	\$33.95

proposal to attend the May 12 meeting. The EC has been supportive of this proposal, and it is expected that it will be submitted to the entire membership for a vote. This vote would most likely take place at the same time as the next contract ratification vote, which will probably be sometime early in the Fall semester. We would like to hear faculty opinions on this dues restructuring proposal. Please contact one of your campus AFT representatives, call the Local office at x6491 or email AFT 1493 Executive Secretary Dan Kaplan at: kaplan@smccd.net.

How many administrators? Chancellor responds*continued from page 1*

times, we must redirect the focus of our collective energy and intellect towards more productive means. To do so, however, we must begin with open communication that relies upon accurate, authentic and comparable information.

As stated many times, I have been determined to create and support an inclusive environment that values an open exchange of information and ideas. Accordingly, let me assert once again that I firmly believe in “shared information” through a variety of resources, including the newly-formed Budget and Finance Committee. Furthermore, I continue to strive for “accurate and to-the-point information,” such as that provided in the comprehensive mid-year report prepared in conjunction with the District’s tentative and final budgets. By the way, these reports are available online at our District website. I urge you to visit the website and carefully review the documents contained therein. Also, I suggest that you attend a Budget and Finance Committee meeting to personally assess the excellent work performed by that group. In other words, I recommend that all faculty and staff become actively involved as unbiased members of our team to fully understand all aspects of the issues facing us.

I believe that Professor Suzuki’s article would have revealed a very different outcome by comparing data between three-college districts – similar to ours. For example, using the identical data source (Fall 2003 Staff Data Report), Contra Costa – which is in close proximity to our District – would have shown 128 administrators (76 educational and 52 classified). Additionally, another three-college district, Los Rios, has 99 administrators (69 educational and 30 classified). By comparison, the total administrative count for our three-college district currently stands at 45 (32 educational and 13 classified).

Please note that to properly evaluate this information, it’s important to consider all administrative positions for two reasons: 1) although clearly defined by the State, there is no consistent or reliable manner in which administrators are distinguished between academic and classified levels at individual institutions (in Foothill-DeAnza’s case, their total administrative count is 74 – which is considerably higher than our total count of 45 noted above); and, more importantly, 2) districts often define academic managers as “supervisors” – in San Francisco’s situation, they have 66 “department heads” that serve in a management capacity, yet are grouped as “supervisors” and, therefore, are not included in the staff data report Professor Suzuki used for his analysis.

The above examples clearly demonstrate how the administrator-to-faculty ratio can be imprecise and inappropriately applied in a decision-making arena. Failure to correctly assess the data is fundamentally unfair

to faculty, staff and students. In a true act of shared governance, let’s work diligently together to obtain and evaluate the best data available and actively engage in strategic discussions. Together, we have the utmost capability to determine properly the staffing levels that are required to fulfill our mission of teaching and learning throughout our District.

Regarding administrative positions in the District Office, there are currently four positions that were eliminated and unfunded from our budget – there has been no “backfill” for these positions, nor is there any present initiative to replace these positions. Beginning in 2001, there was a conscious effort by me to streamline the administrative team in the District Office. That process was concluded with the removal of the final position (Director of Human Resources) in 2004. Accordingly, the four positions that have been eliminated are: 1) Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Planning; 2) Director of Business Services; 3) Director of Compensation and Employee Systems; and 4) Director of Human Resources.

I believe (and the data supports the notion) that our District is very lean administratively and our managers, similar to our faculty loads, are among the most productive in the State. Lastly, I’m convinced that we collectively desire a team of the highest quality – at all levels. Our students deserve and appreciate the first-rate education we provide them. Let’s continue to demonstrate to our students the excellence that results from intelligent, thorough research, lively and respectful discussions, informed decisions, and constructive, assured progress.

Some unanswered questions

We wish to sincerely thank Chancellor Galatolo for his willingness to discuss our District’s administrative load rate. We do not want to engage in a protracted debate on this issue, but unfortunately, the points made by the Chancellor do not adequately clarify the question of how our District’s ratio of administrators to faculty compares to other districts.

Chancellor Galatolo states that our District has 45 administrators (32 educational and 13 classified) while the state data—based on the District’s own reporting—shows 57.6 (47 educational and 10.6 classified). We’d like to know why there is such a discrepancy in these numbers. What were the 15 educational administrator positions that the district reported to the state that, according to the Chancellor, do not actually exist? And, conversely, we would like the Chancellor to clarify the 2.4 classified administrator positions that do exist but that were not reported to the state. (See data table below.)

Chancellor Galatolo suggests that we compare our administrative load rate with two other three-college districts—specifically the Contra Costa and Los Rios districts. This seems reasonable, except that the faculty union in the Contra Costa district has just released a study showing their administrative load rate is particularly low—8.0 faculty per administrator. (The Contra Costa union states: “The United Faculty continues to be gravely concerned about excessive spending for managers in our district.” Their study, released April 19,

continued on next page

One voice, one vote at Cañada

By Dick Claire, Cañada Academic Senate President and
Patty Dilko, Cañada Academic Senate Vice President

One voice, one vote, this year at Cañada has been the one for faculty to stand up and be counted. During the early weeks of Fall '03 the Governing Council surveyed the full Senate to determine priorities for the year. It became clear that increased participation in the Academic Senate and other shared governance bodies was a theme that ran through the many recommendations. The recommendations suggested that faculty were not just interested in sit and listen participation, rather they were asking for deliberative and meaningful participatory decision making. Hearing this, the Governing Council established the following initiatives:

- Develop outreach to faculty;
- Revision of faculty handbook;
- Revise the program review process, and implement the district-wide program improvement and discontinuance process;
- Academic Concern: Grade inflation, median grade reporting and the possibility of using our grading as a tool for curriculum and program assessment;
- By-laws revision and governance restructure;
- Faculty evaluation of Cañada administration;
- Academic Concern: Adoption of a new policy on plagiarism and cheating.

The initiatives as they were adopted were designed to

meet the demand for increased, meaningful participation. In turn the work that we have accomplished has been successful due to the dedication of the faculty members involved and an environment of mutual inquiry on shared governance bodies. With clear and present participation of faculty, the shared decision making processes, like budget and planning and strategic planning, have moved Cañada to a new level of excellence. Among other things, we hope to have the new policy on academic integrity, as well as the revised program review process, approved this semester for use in Fall 04!

These successes have not come without a cost attached. Imagine the demand on our faculty to participate on all of the committees that are necessary for productive shared governance. Currently there are 64 full time faculty at Cañada, and many of us are relatively new to our positions. This year 7 of us achieved tenure; another 17 are still in the tenure process. One of the tasks of ASGC was to clarify committees and committee responsibilities. We have disseminated a matrix of committee appointments to the divisions. It is our goal that each division will take up a discussion on committee participation in the coming year. With such a small group, our aim is to make each person's contribution meaningful.

We are looking forward to a new school year filled with fiscal challenges. Nothing that we can do can make them disappear. What we can do, however, is take responsibility for our part in shared decision making. Clearly the work of the Governing Council this year has gone a long way toward making that a reality.

Unanswered questions

continued from previous page

is available at: <http://www.ufcccd.org>). The Los Rios district's administrative load rate is much higher than ours at 14.3 faculty per administrator. Our district's administrative load rate is 9.7 faculty per administrator. (These rates are based on the total of both educational and classified administrators as suggested by Chancellor Galatolo. While the Chancellor just cites numbers of administra-

tors, we are concerned with the ratio of administrators to faculty.)

A more complete and clearer explanation is necessary to fully explain our district's administrator to faculty ratio. In an environment of budget cuts and serious losses of course offerings and staff positions, it's only reasonable that employees of the district have a full understanding of the number of administrators in our district as compared to faculty. That's all we are asking for.

-ed.

Fall 2003 Staff Data Report (from CCCC: <http://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/staff.cfm>)

District	<u>Educ.</u> <u>Admin.</u>	<u>Classified</u> <u>Admin.</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Admin.</u>	<u>Tenured &</u> <u>Ten. Track</u>	<u>Tempory</u> <u>(Part-time)</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Faculty FTE</u>	<u>Admin. Load</u> <u>Fac./Admin</u>
San Mateo	47.0	10.6	57.6	358.5	199.8	558.3	9.7
Los Rios	69.0	30.0	99.0	968.6	449.8	1418.4	14.3
Foothill-De Anza	45.3	29.0	74.3	539.2	425.7	964.9	13.0
Contra Costa	76.4	51.9	128.3	670.8	351.7	1022.5	8.0

FACULTY RIGHTS

What is a grievance and when does a grievance go to arbitration?

by John Kirk, AFT 1493 Grievance Chair

A grievance is an alleged violation of a specific section of the collective bargaining contract between the union and the district. When a faculty member approaches the union with a "grievance", the union rep. will carefully listen, take notes, and request documents before deciding whether there is indeed a violation of the contract. If a problem doesn't technically qualify as a grievance, a complaint can be filed which goes up the chain of command and ends with the Board of Trustees. Only a grievance can be taken to arbitration.

If the union rep. thinks the facts of the case support a grievance, the rep. attempts to resolve the grievance informally. If the issue is not resolved informally, the rep. prepares a written grievance with supporting documentation and files the grievance with the college president. The college president must hold a Level I hearing within 7 days of the filing date. The college president must respond with her decision in writing within 10 days of the hearing.

If the college president agrees with the grievance and grants the grievant their desired remedy, the grievance is resolved. If the college president denies the grievance, then the union can file an appeal to Level II and request a hearing with the Chancellor. The Chancellor must respond with his decision within 10 days of the Level II hearing.

If the Chancellor agrees and grants the grievant their desired remedy, the grievance is resolved. If the Chancellor denies the grievance, then the union must decide whether to file an appeal to Level III, Arbitration. The union is required by law to represent faculty in grievances. However, the union is not required by law to take each case to arbitration.

The reason the union is not required to take indi-

vidual cases to arbitration is the cost. The cost of an arbitration can be enormous. Included in the cost are attorney fees (preparation, hearing, post-hearing brief, phone calls, etc), one half the bill of the arbitrator (split with the district), and one half the cost of a court reporter and the cost of a transcript of the hearing.

If the union decides to take a case to arbitration, the union pays all of the costs. Our local union initially pays all of the costs but we are later reimbursed by our state (CFT) and national (AFT) organizations for two-thirds of the cost (in the form of

Defense Fund Grants).

How does the union decide whether to take a case to arbitration?

The first thing we do is send the entire grievance to our lawyer for his opinion. The lawyer will analyze the case and apply some standard criteria. What are the chances of winning the case? Does this particular case involve a section of the contract which has wider implications for the faculty at large? Will other present or future faculty members benefit if the grievance is won (or be hurt if the grievance is lost)? Will taking the case protect faculty jobs and/or faculty rights?

If a case is taken to arbitration and the arbitrator rules in favor of the faculty member, one hurdle remains. The final step (Level IV) of the grievance procedure is the Board of Trustees. We have what is known as *advisory* arbitration. The decision of the arbitrator is advisory to the Board of Trustees and is not binding. However, in all of the arbitrations during the past twenty years, only once did the Board of Trustees overrule an arbitrator and in that case only a part of the decision was overturned.

In our negotiations proposals currently before the Board, we have included an item to change the contract to include *binding* arbitration.



Part timers are eligible for unemployment 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 sum-

mer 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). Please call the AFT at x6491 for an explanation of the steps you need to follow to qualify. This is your right, not charity.