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counter productive in chaotic times such as ours.
Certainly there is an economic crisis. Although community colleges fared remarkably well in the 2008-09 budget, the future looks grim. Reductions in state revenues and property taxes are pushing the state further into the red. Each update from Sacramento adds a few billion more to the state deficit. We are unlikely to see COLA for several years. Everywhere belts are tightening. Our faculty knows this and we are all willing to bear a share of the burden. However, we want to act as a community, with shared concerns and shared decision making. We do not want a return to the MacDougall era of trickle down democracy. Dr. Serban has made laudable efforts to reach out and build collaborative effort to chart our course and to fairly allocate our limited resources. These next few years will be difficult. If we do not work together as a community, they will be dangerous. We risk losing our greatest asset: our goodwill.

Lynne Elisabeth Stark
President, SBCC Instructors’ Association

A Warning Bell

I t has been a challenging year to be a new president. Barack Obama and Andrew Serban have my sympathy. I have found it stressful myself. Hard times call for flexibility and innovation, for alliances and true bi-partisanship. We are in this together.

In reality, economic pressures can create a sense of community or they can polarize interest groups and create conflict. We have seen some of both. Our recent decision to join hands with FACCC and create a stronger statewide presence is a heartening example of community action. However, on our own campus, there is the not so faint sound of a warning bell.

In mid-March, two meetings were held at the request of Dr. Serban: a joint meeting with CPC and the Academic Senate, and a pre-negotiation session with the representatives of the employee groups: IA, CSEA, and management. Although the agendas were somewhat different, the tenor of the two meetings was remarkably similar. In the meeting with the negotiators, Dr. Serban handed out a few now familiar budget analyses. She has repeatedly emphasized the decrease in our reserves and the increase in salaries, benefits, and fixed costs over the last eight years. Dr. Serban is a “numbers” person and we know, of course, that numbers do not lie. They can, however, be manipulated. She has emphasized that salaries, benefits and fixed costs (like utilities and insurance) have grown from 83% of our revenues in 2001 to 90% of our revenues as of 2008. This is true but misleading. There is no steady growth, no pattern. If you choose the years 2002 to 2007, the same expenses have actually dropped from 89% to 83% of our revenues! And if you average every three years, there has been very little change. To try and stabilize these fluctuations, she is proposing that salaries now be determined by a formula. She would not share any details of the proposed formula nor would she address the issue of our reserves, even when asked several times what she would consider to be an “acceptable” level of reserves. This will be a central concern in the upcoming negotiations. It is for times such as these that we have reserves and we should be confronting the question now: how much is “enough”?

In the meeting with the Senate and CPC, she reiterated the need to link planning to budgeting. As part of her plan, she wants to “rank resources” and centralize some decisions that have thus far been left up to the discretion of the individual deans and their divisions (e.g. the management of funds for instructional equipment.) Dr. Serban was humoristic and articulate. She had her trademark chocolates to soften the hard edge of her proposals. However, at both these meetings the tension in the room was palpable and the response from faculty and staff was chilly at best. It is important that our new president has little tolerance for uncertainty. She has an affinity for “master plans” and she is striving to create an order and a predictability that is elusive and quite possibly
Independent Statewide: Report on CCCI

May 7-9 brings yet another CCCI confab in Sacramento. As many of you are already aware California Community College Independents is our primary link to other Independent CC faculty bargaining units, as well as other CC organizations statewide. Twice yearly we meet to share insights, strategies, and to develop positions to be carried to the Chancellor’s Consultation Council and to our legislative representatives. The meeting in May will have much on the table.

First, your IA representatives – Lynne Stark, Cornelia Alsheimer, and Tom Garey – will proudly take to Sacramento the news of your vote of confidence to join FACC as organizational members. Last fall, CCCI voted a resolution endorsing FACC’s mission and supporting efforts to increase FACC membership among all the CCCI faculty. Your vote has answered that call for a strengthened voice of community college advocacy. In doing so, SBCC faculty join our colleagues at Santa Monica College and Foothill/DeAnza as organizational contract members providing leadership in supporting FACC’s advocacy for us all.

Issues to be considered at the conference are many: The State Budget has dominated discussions statewide. Of primary interest to CCCI delegates will be the impact of budget changes on college faculty and students, and of course, negotiations. But the cuts are not the only concern, apportionment deferrals, and the additional budget disruptions that may result from the special election of May 19. In that election key initiatives required by the recently agreed to state budget compromise will be voted on. Failure of one or more of these initiatives may set the entire state budget process back to “square one.”

CCCI delegates will discuss the possible merger between CFT/CCC and CTA/CCA with representatives from both organizations. If consummated, such a merger will significantly affect the landscape of faculty advocacy statewide and bears close monitoring.

Relations between Academic Senates and faculty bargaining units will also be on the agenda. With our “thin” contract and reliance on a cooperative relationship with our own Senate, the SBCC IA is a leader in this area and our delegates will look to contributing much to this discussion.

Accreditation has emerged as a “hot button” issue among college faculty across the state since a recent report emerged revealing that AACJC, the accreditation body for California Community Colleges had sanctioned 41 of California’s 110 community colleges over the last five years. This sanction rate of 37% compares to a rate of less than 2% nationally among all the other accreditation regions. In addition, local faculty bargaining units are reporting instances of college administrations using the fear of accreditation sanction to bypass shared governance and abrogate collective bargaining rights. More importantly, may faculty share a widespread and growing concern that accreditation seems to have become more, “about being punitive retribution or personal agendas…” than, “…about good or effective teaching…[and]…what is in the best interest to serve students.” Along with our guests from CFT and CTA, CCCI delegates will consider strategy, tactics, and bargaining implications of this newly aggressive approach to accreditation that at least one CCCI unit president has described as “a dangerous situation.”

SBCC will send a representative to provide an updated report on the impact the current recession has had on the fiscal condition of the retirement system. And FACC director Jonathan Lightman will bring the very latest update on current budget and legislative issues.

All in all, this should be an interesting weekend. Reports will follow.

Tom Garey
CCCI Liaison, Instructors’ Association

FACC Report

Thank you, SBCC faculty, for voting overwhelmingly to approve a contract membership with the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges! Our contract membership serves two very important purposes.

First, it strengthens FACC’s voice in Sacramento. We—all community college faculty—need that voice heard. The California community college system is the largest system of higher education in the world, serving well over 1.2 million students. Yet, the community college system is funded well below the level it needs to operate effectively. There are four educational systems in California (UC, CSU, CC, and K-12), and we are funded at the lowest rate. Do you ever wonder why you feel as if there not enough hours in the day, not enough days in the week, not enough weeks in the year to do your job the way you would really like to do it? Community college faculty are asked—indeed, the entire community college system is asked—to do a disproportionate share of the work involved. Why? Historically, we have been vastly underfunded, and, unfortunately, this trend continues. We need to change that. And one way we change that is to educate our elected representatives, so that our needs are proportionate to the real needs of California. Who educates 1.2 million students a year? We do.

Second, our collective membership provides further legitimacy to FACC’s voice, and our monthly dues provide them with further resources to be more effective. The second purpose of our contract membership is to individualize it for the needs of SBCC faculty. Do we need a workshop-to-go on retirement and benefits? Or a symposium on part-time faculty? Do we need further research on community colleges? These are just a few examples of what type of information we might need that will better help us do our jobs. As always, FACC’s website is a clearinghouse of information. As we move closer to the May Revise (when legislators need to hear from their constituents), faculty will need to conduct a massive letter writing campaign, and we will once again be able to go to the Point-and-Click Letter Writing Campaign link on the FACC website for templates and current information. Our new contract is a step forward. We all SBCC faculty, will determine its success.

Homer Arrington
Region E Governor, FACC

A Call for Nominations!

The SBCC Instructors’ Association will be holding its annual election from May 1 to May 11, 2009. There will be six positions up for re-election. Three full-time faculty representatives will be elected, one adjunct faculty representative will be elected, and one position is open to either adjunct or contract faculty. If you are interested in running for a position on the IA Executive Board, please notify the IA president or any member of the IA Executive Board as soon as possible. Interested candidates will be asked to submit a very brief candidate’s statement by Monday, April 27.

DID YOU KNOW?

As of last fall, each department should have developed procedures for the approach it wants to take in hiring adjunct instructors. If your department has not done so, a default policy agreed upon by the Executive Vice President, Educational Programs and the President of the Instructors’ Association will be applied.

The heart of the issue is to be found in section 12.3 of our present contract dealing with reassignment rights: “If two or more applicants meet...specified standards and possess the experience and skills best suited to teach the course(s) or assignments that are available, priority will be given to the adjunct instructor with the greatest amount of seniority in teaching courses or providing the student support services for the department, up to the number of TLUs or class sections the adjunct faculty member has taught or has provided student support services in the same term in the prior year.” It is your right to request a copy of your department procedures and to ascertain whether your course load and assignment is in congruence with these procedures.

Jan Ford
Adjunct Faculty Representative, Instructors’ Association