

Updated UF Contract Now On-Line

The version of the UF Contract available on the District and UF websites is now up-to-date, including all the changes from past agreements. You may download the contract with all appendices as a PDF to keep on your computer at www.uf4cd.org. For a printed hard-copy of the contract, please contact Terri in the UF office at uf@uf4cd.org.

As a reminder, last year's agreement included a number of new forms in Appendix PT for use in soliciting scheduling preferences from part-time faculty with staffing preference and for communicating with faculty who lose staffing preference or can't be offered their historical load. If you have questions about how or when to use these new forms, please contact the UF at 925-680-1771.

Part-Time Handbook Now Available

A second edition of the UF's Part-Time Handbook is now available on-line as a PDF from the UF website: www.uf4cd.org. For a hard-copy of the Handbook, please email Terri at uf@uf4cd.org or call 925-680-1771. The Handbook is a comprehensive guide for part-time faculty and includes a wealth of useful material on subjects ranging from salary and office hours to benefits and unemployment.

Open Spot for Part-Time E-Board Rep from DVC

Nominations are now open for a part-time faculty representative to the United Faculty Executive Board from DVC. Any current DVC part-timer may apply by submitting a completed nomination form (available on the UF website at www.uf4cd.org). The UF E-Board meets every other Thursday, usually at DVC, from 2:15-5pm. There is a small stipend, \$150/month, paid to part-time representatives. If you have questions about serving on the E-Board, please contact Glenn or Jeff at the UF Office: 925-680-1771.

Know Your Contract: Applying for PT Staffing Preference

Article 25 of the UF Contract spells out all the requirements, responsibilities and benefits of part-time staffing preference in CCCC. Some of these benefits are new (like a permanent parking sticker). It is worth reading the whole article, available on-line at www.uf4cd.org. At its core, the article says that faculty with staffing preference have a right to be offered their historical load each semester before classes can be offered to part-time faculty without staffing preference. This is not total job security nor any form of tenure, but it is an excellent benefit and some stability for established part-timers in case of cutbacks.

Note, however, that *you must apply for this benefit to receive it*. If you have taught for more than seven semesters and if your most recent evaluation meets the required standards, you may qualify for staffing preference. Qualifying the first time, however, is not automatic. You must complete an application. The form is available on the UF website. You may submit a completed application form to your area dean any time after your 7th-semester evaluation. Once you have staffing preference, you don't need to reapply, but you do need to re-qualify with every subsequent evaluation.

President's Message

Greetings colleagues, and Happy New Year! Now all we need to get the year started is some serious rain. On a more positive note, we seem to be at the start of an economic recovery that should be good for our colleges, but we still have plenty of work to do. At the end of last semester, UF Executive Director Jeffrey Michels and I made the rounds of local legislators, pressing for more funding per-student for community colleges and talking about the need for accreditation reform. Michels will be serving on a panel at the FACCC Policy Forum this coming Friday, January 24, 10:30am, at De Anza College, along with the President of CCSF's union and the San Francisco Deputy City Attorney on "The Escalating Fight Over Accreditation." Details are on the UF and FACCC websites.

Our ongoing work with the Bay Faculty Association, Community College Independents (CCCI), and FACCC has helped us to compare contracts, benefits, salary schedules, even union dues. I thought you might like to see the chart below, put together by the union leadership at Chabot-Las Positas. As we consider adding the cost of a FACCC membership to our dues (as Foothill, Santa Rosa and others have already done), it's nice to see we're still one of the most reasonably priced unions around.

District	Full-Time Dues	Part-Time Dues
Allan Hancock	0.5% of gross	0.5% of gross
Cerritos	\$93.98/month	\$21.92/month
Chabot-Las Positas	\$47/month plus \$2/month to PAC	\$12/month
Cabrillo	1.17% of gross	1.17% of gross
Contra Costa	0.55% of gross (overload paid at Part time rate) plus \$2.50/month to PAC	0.35% of gross plus \$0.42/month to PAC
Foothill-DeAnza	0.60% of gross	0.45% of gross
Marin	\$118.14/month	Not confirmed.
Ohlone	\$360/year	\$20/year
Peralta	1.61% of gross	Varies by assignment.
San Jose	1.4% of gross	1.4% of gross
San Mateo	1.2% of gross	1.2% of gross
San Francisco	1.26% of gross	1.26% of gross
Santa Rosa	0.74% of gross	0.74% of gross
West Valley Mission	1% of gross	0.5% of gross

Of course, for current FACCC members (the majority of our full-time faculty), the contract membership will be a savings, not an added expense.

The next *Table Talk* will compare salaries in the Bay 10. Variations in how districts compensate make determining our ranking a challenge. Also, several Bay 10 districts are now "basic aid." This means they get apportionment from local taxes, not from the State, so comparing ourselves to them may be less useful than it once was. One possibility this year will be for us to negotiate a different cohort so we can better compare spending and salaries in similar districts.

United Faculty Executive Board Members

<u>Contra Costa College</u>	<u>Los Medanos College</u>
Vern Cromartie	Milton Clarke
Beth Goehring	Michael Zilber (Vice Pres.)
Jeffrey Michels (Vice Pres.)	Luis Morales
Aminta Mickles	Ursula Velonis (PT Rep)
Rachel Dwiggins-Beeler (PT Rep)	

Diablo Valley College

Bob Abele	Jason Mayfield
Glenn Appell (President)	Lisa Orta
Deborah Dahl-Shanks (PT Rep)	Bruce Koller
Doug Dildine (PT Faculty Advocate)	Donna Wapner
Katrina Keating (Treasurer)	(Vice Pres.)
Marina Crouse	

UNITED FACULTY OFFICE

Terri Adame, Office Administrator
Glenn Appell, President; Jeff Michels, Executive Director
(925) 685-1230 x2502 or 680-1771 fax (925) 680-7283
email: uf@uf4cd.org web site: www.uf4cd.org
(Email Glenn Appell at gappell@sbcglobal.net)



Table Talk

The Newsletter of the United Faculty of
Contra Costa Community College District

January 24, 2014

News at a Glance

- UF Plans a Vote on Contract Membership with FACCC
- Governor's Budget Proposal Highlights Need for Advocacy
- Negotiations Set to Begin January 31
- Answers to Frequently Asked Questions about Negotiations
- Updated UF Contract and Appendices Now On-Line
- Part-Time Handbook Now Available
- Open Spot for Part-Time E-Board Representative from DVC
- Know Your Contract: Applying for PT Staffing Preference
- President's Message: Bay 10 and Other Comparisons

UF Plans a Vote on FACCC Contract Membership

As state budget talks begin again, with many issues on the table affecting faculty (from the STRS contribution rate to "COLA catch-up"), the UF is moving forward with plans to strengthen our relationship with the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC). The plan is to hold an electronic vote (with details and instructions still delivered in hard-copy to campus mailboxes) asking members to approve an annual contract with FACCC, paid for by tax-deductible payroll deductions of \$13.50/month for full-timers and \$4.50/month for part-timers. (Note that this would lower monthly costs for current FACCC members.) A full description of the FACCC contract plan is on-line at www.uf4cd.org. We have also scheduled the meetings listed above for more discussion.

More Meetings Scheduled to Discuss UF Contract Membership with FACCC

**CCC: Monday, Feb. 3,
1-2pm, LA-112**

**LMC: Tuesday, Feb. 4,
4-5pm, L-109**

**DVC: Wednesday, Feb. 5,
2-3pm, L-151**

**SRC: Tuesday, Feb. 11,
3-4pm, W-204**

Vote on FACCC Contract Scheduled Feb. 3-13

Governor's Budget Proposal Highlights Need for Advocacy

Governor Brown released his proposed 2014-2015 budget on January 9, 2014, projecting substantial surpluses in California and claiming that education and paying down prior-year debts are his top priorities. After years of cuts, new money is certainly welcome news (thanks mainly to Proposition 30 revenues and the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee for education), but there are still huge areas of concern and much work to be done for education advocates as the legislature begins to debate the details in the coming weeks and months. (The next official step is usually the "May Revise.")

In the budget and throughout Sacramento, there continues to be substantial talk about changing the way community colleges are funded. The Governor says his “long-term plan” is to move the funding of higher education away from being based on enrollment to instead be based on “critical outcomes,” such as “affordabilities, timely completion rates, and quality programs.” He says educators must “work together to develop innovative and ambitious approaches” to funding, aimed at improving student completion.

Clearly, the funding mechanism for community colleges is broken. When the economy weakens, student demand increases as people look to our colleges for retraining, but funding tends to decrease, as we saw in the recent recession. When the economy improves, as it is doing now, enrollment begins to decline, but since funding is based on enrollments, we wind up scrambling to capture “growth” dollars rather than improving services or recovering from prior-year cuts. A more stable funding model would be in everyone’s interests, but we know there is no easy solution (and some of the seemingly simplest proposals, like funding FTES based on completion, would likely cause even more problems than our current model).

Because of recent cuts and because enrollments tend to fluctuate with the economy, we had been hoping the Governor would propose to increase per-student funding rather than mainly funding additional growth, but the proposed budget is a mixed bag. For community colleges, Brown proposes to fund the statutory cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) at 0.86%, but he does not propose to add any additional COLA catch-up, as the State Chancellor’s Office had requested, to make up for past years where we did not receive COLAs. The Governor also proposes to provide a 3% funding increase for growth/enrollment restoration, to be allocated based on a formula yet to be determined that will direct the funds to districts with the “greatest unmet need.”

Brown proposes a huge expenditure (\$592.4 million -- nearly four times the cost of the 3% growth allocation) to eliminate statutory cash deferrals. This does not allow the colleges to spend any more money, though it will certainly help districts that have struggled with borrowing and cash-flow problems (which does not describe CCCCD).

Additionally, the Governor’s budget allocates substantial new, ongoing money for “student success” and to support “underrepresented student groups.” What this means exactly, and how the money would be allocated or could be spent is as yet unclear. There is also one-time money proposed for maintenance and instructional equipment.

A few notable pieces are missing from the budget. There is some mention of categorical programs and increased flexibility for districts, but prior-year cuts to key categoricals, including part-time office hours and the equity fund are not restored. There is no change, yet, to the State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) contribution, though the Governor does propose talks to begin addressing a perceived need for higher contribution rates. And of course, while there is no increase in student fees, the Governor does not propose lowering them either.

In short, the Governor’s budget proposal is a complicated first step in what will be a long debate over how new money should come to our

colleges and who should decide how best to spend it. In this process, the UF will be joining FACCC, CCCI and other groups in lobbying for additional COLA dollars (or other increases to per-student funding that allow us flexibility to meet local needs) and for restoration of categoricals (including EOPS, DSPS, part-time office hours and equity).

In the next couple of weeks, we will be helping to initiate a letter-writing campaign to inform the legislature of the need to support existing student-success programs (as established by existing categoricals). For the fastest updates, please join the UF’s Facebook Page at www.facebook.com/UnitedFacultyofContraCostaCCD.

UF/CCCCD Negotiations to Begin January 31

The UF and CCCCD have agreed to begin negotiations for 2014/2015 on January 31. Although we have not yet officially opened (or “sunshined”) any new articles of the contract (as must be done before the District Governing Board), we have a number of carry-over issues from previous years and “automatic re-openers” that will be the focus of our first meeting. These include STRS reporting for part-time faculty (the number of hours the District reports for each assignment type, which needs to be established in our contract); and several pilot programs from past-years’ negotiations: sick-leave donation for part-time faculty; catastrophic family leave; and on-line office hours. These pilot programs were extended by last year’s agreement, but now need to be made permanent in the contract. We will also be following up on the salary formula negotiated last year, though we likely will not have needed details from the State budget until after the May Revise. So the first meeting is likely to be mostly “housekeeping,” with nothing too controversial or difficult (we hope) on the agenda.

In February, both sides will likely open new articles (by agreement, we are each able to choose two articles to open and negotiate this year), and then we expect talks over more difficult equity issues to begin. Of particular note are anticipated discussions of lecture/lab loads, as well as compensation formulas and release time for department chairs, program leads, and others, like coaches, who put in substantial extra time working with students outside of class. In all of these areas, the UF has been looking at best practices in other districts and seeking the most equitable models. The biggest challenge in negotiations, we expect, will probably be financial. Addressing equity issues is a key priority of the UF, but so too are competitive salaries and protecting our benefits. In the coming weeks, we will be looking for more faculty input on how best to balance our priorities, even as we press the District to find creative ways to invest in equity.

Many equity issues, of course, are clearly linked to student success. Part-time office hours may be the most obvious example, since students have much better access to some faculty outside of class than others, and this could be substantially improved by simply expanding opportunities for part-timers to hold compensated office hours. But even load and release-time issues affect students directly by determining how much time faculty can devote to each student or project. We hope that if the final State budget does include money earmarked for student success, some will go to these priorities. Hiring more full-time faculty (including counselors) remains a high priority as well.

Answers to Frequently Asked Questions about Negotiations

Why does the UF negotiate with the District every year? Can’t we sign multi-year agreements?

We *do* sign multi-year agreements, and the whole contract only re-opens every three years, but we have agreed that each side may open two articles each year (plus compensation). We have found that smaller, more focused negotiations each spring on four articles rather than the whole contract makes it easier to reach agreements without getting stuck. Some districts spend years negotiating three-year agreements, often retroactively, but this makes it harder to solve problems and too often leads to impasse. Our system allows us make improvements every year and to adjust as needed (even gradually, with “pilot programs,” or with temporary measures, such as when we expanded benefits eligibility for part-time faculty during a year when many lost sections due to funding cuts). This may *seem* distracting, since we need to negotiate (and faculty need to evaluate) a new agreement every year, but we think it’s a lot less distracting and a more effective way to advance our priorities than the alternatives (drawn-out battles with huge retroactive agreements).

Does the UF really fight for faculty rights? Doesn’t “interest-based-bargaining” (IBB) mean everyone is supposed to get along so the UF just takes whatever the District offers?

IBB is just a tool we have chosen, a framework for organizing negotiations with a mediator so that the process feels less like a contest and more like problem-solving. It does not restrict us from seeking the best deal possible or from aggressively representing faculty interests. We may not often use the language of “battle” or stake out stark positions the way one might in more adversarial bargaining, but we don’t back down either. We challenge District assumptions, check facts, argue over priorities, reject some narratives and advance others; we do everything we can to improve working conditions, salaries and benefits. Some of our biggest fights, of course, never get reported in *Table Talk*. Many involve specific personnel and are confidential. Sometimes, we think reporting on disagreements may undermine our effectiveness at the table. But we never let any tool, including IBB, prevent us from fighting for faculty.

Who negotiates for the UF? Do we use a professional negotiator?

Our negotiating team includes current and retired faculty leaders with many years of experience in collective bargaining. To this core, we add subject-area specialists, making sure also that our core constituencies from each college are represented. We *do* hire professionals as we need them. This has included, in the past couple of years, two benefits consultants and an attorney. We also have a lawyer on retainer who often reviews our agreements and helps with negotiations.

Whatever happened to “top third of the Bay 10”? How do our salaries compare to other districts?

Our next *Table Talk* will be full of comparison charts, and we are working with our UF/CCCCD Compensation Committee to prepare some comparisons for the District Board. But the short answer is that our salaries are still too low. See the President’s Message in this issue of *Table Talk* for more on this subject.