

President's Report

Campus Conciliation Numbers Can't be Reconciled

by Tim Shively, *FA President*

Amid the initial unfolding of district budget reduction scenarios, wherein individuals are reduced to numbers and someone who won't have her contract renewed is seen as not "technically" losing her job, we need a disinterested accounting across the entire spectrum of employees, not just faculty and staff. While my colleague, Chief Negotiator Kathy Perino, has addressed the precipitous climb of managerial salaries relative to those of faculty (see her article in this issue), another potential area of inefficiency (i.e. the district paying more for and receiving less of some service) is apparent in the working relationship of managers to faculty.

Having served a stretch as English Dept. Chair at De Anza, I'm well aware of the challenges of working with faculty (The proverbial "herding of cats" comes to mind). And I imagine these challenges are exponentially magnified when it comes to supervising an entire instructional division. We can be demanding, egoistic, obstructionist, etc. Overseeing faculty collectively requires balancing the varied demands, channeling the individual talents, keeping open lines of communication, and making it clear that you have their backs. There are deans who, despite the inevitable occasional conflict, earn faculty respect, who treat individual faculty as professionals and are truly advocates for their instructional divisions. Then there are those who don't and aren't.

A good indicator of the relative functionality of the faculty/dean relationship is conciliation, wherein an *FA* appointed conciliator—we have one on each campus—works with a faculty member and his/her instructional Dean in an effort to resolve conflicts, peacefully, and without the need for a formal grievance, which can occur when the conciliator is unable to resolve the conflict. Every dean has been involved in a conciliation at some point—it comes with the territory. It's not just the qualitative nature of such conflicts (who said/did what when and to whom) that's at issue but the frequency and

repetitiveness of such conflicts. In order to more effectively address the "efficiency" of conciliation, we need a marker on the order of "Full Time Equivalent Dean," or FTED, a rough equivalent to the FTEF often bandied about in discussions of productivity. The ratio of this hypothetical FTED to the hours and labor spent in conciliation might reveal some illuminating patterns.

FA Grievance Officer Nicole Gray has put together a summary of conciliation data from the 2016-17 academic year. Of the total number of 66 faculty contacting a campus conciliator for assistance, 82 percent were De Anza cases, 54 to Foothill's 12. Certainly, some of these were simply contractual clarifications on matters such as the evaluation process, salary advancement, professional conference funds, etc. But why the stark difference between the campuses? Even given that Foothill is the smaller campus, only three of Foothill's cases involved direct conflict with a dean while the majority of De Anza's cases, 28, were a direct result of such conflicts. And that's saying nothing about the cases where faculty members consulted *FA* but chose not to pursue formal conciliation, often out of apprehension that it might make the situation worse. We're only beginning to dig into this data, which has also been provided to Upper Management and Executives. But let's call out the situation as a whole for what it is: dysfunctional.

Were a faculty member to receive repeated "3's," to say nothing of "4's" or "5's," on J1 evaluations regarding his/her work with students (e.g. "Maintains student-faculty relationship conducive to learning"), you can be sure that his/her future employment could be in jeopardy (particularly a part-time



Shively

Negotiations Update

FA Identifies Budget Trends, Proposes Golden Handshake, Salary Increases, Part-Time Improvements

by Kathy Perino, *FA Chief Negotiator*

Before I detail *FA*'s proposal priorities, a review of the current budget situation is in order. The enrollment decline is real. FHDA lost 1176 full-time equivalent students in 2016-17 which resulted in a loss of \$6 million in funding from the state. The 2017-18 District Budget projects a \$10.4 million structural deficit.

With such dire numbers presented at budget and board meetings, *FA* reviewed the trends in the budget over the last three to five years in an attempt to find the hidden pots of money in the budget. Unfortunately, we have yet to find any. We have, however, discovered some surprising, puzzling trends.

The Budget Review

FA focused our analysis on the positions and salaries that are part of the General Purpose Fund (Fund 114) because about \$125M in salaries are contained in this Fund and only about \$20M is in categorical funds, for positions such as SSSP and special education, which have specific rules and requirements that make the flexibility in decision making more difficult.

A comparison of budgeted full-time positions in the General Purpose Fund is shown below. Note that the state budget began to improve in 2014-15, and this is the year the District began the process of filling new positions (see Table):

Unrestricted General Fund 114: Positions			
	Budgeted 14 - 15	Budgeted 17 - 18	Percent Increase
Executives	6	6	0.0%
Certificated Managers	30	29.8	-0.7%
Non-Certificated Managers (Classified Managers)	25	36.4	45.6%
FT Faculty (Certificated Instructors)	442	453.3	2.6%
Classified (ACE/CSEA)	335	355.5	6.1%
Fund 114 and 122 (General and Special Ed)			
PT Faculty	551	517.8	-6.0%

Part-time faculty positions, measured in Full-time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF), are listed in the budget with the General fund and Special Ed fund combined. The enrollment decline has already created a 6 percent job loss for part-time faculty, and a loss of 33 FTEF likely represents income loss to hundreds of part-time faculty.

A review of the salary expenditures for these same groups over the past five years (2012-13 to 2017-18) shows an even more astonishing fact. Budgeted salaries for full- and part-time faculty combined rose from \$72.9M in 2012-13 to \$79.6M in 2017-18, a 6.7 million dollar increase shared by approximately 1000 FTEF, or about \$6700 per full-time equivalent faculty member.

During this same period, budgeted salaries for managers rose from \$8.1M to \$11.4M, a 3.3 million dollar increase shared by about 70 full-time managers. That is an average of about \$47,000 per manager! *FA* will certainly ask the District for an explanation of this large discrepancy because eleven additional classified managers cannot account for this.

The District Town Hall Budget meetings are scheduled for the end of the quarter (November 29 at Foothill and December 5 at De Anza). Topics will surely include brainstorming ideas for budget savings, and faculty must be aware of the current staffing priorities.



Perino

The salary proposal consists of four components:

1) A pass-through of the 1.56 percent cost of living adjustment (COLA) provided by the state in the 2017-18 budget. Many faculty assume the pass-through is automatic and are asking when they will see the COLA in the paychecks; however, since a COLA can be applied to other areas in addition to salary, it must be negotiated.

2) An additional 1.5 percent salary increase for all faculty.

FA has requested that the District work with *FA* to investigate the cost savings possible via a Supplemental Retirement Plan (SRP), also known as a "golden handshake." FHDA last offered one in 2004. An SRP allows a faculty member, or other employee, to retire and receive an annuity (duration and terms are negotiable) that is a percentage of the final year's salary. Other districts in the state have offered 65 to 75 percent of final salary, with the future savings from either not rehiring the position or rehiring the position but at a lower cost. *FA* will recommend using a consultant to provide a no-cost analysis using data and salaries specific to our district.

3) Increase the Part-time Faculty salary schedule (*Appendix C*) from 83.5 percent of the full-time schedule to 85 percent of the full-time schedule and increase the maximum number of required office hours to three per week. This proposal will move the part-time salary schedule within 2.5 percent of our district's parity goal of 87.5 percent of full-time for the steps that exist on the part-time salary schedule. Both the 2016-17 and the 2017-18 state budgets included additional ongoing funding for part-time faculty and office hours that FHDA can use to pay for these increases.

4) Compensate non-credit faculty teaching specific courses at the credit instructional rate (*Appendix C*).

Currently, non-credit courses receive a lower load factor for the instructor and are paid on the non-credit salary schedule. The non-credit salary schedule is 60 percent of the full-time rate, lower than the part-time rate of 83.5 percent, due to the fact that the district is only funded at 60 percent of the credit rate for the student contact hours.

However, the state now has "enhanced non-credit funding" for hours associated with non-credit courses that are part of a Career Development College Preparation (CDCP) approved program—such as Foothill's NCBS: Arithmetic, NCSV: Geriatric

Home Aide, and NCEL: English as a Second Language—so *FA* is proposing the faculty teaching these courses be compensated at the full-credit rate using the credit load factor applied to *Appendix C*.

Clearly, there are several unknown variables regarding this salary proposal. One of the biggest questions is if the savings created by a SRP, aka "golden handshake," will balance (offset) the cost of the increases. How many managers, faculty, and staff would have to participate in the plan in order to provide the savings necessary to provide a raise faculty can accept? Then, if the SRP gets enough participation, other questions to resolve include who will be allowed to decide which positions are replaced and which are not, and will the ratio of managers to faculty and staff remain at the current level? An update on the *FA* proposal and its surrounding questions will be given in the next *FA News*.

Part-Time Faculty Workshops

California History Center
Friday, December 1, 2017
De Anza College

9:30 am Coffee and Registration

10:00 am Know Your Contract
This session will focus on *Article 7* and other sections of the *Agreement* that are specific to part-time faculty employment, with particular attention to recently negotiated provisions.

12:00 - 12:30 am LUNCH

12:30-2:30 Unemployment Filing

Part-Time Faculty are eligible to apply for unemployment benefits at the end of each quarter. This workshop is not only valuable for first time applicants, but is also a good refresher for previous applicants.

All District part-time faculty are invited to attend. Please RSVP to Mary Ellen Goodwin, goodwinmaryellen@fhda.edu

... Conciliation

(from Page 1)

instructor without reemployment preference). Tenure would be doubtful, and other benefits such as “Professional Achievement Awards” thrown into question. Yet the same conciliation conflicts tend to occur repeatedly (scheduling shows up 12 times at De Anza) and often involving the same Deans (four were related to a hostile/overly stressful work environment). Resolving these repeated conflicts is a drain of time and resources on both the administrative and FA sides. And yet there don’t seem to be any correlative reductions (or personnel changes) forthcoming in FTED.

It’s not much of a stretch to suggest that what’s sketched out above is just the tip of the iceberg, that many more faculty did not seek FA’s assistance and attempted to resolve conflicts on their own, while others simply chose not to “cause friction,” particularly more “at risk” faculty. So as a faculty member, before “letting it go,” or assuming “it’s too much trouble,” consider how you may be unwittingly “enabling” further conflict by not stepping up with your concerns. Yes, filling out that evaluation of your Dean is kind of a pain, but it’s like getting out the vote during a midterm election: your collective participation is necessary to effect change. Faculty within a given instructional area may find they share many of the same types of concerns, and collectively, they have more leverage in addressing them. By all means, talk to your FA representatives, but also talk to your fellow department members, and reach out to newer faculty, full- and part-time. Collectively we’ll begin to rectify this situation.

KYC: Important Dates for Winter Quarter

2017

Dec. 8: Part-time faculty file intention to change salary column starting in the Winter 2018 Quarter with campus Personnel Office (*Appendix B.1, C, E, G*).

Dec. 15: Full-time faculty submit Early Retirement Incentive Notice to District Human Resources Office (*20.4*).

2018

Jan. 5: Part-time faculty submit completion of requirements documentation for column change starting Winter quarter to campus Personnel Office (*Appendix B. 1, C, E, G*).

Jan. 15: *Article 18* faculty meet with the appropriate administrator to determine their reduced contract schedule (*18.8.1, Appendix W*).

Feb. 5: Professional Development Leave Committee makes recommendations to the Board at its meeting in February (*17.12.3*).

Mar. 1: Full-time faculty submit written initial request for *Article 18* pre-retirement reduction in contract to college president (*18.8.2, Appendix W*). See *18.9* to request percentage change in subsequent years.

Mar. 9: Part-time faculty file intention to change salary column starting in the Spring Quarter with campus Personnel Office (*Appendix B.1, C, E, G*).

Mar. 15: *Article 19* faculty submit to District Human Resources the annual Early Retirement Service Plan for the following academic year with all required signatures for second and subsequent years of participation (*19.6.2.2, Appendix UI*). See *19.6.1* for initial year of participation.

Mar. 15: Board notification to probationary or other faculty whose contracts will not be renewed (California Ed. Code).

Apr. 2: Full-time faculty submit written request to return to full-time employment status from *Article 18* pre-retirement reduction in contract (*18.4*).

Apr. 6: Part-time faculty submit completion of requirements documentation for column change starting in Spring Quarter to campus Personnel Office (*Appendix B.1, C, E, G*).

FA Appoints Executive Council Member

At its meeting of October 5, FA’s Executive Council appointed Spera Georgiou to replace council member Tim Shively, who was appointed FA President last June. FA welcomes Spera, a veteran FA staffer, who will serve the remainder of Shively’s term.

Effective Fall 2018

CSU to Eliminate Placement Tests, Most Developmental Courses

by Steve Howland, FA News Editor

The August 2nd bombshell announcement, by Chancellor Timothy White of the California State University (CSU), that the CSU will abolish incoming student placement tests and many pre-baccalaureate, remedial classes as of fall 2018, will likely have consequences as far reaching for California higher education as they are uncertain.

Actions at the state level appear to be in concert: two state bills signed by the governor, one (AB 705) mandating multiple measures placement for community colleges (read: more relaxed standards for entry into credit-bearing first year English and math courses), and another bill (AB19) offering one year free tuition systemwide for our full-time students (funding not assured); a memo from the California Community Colleges (CCC) chancellor endorsing CSU’s decision and urging our schools to partner with local CSU campuses; and predating all of the above, last summer’s 48 page “Vision for Success” position paper emanating from the CCC State Chancellor’s office.

The “Vision for Success” details breathtakingly ambitious goals for our system: significant increases in the annual number of degrees and certificates awarded, as well as in transfer rates and degree-related employment, along with “cutting [equity] achievement gaps by 40 percent within 5 years and fully closing those achievement gaps within 10 years.”

Two themes emerge from these many moving parts: an enforced acceleration of students towards degrees, and an early professionalization of studenthood which aligns studies and career from the get-go.

CSU’s initiative was the first shoe to drop. The high-stakes reengineering of first year coursework certainly gives off a distinct whiff of the future in its ‘new-car’ smell—say, that of a Tesla. There’s much to like from an incoming student’s point of view. Graduation credit, in the form of one and two units courses, will be offered for those deemed by a new multiple measures placement formula to “need further skill development.” High school GPA will figure more decisively in placement decisions, with the vast majority of incoming freshmen placed in the regular, transfer-level curriculum. Further, freshmen math and English courses will be more varied in content and tied to one’s major, with “innovative” formats and curriculum in support of those needing extra help.

It’s likely to be a win for the university administration, too, in its effort to boost four year grad rates from 19 percent to 40 percent by 2025, and to mean less remediation and fewer dropouts.

Meantime, the state effort to enroll more students in the CCCs via possibly free or reduced first year tuition may bolster CSU’s numbers through transfer; both systems appear to be gearing up to cast a wider net for potential enrollees. CSU may be positioning itself to enroll those out-of-state and international students whose numbers UC has begun to scale back on.

CSU encourages its campuses to “partner with local community colleges” in providing developmental coursework, primarily offered to incoming freshmen through its summer “Early Start Program” (some developmental classes will also be offered as co-requisites to standard coursework classes during regular year for freshmen.). But the community colleges don’t offer graduation credit for developmental coursework, whereas CSU will. Clearly there will be pressure for us to align our curriculum with CSU schools, which will affect our Math and Language Arts curriculum. In the near-term, some students whose first choice is their local community college may attend a CSU instead, given the prospect of fewer developmental classes and grad credit. And will CSU’s move begin a larger trend in higher education of downsizing and devaluing developmental ed? At any rate, CSU is requiring the completion of remedial math and English before beginning sophomore year.

So with the bold stroke of a pen, one of the very foundations of the California Community College system—developmental education—is called into question even as our enrollment numbers may become augmented. The new CSU model—and CSU is the largest state university system in the nation—provokes plenty of concerns; the following are a few expressed on the De Anza English list-serve immediately after the CSU announcement in August:

Will other public universities and private colleges pursue similar policies?

How can our district partner with local CSU’s in aligning developmental courses?

Why would students placed into regular curriculum at CSU take their transfer classes with us if our district requires them to take non-credit remedial courses first?

Why would students in need of CSU Early Start classes take them at community colleges if not offered units towards four year college graduation?

“Why do I need to take an English placement (or ESL) test at De Anza if CSU does not require one?”

“Are De Anza’s remedial math and English classes the equivalent of CSU’s Early Start Program and/or its freshmen year co-requisite course requirements?”

And many more....

On the face of it, the new model seems to reflect a misconception of what developmental education is about, as if vast numbers of students had been set adrift in some horse latitudes of remediation, and could now instead move full sail towards graduation. But in denying the reality of the problem of unpreparedness that developmental education is designed to tackle, CSU’s downsizing its course offerings smacks of expedience. Given the potential savings in labor costs (faculty to teach developmental coursework), and with academic triage cycling out marginal students before yeartwo, it’s a “win” for CSU, and for industry too, as there are speedily replenished ranks of future workers at both ends of the entry-level wages spectrum—the early drop outs and an expanding pool of twenty-two year old graduates.

And whatever boon this becomes for our district in the short-term—and naturally we’d like to capture students otherwise headed for CSU’s summer “Early Start” program or its freshmen year equivalents—over the long term the new model could exert downward pressure on both the quantity and variety of our developmental course offerings.

If any of the above sound familiar, it’s probably because you’ve heard this tune before. It’s education on the industrial model, students having to declare their major from Day One, and don’t let the door hit you on the way out—as long as it’s not later than year four, six at the most. Cloaked in the language of equity, cost-savings, “win-win”, student success, and never-ending quest for the Holy Grail of Efficiency, it likely will weed out the ‘low-performers’ right away. It’s success set against continuing access, just as meritocracy trumps solidarity in most contexts in contemporary America. It decries barriers to success—ceilings—while ignoring the arguably greater problem of few or no floors. Ironically, CSU could over time become more “selective,” its relaxed placement criteria leading to many students failing out. (You heard it here first: CSU will also eventually become a PhD granting institution, leveraging its California brandname to the world.) Will students who fail cycle out of higher education permanently?

In a small sample pilot in De Anza English, multiple measures placement significantly increased, not reduced, the equity gap in success in EWRT 1A with respect to our “targeted” vs. “non-targeted” students.

The CSU chancellor cites a supposed “shortage of 1.1 million bachelor’s degrees” by 2025, which fact, figment, or fiction, is the datum that launched a thousand ships. But hey, industry would probably prefer degree’d

‘data collectors’ over critical thinkers, anyway. For English, which I can speak to, CSU’s new policy fails to grasp the realities of beginning writing courses. Developmental English teachers are not ruthless gatekeepers, extolling the Holy Writ of Grammar and Correctness with red pencil incarnadine. On the contrary, developmental writing and reading classes are an introduction to critical literacy, without which the vast majority of our students wouldn’t succeed. Many California high school graduates simply aren’t prepared for the play of ideas, the published discourse and ongoing debate on issues, the rigor of academic thought, and the level of written language that a college education is responsible for developing facility with. An education of this sort is vital for citizenship, democracy, full participation in society—and for acquiring the skills necessary to negotiate the credit-bearing, two- and four-year college curriculums.

Our own system’s Vision for Success makes a big deal out of supposed “lost lifetime wages” for students who take more units than necessary to graduate, as they sort out where their interests lie. And for struggling parents too busy themselves to “helicopter,” who want their child to be a “locomotive kid,” pulling the rest of the family like a train behind them to greater affluence, the folks might well like this plan. But would their son or daughter?

Public education is made responsible for addressing a whole host of social ills. But the CSU literature’s implicit “vision” of slacking students stuffing classrooms taught by a professoriate of solipsistic, self-regarding Mandarins is inaccurate and offensive. And our own system’s “Vision for Success” paints a picture of our students taking more classes than needed to graduate as an enormous boondoggle suffered by state budget-makers and victimized taxpayers. Yes, it is devoutly to be wished for if California residents who graduated from our primary and secondary schools were gainfully, that is, sustainably, employed in in the state where they grew up (ditto for teachers being able to afford to live where they work). But financially insecure students may need periodically to drop out to pay the bills, and CSU’s decision could end up jettisoning these students—who often most need the most help—from the system. They shouldn’t be forever deprioritized.

See future issues of FA News for more on this stunner. A late-breaking news flash: a November 1 article in EdSource.org reports on give-and-take between CSU administration and faculty about the timeline for implementing these changes, with one-year delays already approved for two campuses.

NEWS

Volume 42, Number 2

FOOTHILL-DE ANZA FACULTY ASSOCIATION

FA News is published nine times during the academic year by the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Association, an independent California corporation certified by the California Public Employment Relations Board as the exclusive employee representative for the faculty of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District.

Letters and articles from District faculty are invited. FA, 12345 El Monte Road, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022. Ph: 650.949.7544 Email: ElwellSusanne@fhda.edu Website: <http://fa.fhda.edu>

FA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Steve Batham (FH)	Lisa Markus (DA)
Raymond Brennan (DA)	Kim Palmore (DA)
Karen Erickson (FH)	Kathy Perino (FH)
Donna Frankel (FH)	Katherine Schaefers (FH)
Spera Georgiou (DA)	Tim Shively, Pres. (DA)
Mary Ellen Goodwin (DA)	Robert Stockwell (DA)
Nicole Gray (FH)	Sue Yoes (DA)
Meredith Heiser (FH)	Nicky Yuen (DA)
Steve Howland (DA)	Bill Ziegenhorn (FH)

ADMIN. ASSISTANT: Susanne Elwell
FA NEWS EDITOR: Steve Howland

FA

4

FA

5

FA

6