

## 75/25 Vitality . . .

(From Page 1)

Our contracts are negotiated and maintained in accordance with the belief that a stable corps of full-time faculty is the bedrock of each community college. Further written expression of this value, found in AB 1725, states that "... because the quality, quantity and composition of full-time faculty have the most immediate and direct impact on the quality of instruction, overall reform cannot succeed without sufficient members of full-time faculty ..." (AB 1725, Section 70). The 75 percent goal has wider educational and cultural significance. The Legislature placed demands on the California State University system in 2001 to "... raise the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty to at least 75 percent ..." (ACR 73). External, independent research from groups like the American Association of University Professors shows that the California Community College system in particular, where the student population includes the less well-prepared, can benefit significantly from an enduring cadre of full-time faculty of at least 75 percent.

The CCC Board of Governors are the keepers of the myth with Title 5 regulations spelling out how the "75 percent full-time faculty standard" is to be achieved. BoG members openly embrace the language of 75 percent full-time faculty and are the arbiters of compliance and wrongdoing. They are entrusted to ensure that those who act against the system goal do not profit from their transgression. Yet, annually, the CEOs of our various districts present cases for why they should be absolved of any full-time faculty obligation whatsoever, and they continually seek to escape what they consider "punishment." Particularly, over the last four years, statewide faculty leaders have been in open disagreement with the Chancellor's Office, the CEOs and members of the Board of Governors on matters of waiving full-time obligation requirements.

Most recently, at the Board of Governors meeting of March 6 and 7, 2006, the Chancellor took forth a proposal "to revise Title 5, California Code of Regulations, to provide one-time relief from funding reductions to certain community college districts that otherwise would be required pursuant to regulations governing the number of full-time faculty hired by these districts in prior years." This prompted impassioned testimony from faculty. Faculty no longer be-

lieve that the system supports full-time positions. The CCC Board continually entertains amnesty proposals for districts that violate the 75 percent principle. The time is nigh when the 75/25 myth will explode, and the system will have to remake itself or flounder.

The most recent report (June 1, 2005) on the status of 75/25 in our system, issued by a Chancellor's Office taskforce, shows that, despite the regulations governing the implementation of the 75 percent goal, the system's average percentage of full-time faculty has remained static over time. More disappointing is that the little movement that has occurred has been in the wrong direction. In Fall 2004 the system average was 62.2 percent, a lower percentage than the system average of 63.1 in Fall 1988.

The new and first CCC system strategic plan has just made its debut wearing a slick cover and spouting movingly expressive language about education and the future of California. Under Strategic Goal B. Student Success and Readiness, the language of Subsection B5. Teaching and Learning Effectiveness cites "the need for more full-time faculty positions" as a challenge for the system. There is no question where the strength will have to come from if we are to overcome this challenge. Perseus killed the snake-headed Medusa, Theseus killed the Minotaur and Hercules, who was given twelve impossible tasks to perform, completed them all. It will be faculty who continue the quest and defend 75/25.

## Legal Workshop . . .

(From Page 1)

regulatory bodies, political activity, free speech and civility codes, and district investigations.

The cost for attending only the Friday Legal Workshop is \$100, including lunch. The fee for the entire Spring Conference is \$200, including the Legal Workshop, Thursday afternoon negotiators' session and Saturday CCCI state topics meeting. Mark your calendars now for the CCCI Spring Conference, April 27, 28, and 29 in Berkeley.

[www.CCCIIndependents.org](http://www.CCCIIndependents.org)

President: Zoe Close Ex. Secretary: Dennis Frisch  
*Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD Santa Monica CCD*

Treasurer: John Smith Editor: Richard Hansen  
*Rancho Santiago CCD Foothill-De Anza CCD*

# CCCI

California  
 Community  
 College  
 Independents

12345 El Monte Road • Los Altos Hills, CA 94022 • (650) 949-7544

## Legal Issues Workshop Highlights Conference

This year's CCCI Spring Conference features a one-day Legal Workshop. Topics range from an introduction to collective bargaining rights and responsibilities under the 1977 Rodda Act



Bezemek

to current issues that are setting new legal precedents. The all-day workshop is scheduled for Friday, April 28, at the Claremont Hotel in Berkeley and will be presented by the law offices of Robert Bezemek, one of the state's most prominent labor attorneys.

For more information, contact your local union office or CCCI President Zoe Close at 619/644-7510 or <ZoeClose@aol.com>. This workshop is of special value to union activists on local negotiation teams or those involved in the grievance process. In addition to fundamental rights under the Rodda Act, negotiation and grievance rights and obligations, the duty of fair representation, and agency fee requirements, the workshop will review statutory and constitutional issues involving the 50 Percent Law, discrimination or harassment charges against faculty, tenure denial, dismissal or suspension and other disciplinary actions, layoffs, and demands for information. Some of the issues to be discussed are academic freedom and intellectual property rights, part-time ancillary duties, the 60 Percent Law, retiree health benefits, the role of

(See Page 4)

## President's Message

# Faculty Ensure 75/25 Goal Remains Vital

by Zoe Close, CCCI President

Cultural myth can be defined as "a collection of stories, either based on fact or constructed, that embodies the values of the culture." What matters most to the culture will be woven into the woof and warp of cultural practice and will be readily recognizable in the literary expression of the culture. All myths deal significantly with the culture's moral values and include a mechanism for dealing with wrongdoers and their punishment. When the truth or significance of the cultural myth begins to be questioned by members of the culture, some form of radical change is usually afoot. If the myth loses vitality altogether and ceases to empower the members, a breakdown occurs and the culture must redefine itself if it is to survive.



Close

The California Community College system constitutes a significant subculture within the educational culture of the United States. Although implicit in the ethos of the community colleges since their inception, the explicit legislative embodiment of a goal of 75 percent full-time faculty came with the enactment of AB 1725. We, as faculty members, love to hear the beautiful words "... the Legislature wishes to recognize and make efforts to address longstanding policy of the Board of Governors that at least 75 percent of the hours of credit instruction in the California Community Colleges, as a system, should be taught by full-time instructors" (AB 1725, Section 35; Education Code Section 87482.6).

The quality-standard myth of 75 percent full-time faculty is at the nucleus of working conditions for faculty.

(See Page 4)

*A Network for Independent Bargaining Agents*

## CC Initiative Progresses Toward State Ballot

Richard Hansen, *CCCI Editor*

To allow more time to raise money and gather enough valid signatures to qualify, the Community College Initiative coalition has reset the kickoff for signature gathering to the beginning of fall term. Petitions will be available in mid-August. This means that the measure will appear on the next general state election following November 2006, possibly as late as the primary election scheduled for June 2008. The end result will be the same: campaign political advisors predict easy passage.

Fundraising must be the top priority as the spring term draws to a close – momentum is building. CCCI locals already raised about five percent of the target set for each of their districts. This amounts to nearly \$25,000, just about one percent of the \$2.5 million the campaign estimates that it needs to successfully qualify and pass the ballot measure. There will be no substantive changes to the carefully constructed language, so every dollar that has been and will be raised goes toward the same initiative.

Officially titled “The Community College Governance, Funding Stabilization, and Student Fee Reduction Act,” the Initiative is critically important in light of projections showing a declining rate of growth in the Proposition 98 guarantee over the next decade. It addresses the problem by creating a separate community college “pot” under Prop 98 with a growth rate tied to the state’s population increase in two cohorts, recent high school graduates (17 to 21 year olds) and returning students (22 to 25 year olds). The community college Prop 98 guarantee will grow by whichever cohort growth rate is greater, while the K-12 guarantee will grow according to its average daily attendance (ADA) as it does now. The important point is that the community college share of Prop 98 funding will not hurt K-12. The overall guarantee will vary in accord with two parameters, and there will be no more annual fight over the Prop 98 “split.”

In addition, the funding stabilization plan corrects the “double-whammy” inflicted on community colleges during state economic declines. Instead of facing state cuts and increased student fees, the system will



Hansen

get an additional boost by adding to its growth rate any amount of state unemployment over five percent; that is, if the unemployment rate hits 5.3 percent, the community college Prop 98 guarantee will grow by an additional 0.3 percent. There is also a provision for backfill of property tax shortfalls to allow colleges to continue to operate in case of a late state budget.

As for student fees, the Initiative makes an immediate reduction from \$26 per semester unit to \$20 (\$17 to \$13 per quarter unit). It also links future increases to the percentage change in per capita personal income and eliminates the possibility of mid-year fee increases. Finally, it ensures that any fee increases stay with the colleges.

The third component of the Initiative addresses governance, writing the statewide Board of Governors and local Boards of Trustees into the constitution. At the same time, it protects both local control and local bargaining. It also gives the Board of Governors the power to hire senior staff while preserving collective bargaining and state civil service protections for the rest of the chancellor’s office staff. Finally, it brings more experience to the Board by increasing its size to allow more faculty and trustee positions, bringing the number to three each, and designating an administrative employee seat. Both student appointees will be able to vote; at present this right alternates between the two from year to year.

Bottom line, local collective bargaining agents should compare the projected budget increases for the system with and without the initiative. In 2007-08, the Initiative promises to bring an additional \$50 million per year to the system. In 2011-12, this jumps to an additional \$1.6 billion for the system in annual ongoing funds. It is important to note that this increase is possible without increasing the Prop 98 percentage share of the state general fund. It remains at about 43.5 percent, so the Initiative stabilizes community college funding not only without hurting K-12 but also without raising taxes.

The original coalition, the Californians for Community Colleges, included the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), the Los Angeles Faculty Guild, and the Community College League of California (CCLC). It recently expanded with the addition of the California Federation of Teachers (CFT). Visit the Initiative web site at <[www.CaliforniansForCommunityColleges.org](http://www.CaliforniansForCommunityColleges.org)>.

## Legislature Gets System Equalization “Compromise”

Debate over the governor’s state infrastructure bond proposal stalled legislative review of the system budget, but as this CCCI newsletter goes to press, the review is finally getting underway. On the table is a January proposal from the governor that is very favorable for the community colleges. A COLA of 5.18 percent appeals to just about everybody, and rumor has it that this figure may go up.

For a large number of Independent districts, the governor’s promise of another \$80 million annual installment plus \$50 million to make up for last year’s shortfall in equalization sounds very good indeed. However, Independent bargaining agents report mixed results on the use of these equalization infusions.

While faculty have been asking for greater accountability for these funds, administrators have been arguing over which districts qualify for the money and how much each should get. Recent shifts in enrollment (FTES) have created underfunded districts where there used to be none and have made some of the originally underfunded look more wealthy. As a result, administrators have been busy crafting a compromise distribution plan to take to the legislature.

Briefly, this compromise requires that, of the proposed \$130 million in the governor’s budget, the \$50 million “make up” be distributed under the old FTES alignment with the remaining \$80

million allocated under the new SB 361 model using 2005-06 base data. In addition, the recommendation calls for an additional \$43.5 million to realize the equalization goal as specified under SB 361.

It remains to be seen not only how the legislature, and ultimately the governor, will react to this recommended “compromise” but also how they will react to the allocation model contained in SB 361. It does away with program-based funding and institutes an FTES allocation model for the system. Independent bargaining agents should study SB 361 carefully because it grants more spending flexibility to districts and thereby increases the importance of what happens at the bargaining table.

## Independents Have “Right Stuff” to Meet Challenges

Although union work at our colleges is always demanding, the current climate presents additional challenges to collective bargaining. Anti-union interests have become more vocal, both statewide and nationally; we are witness to more generalized attacks on labor. Our Independent unions are well poised for dealing with the new conflicts and are well suited for weathering the nasty climate.

Ten quick points attest to having The Right Stuff:

1. CCCI believes that respect for the unique culture of each of our members is foremost. We all know our own campuses and what is best for them at any given time.
2. Our members owe no allegiance to a parent organization. Local organizational decisions are entirely autonomous.
3. CCCI represents community college interests only. Others who are affiliated must compete with additional interests such as those of K-12 or classified employees.
4. Our unions have complete control over local

dues structures. Decisions about how to use those dues is absolutely local.

5. Dues are at least half (and often much less) of those of affiliated organizations.
6. CCCI dues are reasonable, and CCCI has no bureaucracy to wade through when members need help.
7. Local organizations are free to retain and speak directly with their own legal counsel and to use whatever monies they choose on legal advice.
8. CCCI devotes significant time to sharing information on negotiations and to offering as much guidance and help as our members request.
9. In addition to a website and a newsletter, CCCI has an email list-serve that provides quick access for our organizations and a discussion forum for members.
10. CCCI is a member of the Council of Faculty Organizations and maintains a liaison to the Academic Senate. The Independents are represented by CCCI at Consultation Council, the advisory body to the State Chancellor and the CCC Board of Governors.