

ACADEMIC SENATE NEWSLETTER

October 2004

Vol. 2 No. 2

PRESIDENT'S CORNER

The recent actions taken by the district have caused much concern in every corner of the campus. Campus leaders continue to bring forth rational information, data, and a good faith effort to solve problems, all to no avail. In response, the faculty have generated a list of actions to be considered by the senate. At the October 18 meeting, the senate officers will ask for direction from the faculty as to which items on the list should be considered the top priority. If you have not yet seen the list, please call your senators or the senate office, and Tasa can help you. It is clear that Prop R continues to be a very hot topic.

You've probably read the email from Dr. Martinez indicating that 20+ new faculty will join our ranks by the fall. The Planning and Budget Council had to make a difficult decision in order to secure the new faculty: They decided not to restore department budgets with the savings we generated from last year. It is important to note that none of the faculty will be hired using equalization dollars or any new dollars. We have cannibalized ourselves in order to bring about stability and security for our students. The addition of these new faculty will make a dent in the backlog of hires, but we will still be behind in hiring the faculty that we need.

Equalization continues to be important for our students and programs, and the chancellor has stated that the next round of equalization money will bring to the colleges more dollars for hiring. We sincerely hope to see the equalization dollars in our budget next year.

Don't forget the Gala on Oct. 23!

IN A NUTSHELL

1. Dr. Martinez has invited six faculty to participate on each hiring committee that will be formed over the next few months to replace Bobby Thompson, Elisabeth Hamel, Shannon O'Dunn and Bill Bradley.
2. Yes, there are staff development funds for this year. How much? How to access? The College-wide Professional Development Committee will work out the logistics. And that committee has need for additional faculty representatives. Please contact the senate officers if you wish to serve on this committee.
3. A new voicemail system has been purchased with Prop R funds for the district. Your current messages that are saved or archived

CALENDAR

Oct. 18
Senate Meeting,
11:10-12:20, room
325A

Oct. 19
Governing Board
Meeting, 7:30-9:00,
Griffin Gate

Oct. 23
Foundation Gala,
5:30, Barona Valley
Ranch, \$75 for faculty

Oct. 28-30
State Senate Plenary
Session,
Newport Beach

Oct. 31
Halloween

Grossmont College
Academic Senate
http://www.grossmont.edu/academic_senate

President: Beth Smith
Phone:
(619) 644-7893
E-mail:
Beth.Smith@gcccd.net



will not transfer over to the new system. The new system will go into effect at the end of the month or early November. More info later...

LOCAL ISSUES

Vice President:

Bonnie Schmiege
Bonnie.schmiege
@gcccd.net

Senate Officers:

Jennifer Carmean
Jennifer.carmean
@gcccd.net

Victoria Howitt

Victoria.howitt@gcccd.net

Senate Secretary:

Tasa Campos

Newsletter design:

Patricia Morrison

The following committees need faculty members. Please contact the senate officers if you wish to serve. If you need more details about the committees, go to http://www.grossmont.edu/org_gov_structures/

1. College-wide Professional Development Committee
Business and Professional Studies rep
Communication and Fine Arts rep
Math, Natural Science, and ESW rep
Student Services or Learning Resources rep
2. Disciplinary Hearing Committee and Formal Student Grievance Hearing Committee
These committees need a pool of faculty from which to draw participants for individual cases.
3. Enrollment Strategies Committee
Business and Professional Studies rep
4. Equipment and Technology Committee
Faculty rep
5. Instructional Computing Committee
Child Development rep
6. Student Services Program Review
2 Faculty rep

STATE ISSUES

Attached are reports from FACCC and the state senate.

GOVERNOR SIGNS/VETOES COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEGISLATION (from FACCC)

The Governor signed the following community college measures:

AB 1417 (Pacheco) - softens the impact of the governor's \$31 million veto of Partnership for Excellence funds on select districts by allowing them to use a portion of Scheduled Maintenance for operations. This measure also reinserts prior year control language over the Part-Time Faculty Equity funds, inadvertently left out of this year's budget.

AB 2412 (Yee) - this FACCC sponsored measure authorizes the Employment Development Department to penalize districts that willfully provide

incorrect information about the employment status of an unemployment insurance applicant.

AB 1415 (Brulte) - requires the California Community Colleges and the California State University, and requests the University of California and private institutions of higher education establish a common course numbering system.

AB 1852 (Mullin) - prohibits K-12 and community college faculty who receive a golden handshake from returning to work for any district for one year, and from returning to work for the district that gave them the retirement incentive for five years. This measure also eliminates the minimum age requirement for receiving a partial lump sum payment from the CalSTRS Defined Benefit (DB) Program.

AB 2554 (Pavley) - creates a two-year limit on the current exemption for retired members of the CalSTRS DB Program who fill a vacant administrative position.

SB 102 (Burton) - allows a retiring faculty member to apply up to two-tenths of one year of unused sick leave in the calculation of creditable service and the longevity bonus.

SB 1785 (Scott) - requires the California State University establish transfer student admissions requirements that give priority to students meeting specified criteria, including completing at least 60 units of lower division, baccalaureate-level coursework; declaring a major; and meeting all general education requirements for that major.

The Governor vetoed the following community college measures:

AB 242 (Liu) - this measure would have implemented many of the personnel recommendations from the Master Plan Committee, including an affirmation of the 75/25 full- to part-time faculty ratio and a call for pro-rata pay for all higher education faculty. It also would have allowed for tenured faculty members to retreat to a faculty position within a period of five years if they moved to a different district to assume a position as an administrator. Gov. Schwarzenegger's veto message referenced problems he had with the K-12 portions of the bill.

AB 3010 (Laird) - would have streamlined the process for approving the designs and construction of community college buildings.

SB 905 (Chesbro) - would have eliminated the current cap on concurrent enrollment by K-12 students during the summer sessions at community colleges, while prohibiting these students from displacing regular community college students.

From the State Senate

President's Update September 2004

It is an agonizing and very busy month for us as we launch our fall schedules and count every student each day. Meanwhile, across the state, discussions about salient matters bring faculty, administrators, students, and others together, the Executive Committee is putting the finishing touches on our planning for the Fall Plenary Session, and daily we await information about Governor Schwarzenegger's treatment of pending legislation. As often happens, this UPDATE will provide an abbreviated commentary on a number of issues, with links to more extended information.

Fall Session

You've already received your save-the-date card, and many of you have responded by making your hotel reservations and registering for the session. The Sutton Place Hotel is located just south of the 405 freeway on MacArthur Boulevard, several blocks from the John Wayne Airport—where Santa Ana, Irvine, and Newport Beach converge. Continue to watch your mail: first, you will receive a white paper with information to foster your campus' discussions about the current graduation requirements for English and mathematics and whether or not they should be raised. We urge you to engage in a campus-wide discussion of this matter now so that your delegates to the plenary session can provide the best of our diverse faculty thoughts on this matter.

Then, in addition to the usual packet of resolutions and information, we will next send several papers for your careful review and scrutiny.

- a paper on the 2002 Accreditation Standards and how faculty might best address ACCJC demands
- a significant paper on student fees and why the Academic Senate (and other faculty groups) have long opposed them
- a second report on the findings of basic skills research, with focus on matriculation, assessment, and placement.

We urge you to read and debate these materials, draft and pass resolutions expressing your concerns, and carry them forward to the Area meetings scheduled October 15 and 16. While you will be sent information specific to your area, you can also check the homepage of our website

<http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us>

California Performance Review (CPR)

Representatives of the Academic Senate attempted to provide testimony to the California Performance Review Commission at its hearing on Education—to no avail. The process has been less than open, with little testimony from the public taken. Commission members have, however,

been quick to recognize that the report offers far too many policy recommendations and far too few suggestions for genuine savings as was the initial charge. The Legislative Analysts Office found the claims for savings overstated, and many of the recommendations without merit. The Academic Senate joined with other representatives of the system to craft a response within a very short period of time. That response began with a table provided by the System Office, indicating what the implications were for their offices and personnel. The Academic Senate's Executive Committee crafted its own unofficial response, based on prior resolutions and adopted papers, on sound academic principles, and much common sense.

Ultimately, a version of that document (minus the faculty focus) appeared as an appendix to the written testimony provided to Commission members at their hearing. That document, including a narrative analysis with input from CCC/CFT, and CCA/CTA, and CalSACCC/Student Senate, and the Academic Senate, as well as the CEOs, appears at the System Office website: <http://www.cccco.edu>. (Click on "What's New" and then "Written Testimony" in the paragraph on the CPR.

You can find our original commentary on our website. The two Academic Senate-generated tables appear very similar: (1) Appendix to the Written Testimony. We were asked to modify it to focus less on faculty, and more on students and fiscal questions not addressed. The Board of Governors approved the System response at its September meeting. (2) An Academic Senate, faculty version. As the cautionary header to this table suggests, it is NOT an adopted document and has not undergone your external review; it is only intended to generate discussion among faculty-who will doubtless raise other reasons to support or object to specific recommendations. We'd like to know more about those views, and thus will have a strategy breakout on the topic at our Plenary Session.

System Office Review

We reported earlier that the Chancellor had commissioned a study of the System Office to make recommendations on how that office can be more responsive to local colleges and districts. The Board of Governors adopted that report at their September meeting, and the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors are moving ahead. Of considerable interest to us is the formation of a new statewide curriculum committee to provide oversight. The Academic Senate will be represented by four faculty members with a range of experience and curricular interests. That group will meet for the first time in October. To see what else is afoot in response to the review, visit the site at http://www.cccco.edu/reports/review/agency_review.htm.

2004-2005 Budget and Enabling Legislation (AB 1417-Pacheco is Signed!)
By now you have a clear sense of how the budget plays out on your local campus. The last piece of the puzzle fell into place when Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 1417 to rectify a double whammy when PFE

funds were returned to the base-and then diminished by \$31.4 million dollars-and when districts were impacted by equalization and "over-cap" allocations. The bill permits districts to use the block grant funds in the physical plant and instructional support category during 2004-05 to continue activities begun under the original PFE funding. There are qualifications, however, and the September 20 letter from Robert Turnage [see letter and comparison table] explains those limitations that apply to Allan Hancock, Gavilan, Hartnell, Kern, Marin, MiraCosta, Napa Valley, Rancho Santiago, Redwoods, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose-Evergreen, San Mateo, Shasta-Tehama-Trinity, South Orange, Victor Valley, and West Hills. It amounts to a windfall for some districts and is welcomed news for other districts. We trust you faculty, in your adopted budget and planning processes, are afforded opportunity to discuss how these funds will be used to achieve the aims of PFE and continue the fine programs many of you have instituted on your campuses.

CCLC Leadership Forums

On September 20, I attended the meeting at Long Beach City College, sharing the day with administrators and local senate letters from Southern California to listen to the presentation offered by the Community College League of California. The session was repeated in Bakersfield on September 21, and at Ohlone College on September 22. The League explained the System's response to the California Performance Review and the need for local action with local legislators. The League also unveiled a revision of an allocation model first seen last spring. See their website (<http://www.ccleague.org>) to review a short version (PowerPoint) or the detailed explanation (PDF). Because of its wide implications for all colleges, we have invited the League's Scott Lay to present it for our public scrutiny and comment at our Fall Plenary Session. A Board of Governors study session on this topic may be schedule for their November meeting at Southwestern College.

Full-time Obligation Numbers

Earlier this fall we sent you Vice Chancellor Turnage's latest missive concerning the full-time faculty obligation numbers for Fall 2004, expressed either as a raw number or as a percentage of the 75/25 goal toward which we all aspire. Districts will soon be submitting any requests they may have for relief, so be watchful and engage your district administrators in appropriate conversations. We'll keep you apprised of these discussions as they play out at the state level in the coming months.

Other Legislation of Interest to Community Colleges

In these final days of September, we watch the status of legislative bills of interest to us, particularly SB 1785 (Scott) and SB 1415 (Brulte). They are of particular interest to our transferring students and us. In watching Governor Schwarzenegger's public statements issued upon signing or

vetoing those bills, we seek a pattern to understand why he rejects so many bills of interest to community colleges. Two recurrent reasons have emerged thus far: (1) there may be some remote possibility of a local college incurring costs and filing a claim against an unfunded mandate; (2) the bills' provisions might conflict with recommendations of California Performance Review-whose status is yet to be determined. Which brings us full circle. While across the state observers suggest that many of the CPRs recommendations will not move forward, we have before us an obligation to speak clearly and forcefully-with and on behalf of our students and our communities-to protect our educational priorities and the system we share.

I look forward to being with you all in just a short five weeks. I value your company and your thoughts.