

## **AFA GENERAL MEETING MINUTES**

October 26, 2011

*(Approved by the Executive Council on 11/9/11)*

Executive Councilors present (noted by \*):

*Warren Ruud, <i>presiding</i>	*Cheryl Dunn	*Andre Larue	*Mary Pierce
Paulette Bell	*Terry Ehret	*Reneé Lo Pilato	*Audrey Spall
Paula Burks	*Brenda Flyswithawks	*Sean Martin	*Mike Starkey
*Ted Crowell	*Karen Frindell Teuscher	*Dan Munton	*Julie Thompson
*Dianne Davis	Lynn Harenberg-Miller	*Margaret Pennington	

Officers/Negotiators present: Will Baty, Ann Herbst, Jack Wegman  
Faculty present: Nancy Persons, Karen Stanley, Jerry Thao  
Guests present: Rich Hansen (President, [Foothill De Anza Faculty Association](#) (FHDAFA); Secretary, [Faculty Association of California Community Colleges](#) (FACCC); President, [California Community College Independents](#) (CCCI); President, Bay Faculty Association (BFA); and Member, [California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force](#))  
Staff present: Judith Bernstein, Candy Shell

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. in Doyle Library, Room #4246, Santa Rosa campus.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. [FACCC Contract Membership](#). Warren introduced Rich Hansen, former president and current secretary of FACCC, who was invited to speak to the Council and answer questions about the following three topics: FACCC contract membership; the Student Success Task Force Draft Recommendations; and CCCI's recently hired statewide advocate. Rich began by providing the Council with background information including a brief history of the [Foothill De Anza Faculty Association's](#) (FHDAFA) involvement in statewide advocacy and its relationship with FACCC, CCCI, and BFA.
  - A. Background Information: FHDAFA has been actively involved statewide since Cy Gulassa became its president and worked actively to get various provisions benefitting community colleges into law. The end result was AB 1725, which was the legislation that separated community colleges (CCs) from K-12 (except for funding) and linked them to higher education (CSUs and UCs); set up the "10+1" areas of responsibility for academic senates; established the masters degree as the minimum qualifications necessary for CC faculty (previously a K-14 certificate was the minimum); instituted program-based funding; and established the goal of a 75/25 ratio of full-time to part-time faculty as a statewide standard. Initially, the State funded positions whenever there was enough money in the budget to help districts hire more full-time faculty because they weren't sufficiently high enough in their percentages. Cy Gulassa also organized CCCI, which currently is comprised of 13 member organizations (including AFA). FHDAFA is CCCI's largest member, followed by Contra Costa and West Valley/Mission. Cy Gulassa also set

up the Bay Faculty Association (BFA). BFA members, including independent and CFT-affiliated faculty organizations, meet monthly to talk about negotiation issues and share solutions to their common problems. Rich encouraged interested Councilors to join Warren in attending BFA meetings, which provide a valuable learning experience.

#### B. [FACCC Contract Membership](#).

- **History:** FHDA was the second CC to become a contract member of FACCC. (Santa Monica College was the first and Santa Barbara City College is the third.) FHDAFA has always maintained a close relationship with FACCC—something that not every district does. FACCC was originally set up as a joint administration/faculty organization, before reorganizing to become a faculty-only organization. Contract membership provides member associations with immediate access to FACCC's Jonathan Lightman and Andrea York for assistance with problems. Rich told the following anecdote to illustrate the value of that assistance and the high regard in which FACCC is held at the state level. Throughout the last decade, the [California Community College Chancellor's Office](#) (CCCCO) and its [Board of Governors](#) (BOG) rely on FACCC and Jonathan Lightman for input and assistance.
- **[FACCC Board of Governors](#):** FHDAFA has always worked hard to elect one or more people to serve on the FACCC Board of Governors, which includes faculty representatives from CTA- and CFT-affiliated CCs, and from CCCI-member CC's. For AFA, it would be important to have a seat on the Board, because it helps the organization and faculty to stay informed and gives them a greater voice at the state level. If SRJC becomes a FACCC contract member, AFA would need to run at least one candidate for the Board. If that candidate doesn't win, FACCC would backfill an SRJC-designated seat on the Board for a year to make sure that the SRJC faculty is represented. Serving on the Board allows one to learn a great deal about how the (very complex) statewide system works.
- **[FACCC Staff](#):** With the prospect of an increasing number of schools entering into contract memberships with FACCC, FHDAFA would like to see FACCC hire an additional staff person specifically focused on research. FACCC has a policy committee; but, if FACCC could generate its own research data, it would take the lead in being the primary source of information for CCs in Sacramento.
- **FACCC Advocacy:** If a CC has many individual members of FACCC, it makes sense for the college to become a contract member. FACCC lobbies and pursues the interests of CC faculty, and is focused on making the CC faculty voice heard at the state level. No one has the advocacy program that FACCC has. Every other group is diverted by K-12 or other interests. The contract member relationship of independents with FACCC serves to strengthen FACCC in addition to strengthening the local independents. Sometimes, the independents want to hang back and take care of their own local issues; however, the present era demonstrates how important those statewide activities are.

#### C. [Student Success Task Force \(SSTF\) Draft Recommendations](#).

- **SSTF Charge and Positions:** The charge of the [task force](#) is outlined in [SB 1143](#). The SSTF is focused on an outcome-based model of success. (Rich commented that the quality issue is completely absent from the draft recommendations, and he agreed with the comment that the claims made to push SSTF's agenda make good headlines, but are lacking in evidence.) One of the primary sponsors of SB 1143, Senator Carol Liu, is a strong proponent of outcome-based funding. The report includes twenty-two recommendations. At the end of the recommendations, however, is a statement recommending against implementing outcome-based funding at this time. Nancy Shulock, who is the director of a research institute at CSU Sacramento, a social scientist, a member of the SSTF, and another strong proponent of outcome-based funding, has the ear of the legislature. The legislature is focused on counting the

number of certificates and transfers the CCs generate. Outcome-based funding, however, has had no success anywhere, and there is no model for it. Dr. Shulock's response when confronted with these arguments has been that the lack of success is because the right model hasn't been designed yet.

- [Campaign for College Opportunity](#) (CCO): CCO is a supporter of outcome-based funding. One of its founding members is David Wolf, a former administrator at SRJC. CCO's interest stems from the idea that students should bear the cost of each segment of their higher education. CCO's position is that every student should pay his or her own way and that education should not be free anymore. They suggest that the students' share of the cost at the CC level would be low, their share at the CSU level would be in the middle range, and their share at the UC level would be at the top. The faculty, on the other hand, is trying to keep fees as low as possible. Although the SSTF recommendations do not slam the door on access, they do start to close it.
- Outcome-Based Funding and the Academic Senate. The issue of outcome-based funding involves the Senate, because it affects CC faculty's instructional mode and the way faculty work with students. Many faculty members are wondering what to do and are saying that they need to be given a direction. Do we target those things that we hate? Do we try to make it better? Unions have their bargaining issues, but they can't become too involved, as this matter is primarily a Senate matter. They can support the Senate, which needs to provide the leadership. There could be a full counter proposal coming from the faculty. That task will fall to the [Academic Senate for California Community Colleges](#) (ASCCC) with the support of all the other faculty groups, and there is a possibility that such a proposal could come out of the [ASCCC Fall Plenary Session](#).
- Student Success vs. Access. There is no magic pill in terms of how to reform CCs with regard to student success. The whole issue of outcome-based funding is fraught with the "access" question, particularly for under served and under represented groups. Implementation of the draft recommendations would turn CCs into basic skills providers for CSUs and UCs. Access would only be provided for those who know what they want to study and are ready to go straight out of the gate. There are first-generation college students who are coming to CCs with no knowledge about how to go about applying for financial aid. CC's currently don't have sufficient staffing in that area. One positive thing in the recommendations is the possibility of increased staffing for Student Services; however, a concern remains about the 50 percent law, which stipulates that 50 percent of a district's budget has to go to classroom instruction. Faculty salaries and benefits are the biggest cost item, and it's important to make the CC career inviting to people.
- Funding: There are no details about how these recommendations would be implemented. Because the SSTF members agreed that they could never agree on recommendations for implementation, they decided to omit that aspect and let the framework be the proposal. A Councilor commented that many of the recommendations seem to require additional funding (e.g., basic services, more counselors) and asked when that is made clear at the legislative level, what Rich thought legislators' reaction would be. He responded that the SSTF recommendations will be couched in language suggesting that it's not going to cost the state more money. SSTF members are not thinking about counselors; they're thinking about computers. Statewide, the ratio of counselors to students is something like 2000 to 1. FACCC and CCCI would definitely pick this issue as one of their issues. Rich said that he is hoping that the ASCCC will come out with a full counterproposal that FACCC and CCCI can support.
- FACCC's Response: The upcoming issue of FACCC's journal will be entirely devoted to the SSTF, and it will include an article written by United Faculty of Contra Costa President and Lead Negotiator Jeff Michels, who also composed [CCCI's resolution regarding the SSTF recommendations](#).
- Opportunities to Present Feedback: Faculty can go to the CCCCCO BOG and present an alternative proposal or present arguments against those things that they find

particularly objectionable. Rich encouraged Councilors to attend one of the next official SSTF presentations, which will be held at the [ASCCC Fall Plenary Session](#) in San Diego on Thursday afternoon, November 3. Although he will be attending the SSTF presentation during the plenary session as an SSTF member, Rich regularly attends ASCCC meetings as CCCI's liaison. FACCC staff attends ASCCC meetings, as well.

- **Timeline:** The SSTF was formed for one year, beginning January 2011 and ending December 2011. The draft recommendations in their current form are going to the CCCCCO BOG. The Board will receive a preview in December and the final document will be presented at a hearing in January 2012. The Board is set to approve a final document in March 2012, because the legislation mandates a report to the legislature. A major lobbying effort will take place at that time. The Chancellors Office is expected to say that implementation is not going to cost anything. FACCC will argue that it's going to cost a lot. The legislature could approve legislation to be effective July 1, 2012.
- **What Can Faculty Do Now?** Faculty members need to be informed about the proposal. Anyone who has an interest in this issue may present arguments to the CCCCCO BOG, which meets in Sacramento in January and March. CCCI, FACCC, the State Academic Senate, and other unions will be pushing back in some way. There is a statewide faculty position on this issue and a strong interest in swaying the state leadership away from outcome-based funding. Faculty members sitting on the SSTF argued unsuccessfully against the recommendations, which have gained a momentum that is significant. The biggest battle will be in the legislature.

#### D. [CCCI](#) Advocate.

- **CCCI's History:** CCCI's development as an organization has been a long, slow process. In the late 1990s, a loosely formed group of unaffiliated, local, independent community college faculty associations in California began to meet twice a year—once in the south and once in the north. (SRJC faculty member and former AFA Chief Negotiator Deborah Sweitzer was CCCI's president in the mid-1990s.) Historically, the CCCI president was the sole manager of the organization and attended all of the CC statewide meetings without a great deal of input from members. Over time in response to a push for a higher level of organization and participation, CCCI sought an increase in the amount of reassigned time for the president and an increase in other members' attendance at meetings; drafted a set of Bylaws; elected officers, including a part-time officer; and set up a listserve. The officers ran the organization and conferred about pressing issues, but the organization still lacked a strong statewide presence.
- **Increased Interest in Statewide Advocacy:** Over the last several years, CCCI members began to think more seriously about hiring a CCCI advocate—someone like FACCC's Andrea York—who could more easily travel to hearings in Sacramento, meet with legislators, and provide CCCI members with training on how to activate faculty at the local level. Another factor in convincing CCCI members of the benefits of hiring a part-time lobbyist was the prospect of a potential merger of the community college wings of CFT and CTA. (Due to organizational and dues issues, that merger is officially on hold for a year.) CC faculty is split up into different groups. FACCC does the best job of advocating for CCs at the state level, but it doesn't get the best support from the faculty in the affiliated unions (CFT and CTA), who are split between CCs and K-12.
- **CCCI Hires Part-Time Advocate:** In September 2011, CCCI hired David Balla-Hawkins, who did for FACCC in the late 1990s what Andrea York does for FACCC now. Most recently, Mr. Hawkins worked for the [California Faculty Association](#) (CFA) for ten years, and he brings grass roots organizing skills to the new CCCI half-time advocate position. Mr. Hawkins is very familiar with community college faculty issues. Each CCCI member organization is entitled to have at least one meeting with Mr. Hawkins at CCCI expense. As one of many options, Mr. Hawkins will offer local trainings for campaigns. As another option, Mr. Hawkins will be helping FHDAFA to organize students. "Our working

conditions are our students' learning conditions." Rich noted that the [Los Angeles Faculty Guild](#), which is a supporter of FACCC, has hired interns and has started working with students, as is the [Pasadena City College Faculty Association](#).

- Relationship between CCCI and FACCC: The advocacy work of CCCI and FACCC will mesh completely. Working with FACCC is written into Mr. Hawkins' contract. It's important that groups attending legislative hearings weigh in with their input. Legislators balance the input they receive based on their knowledge of the individuals who are advocating on behalf of the groups. CCCI represents close to one quarter of the faculty in the system, and it has been effective in the past because of its support of FACCC. Now, Mr. Hawkins will be able to establish a CCCI presence of its own, which will supplement, not interfere with or contradict, FACCC's voice.
- E. Categorical Program Flexible Funding. Rich briefly described some of the specific problems that departments (such as EOPS and CalWorks, whose budgets fall within the categorical programs in the State budget) are encountering as a result of the relatively recent switch to "flexible" funding within certain clusters. He said that the faculty needs to get organized and explain to legislators why that flexible funding option doesn't work, and how it impacts local funding. Rich also pointed out that many people worked very hard at the legislative level to procure funding for the part-time faculty categorical items (which include office hours, health benefits, and parity), only to see them fall victim to budget cuts. It's important for faculty to advocate for these items, otherwise legislators will forget that they were once interested in them.
- F. Conclusion. Rich reiterated that all of these issues are interrelated, and that it is important to be engaged at the state level because of the impacts on districts at the local level. In response to a comment about how even legislators who appear to be community college advocates still seem to be ruled by the "squeaky wheel," Rich said that that's the reason why CCCI and FACCC advocates will be "squeaking loudly together." Community colleges need to be protected and defended, and the name of the game is in convincing legislators that they need to pay attention. Rich commended AFA for its efforts in fostering communications with local legislators. He concluded by mentioning that, for those faculty members who have "policy wonk energy," there are plenty of opportunities out there. On the other hand, if faculty members want to stay in the classroom, that's fine; but, someone needs to be doing the advocacy work if the local faculty does not want to do it.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Judith Bernstein.