our lack of confidence in the ACCJC. We agreed to press at our spring 2012 meeting, CCCI voted to reaffirm our resources and faculty workload that most concern bargained, not imposed by the ACCJC), and the waste interference in collective bargaining (SLOs in faculty creditation standards or ACCJC tactics, the persistent dialogue on this subject, the culture of fear that inhibits one hasn't completed an SLO report, and “student suc... outcomes assessment.” Also, faculty evaluation “must include a component addressing participation in student learning outcomes assessment.”

This need for SLO documentation is included in both the Redwoods and Cuesta sanctions as well. And for the ACCJC, incomplete assessment records indicate a problem with the governance of the institution.

Many faculty, of course, would disagree. The divide between what goes on inside the classroom and the learning experience outcomes on the other hand, is a key issue in our colleges today. Clearly one class can be terrific, even if one hasn’t completed an SLO report, and “student success” can be measured in other ways. But it is the lack of dialog on this subject, the culture of fear that inhibits colleges and administrations from even challenging accreditation standards or ACCJC tactics, the persistent interference in collective bargaining (SLOs in faculty evaluations, after all, is clearly something that must be bargained, not imposed by the ACCJC), and the waste of resources and faculty workload that most concern CCCI. We are not satisfied with the status quo, and we are committed to seeking ways to reform our accreditation process.

At our spring 2012 meeting, CCCI voted to reaffirm our accreditation strategy. We agreed to press for an audit of costs because we know that districts are spending huge sums of money hiring consultants and paying managers to meet the demands of the Commission. We are asking that the Chancellor’s Office task force be reconvened. As a recent Consultation Council meeting, there seemed to be consensus on the need to reestablish the task force but some desire to wait until the new Chancellor is in place and we are looking for other ways to press for change. CCCI is committed to improving faculty working conditions and to making sure that the work faculty are asked to do directly affects and supports our students. As long as accreditation paperwork and the SLO project serve to distract faculty from teaching and real assessment, as long as the ACCJC punishes rather than encouraging and on taking resources away from the classroom, we will continue to seek reform.

Sacramento State (From Page 2)

last moment to remove most of these improvements from the bill that eventually made it to the governor’s desk. Two important amendments remained: Board of Governor minimum academic and progress standards cannot include a maximum unit cap, and students will not lose their Board of Governor fee waiver unless they have failed below academic or progress standards for “two consecutive academic terms.”

While this might be a disappointing outcome, CCCI persists with the goal of achieving a comprehensive reform for SLOs. This goal will have the greatest impact on the organization. Our victory on SB 1456 lasted only two years, but people took notice, and CCCI’s impact and influence is firmly established. The organization is better known in the Capitol, and we have shown ourselves to be both a formidable opponent and a helpful ally in the legislature and among community organizations and unions. In the next legislative section, we will no longer be greeted with the question, “Who is CCCI?”

CCCI leadership believes the organization has made a good start, having its own advocate in Sacramento this year. The organization is respected and influential, CCCI’s collaboration with FACC and other organizations has been strengthened, and CCCI is poised to expand its influence as a leader on community college issues.

I am honored that I was asked to join with CCCI as its presiding officer will have there is much more we will accomplish in the coming years.

by Richard Hansen, CCCI President

It is difficult to recall a fall when getting back to the accreditation process was not a challenge. The top of the list are Propositions 30 and 32 with Prop 30 offering a first step toward stopping the bleeding suffered by California’s higher education and the waste of a result of repeated budget cuts. In contrast, Prop 32 is a major threat to unions as a political voice for regular people whether they consider themselves middle or working class.

Community college faculty unions, including CCCI, have joined with union colleagues throughout the state in a common get-out-the-vote effort on these two measures, urging a “YES” vote on Prop 30 and a “NO” vote on Prop 32. Complicating the situation is Proposition 38, the K-12 funding plan that relies on a graduated income tax increase on most Californians, including those earning taxable incomes as low as $7,316 per year. The estimated $6 to $8.5 billion in annual revenue flows directly to K-12 school boards and charter school governing bodies and will have little effect on the funding difficulties faced by other public services and higher education, including the community colleges.

If both measures get enough votes to pass, only the measure gaining the most votes will be implemented. So if Prop 36 comes out ahead, the trigger cuts already outlined in the state budget will come down on higher education and other public services. Under Prop 38, the community colleges will be cut $54 million in the current year while UC and CSU will get cuts of $250 million each.

In the issue of the CCCI newsletter goes to press, the election is close at hand, and Prop 38 continues to poll badly with only about 42 percent in support while 43 percent oppose. In contrast, Prop 30 is still a winner at about 54 percent in favor versus 37 percent opposed, on average. While this is encouraging for Prop 30 supporters, negative opposition advertisements have been nibbling away at this margin. Ironically, the multi-millionaire Munger siblings, liberal Molly who created Citizens for Accountable and Transparent Ethics (MATE) and her brother, conservative Chad Jr. who is backing Prop 32, find themselves in the same anti-Prop 30 camp.

It will be a sprint to the finish for CCCI and its labor allies joined in offense on behalf of Prop 30. At the same time this coalition must mount a formidable defensive effort against Prop 32. There may be some comfort in the fact that candidates and propositions funded by rich individuals and wealthy interests have not fared well in California elections. Recently, we have seen the Meg Whitman gubernatorial candidacy and the Pacific Gas and Electric ballot attempt to corner the energy market go down in flames.

In both of these examples, it was campaign exposure that turned the voters against well-funded efforts, and it has hurt Prop 32 when voters learn that its corporate authors and supporters have exempted themselves from the restrictions the initiative places on political spending. Even without Prop 32, corporations outspend unions 15 to 1. In the wake of the Citizens United decision declaring corporations “people” with the “free speech” right to spend as much money as they want in political campaign, the backers of Prop 32 are hoping for a knockout punch against the right of unions to participate in politics. We will have to work hard over the next several weeks to turn public opinion, which was initially inclined to support, against the measure.

Labor is looking for better results than we saw with respect to Proposition 30 and its successful working people with pensions were made scapegoats for the continuing economic doldrums. At this point, faculty unions are coming to grips with the impact of AB 340, the pension reform bill that swept through the legislature at the end of the recent session. Yes, this presents another challenge...
Sacramento Now Knows, Respects CCCI

by David Balla-Hawkins, CCCI Legislative Advocate

“Who is CCCI?” This was a question commonly asked at the State Capitol early this year. Legislators and their staff now know who we are: an influential association of independent faculty unions representing over 12,000 community college faculty teaching over a half-million students. More importantly, CCCI is now viewed as an organization that can be relied on and trusted; a fact reinforced by calls we received from legislative offices asking for our advice and help.

Along with CCCI’s success in the legislative arena, we built strong alliances with other unions. Numerous organizations and individuals called on CCCI to join them in legislative efforts. One example was when the California School Employees Association (CSEA) approached CCCI requesting our assistance with their sponsored legislation. We sat next to CSEA to testify at legislative hearings and meet with legislative staff. The CSEA-sponsored bill – AB 1908 (Luis Alejo-D), increasing from 45 to 60 days the layoff notices given classified employees – was signed into law by Governor Brown.

CCCI was also an active member on the statewide Labor and Retirement Coalitions. CCCI leadership wrote letters, testified at committee hearings, and met with legislators and staff on key bills.

CCCI’s most noticed victory was also the shortest lived. Legislation to implement recommendations of the Chancellor’s Office Student Success Task Force Report (SB 1456, Alan Lowenthal-D) was quickly moving through the Senate and Assembly. After six months of legislative hearings, SB 1456 had received only two “No” votes. One by one, organizations in opposition decided they had achieved all that could be accomplished or restrained their opposition, but CCCI continued to actively seek amendments.

We were told our efforts were fruitless, that we were “wasting our time.” We were told that any changes we wanted to add to SB 1456 would never be adopted. We were told to stop SB 1456. (The bill was defeated.)

Despite the odds against us, CCCI was successful in persuading legislative leadership and key staff to substantially amend SB 1456 to require community colleges to expand student support services and student intervention programs; to require campuses to have student support infrastructures in place prior to implementing new academic standards; to protect students receiving Board of Governor fee waiver grants; and to mandate that campuses report their counselor-to-student ratios.

CCCI accomplished what seemed impossible, only to have the Governor’s Office intervene at the very end of the legislative session (see the related article in this newsletter).

Top Fall Challenges . . .
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Sacramento Now Knows, Respects CCCI

by Jeffrey Michels, CCCI Executive Secretary

Despite the crippling funding cuts of the past three years, the publication of a complete, professionally written and peer-reviewed paper on the need for a “technology plan” referenced in the Redwoods show-cause order or the need to improve “institutional planning” makes little sense. Many faculty are glad to see the Cress Task Force took center stage, the accreditation task force stopped meeting shortly thereafter with the Commission’s “unusually rigorous” recommendation to close Cuesta. The state budget and its “solution” except for some increased cooperation with the Academic Senate with regard to training. The task force could claim one victory insofar as a complaint filed against the City College of San Francisco by the Department of Education brought federal scrutiny to the Commission’s practice of handpicking its members. As a result of a DoE directive, the Commission was forced to update its bylaws to make the process more transparent and open to candidates coming from within the system, both faculty and administration.

For most faculty, the notion that our accrediting agency would close down a college (or threaten to do so) over a faculty-staff “need for a technology plan” referenced in the Redwoods show-cause order or the need to improve “institutional planning” makes little sense. Many faculty are glad to see...