PRESIDENT OBAMA’S FISCAL YEAR 2011 BUDGET PROPOSAL
February 1, 2010

Jonathan Lightman, Executive Director, Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACC) releases the highlights of the Presidential Budget to FACC Board. Here are some of the key issues:

President Barack Obama formally released his FY2011 Budget Request – a formal submission to Congress. The President's budget provides $49.7 billion (7.5% increase over the FY2010 budget request) for the Department of Education, but this figure does not include the Pell Grant program. The Administration is seeking to move the Pell Grant into the mandatory side of the federal budget. If this switch was to occur, the Pell Grant program would not be subject to the annual discretionary appropriations process. The total budget request for Pell is $34.9 billion and would provide for a $5,710 Pell Grant maximum. It is estimated that there is a $18 billion Pell Grant shortfall.

The Department of Education FY2011 budget request also includes "$10.6 billion over 10 years for the President's American Graduation Initiative, to strengthen and support community colleges, focus on college completion, and graduate 5 million more students by 2020." The House passed version of H.R. 3221, "Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act," provides $9.5 billion for AGI. The AGI funding amount is expected to increase in the Senate bill, which still has not been released.

Below are some other key other funding areas:

Carl Perkins Career and Technical Education State Grants: $1.26 billion, an increase of $103 million (the increase comes from the consolidation of Tech-Prep)
Tech-Prep State Grants: $0, a decrease of $103 million
Strengthening Institutions: $88.2 million, an increase of $4.2 million
Hispanic Serving Institutions: $123.3 million, an increase of $6 million
Predominantly Black Institutions: $11.3 million, an increase of $500,000
College Pathways and Accelerated Learning: $100 million (a new program, focused on early college initiatives and Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate)
Work-study: $980.5 million, level funding
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants: $958.8 million, level funding

The full Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Summary can be found at:
http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget11/summary/edlite-section1.html

Meanwhile, the Department of Labor also released its budget request, which includes $14 billion for its programs. Unfortunately, the Career Pathways program is slated to be consolidated because the Department believes that many of the programs would be eligible for funding under the American Graduation Initiative. The Department would provide $85 million for a program focused on Green Jobs and $261 million for two new innovation funds for job training. Additionally, language was inserted in the request for the Workforce Investment Act to allow local workforce boards to award contracts to institutions of higher education or other eligible training providers.

The Department of Labor's budget request can be found at: http://www.dol.gov/budget/
GOVERNOR RELEASES PROPOSED 2010-11 BUDGET
January 8, 2010

Major points of the proposed community college budget

• Provides $126 million to fund enrollment growth of 2.21 percent (about 26,000 new full-time students)
• Reduces funding for apportionments and select categorical programs by $22.9 million to account for a negative cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), computed at -0.38% due to reductions in the statutory inflationary index
• Cuts $10 million from Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
• Cuts $10 million from Part-time Faculty Compensation
• Increases Career-Technical Education by $20 million
• Maintains all categorical cuts and flexibility allowances approved in 2009-10, and does not backfill the $35 million in federal funds provided this year to ease the cuts.
• Proposes student fees be maintained at $26/unit.
• Makes technical changes to accommodate and backfill reduced property taxes and other budget year revenue shortfalls and acknowledges, but does not backfill, student fee revenue shortfall of $10 million in the current year.
• Proposes the suspension of the competitive Cal Grant program, with no new awards provided beginning in fall 2010.

Talking points

• The governor has taken significant steps to protect college access at a very difficult fiscal time for California. This gives hope to the graduating high school seniors and unemployed Californians seeking education and a skilled job.
• Even with funding for 26,000 additional full-time students, enrollment will continue to exceed state support, and community colleges will have to prioritize basic skills, transfer and career technical enrollment.
• The decision to propose a negative cost-of-living adjustment is disappointing, as state mandated increases in pension benefits for non-academic employees appear to not be fully considered and districts are seeing continued double-digit health insurance increases. The negative COLA also fails to recognize a deficit that has accrued over the last two years as the state has failed to provide over 10% in statutorily guided COLAs. We will collect information on actual cost increases from districts to present to the Legislature if indeed the index does not match reality.
• The proposed elimination of the competitive Cal Grant program would hurt the neediest community college students at a time when California's citizens are deeply concerned with college affordability. This program provides 44,000 community colleges students grants of $1,551 for textbooks, transportation and supplies. These are generally older students whose income averages $14,000 and are ineligible for the state's entitlement program because they worked between high school and college.
• While no further categorical program cuts are proposed, devastating program cuts will have to be implemented as districts across California used one-time budget reserve funds to protect student access to the most vital programs. We commit to looking at the impact of these cuts on student success, particularly among the most vulnerable students, and finding ways to maintain the most essential services.
• From Sacramento to Washington, the recognized role of community colleges in our state and nation's economic future has never been higher, and locally elected trustees, faculty and staff are ready to step up to the challenge and deliver quality degrees, certificates and lower-division transfer curriculum to the record number of students and would-be students turning to our colleges.

• This budget proposal for community colleges clearly shows Governor Schwarzenegger's commitment to help underemployed and unemployed Californians get back on their feet and cements his legacy as an advocate for the role of our colleges in that priority.

FACULTY CONTRIBUTION

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UFO: PART II
Alan M. Kirshner, UFO President

In the last Newsletter, I ended the story of my “Brief History of the UFO in Two Parts: Part I” when on February 1, 1979, my birthday, I received a nice present—the ratification vote that established the United Faculty of Ohlone as our collective bargaining unit. Concerned that for the first time in the college’s 12 year history we would soon be getting a President who was not known to us we determined that we needed to get to work on a contract proposal that would establish the UFO as a vehicle to protect and improve the faculty’s rights. We decided we wanted to create a contract supporting the Ohlone Way.

The term the “Ohlone Way” derived from the book that Malcolm Margolin published the year before (1978) on the indigenous people of this area. As noted in my first article, the Ohlone faculty selected to go its own way becoming an unaffiliated union. Despite our expressed anxiety about the direction a new president from outside our community and culture might take we decided to avoid negotiating a detailed and all encompassing contract. The Ohlone Way meant collegiality, working closely with the administration, and establishing a minimalist contract. Translation, we wanted to avoid detailed legal language that we felt would impede the creative energies of both the faculty and the administration. We wanted a document that set guidelines for the college in the same manner as the U.S. Constitution did for our nation.
Luckily, the District agreed and did not follow the path of most other colleges that hired labor attorneys. Our Board of Trustees instead brought in a John (Joe) Crossett—a professional negotiator without a law degree. He was amiable, understanding, non-confrontational, non-adversarial and came close to using interest based bargaining in our discussions. SIDE NOTE: Sadly Joe Crossett died a few years later from a stroke in his early 40’s and the District decided to bring in an attorney from San Diego who I often referred to as their hired gun.

Our initial contract committee consisted of ten individuals with Vern Piumarta at its head. We felt Vern, who is still teaching, was a great choice not only because he was a CPA, but due to his mellow personality and a strong understanding of faculty needs. Other commitments forced Vern to resign the post and Geography, Geology and Anthropology Professor, Jerry Pressler became the Chief Negotiator for our first contract. Our committee obtained training in preparing a contract and negotiations from a Laurie Fried Lee, President of San Francisco’s Community College’s AFT. We went up to her office in the city for our sessions. In September 1979, we submitted our first contract proposal.

Vern had, during his brief tenure as head of the contract committee, circulated two requests for faculty to submit input on which issues we should place on the table. We invited all full and part-time faculty to give suggestions even though only about 75% of the full-time and a very small percentage of the part-time instructors were members. Agency Shop, where all faculty must join or contribute to union, did not come into existence until about four years back. We did extensive recruitment to convince non-members to join the UFO. We emphasized the Ohlone Way arguing that the UFO was providing an efficient, economical, autonomous and professional union. We assured the faculty that we felt a strike would be “counter-productive” and that “such an action would only be possible with the consensus of the faculty—and that would be a virtual impossibility given the mood of this faculty.” For those that feared a contract that could be a “factory worker’s nightmare” we tried to assure them that our goal would be a contract similar to Foothill College which only consisted of four pages that basically set the status quo into law.

A total of 64 full-time and 37 part-time instructors responded to Vern’s survey on setting priorities in the initial contract proposal. Salary and benefits were numero uno—surprise, surprise. Ohlone compared to other CC’s in the Bay Area placed next to the bottom for our full-time salary schedule and at the bottom for the part-time schedule. SIDE NOTE: Under Dr. Bennett Oppenheim’s tenure as Chief Negotiator, we moved the part-time schedule to near the average and the full-time to the top of the list in most categories, albeit, by placing the cost of health benefits within our salary.

Granted this creates an artificial figure as we may be the only unit in the Bay Area to do this, but my calculations indicated that even if this had not been done we would be third or fourth out of the 12 campuses—a long way from next to the bottom in 1979. Other issues included class size, load, leaves, grievance procedures, working days and method of evaluation.

Negotiations got underway in the early Fall of 1979 with three UFO representatives at the table and seven others, including myself, meeting between negotiation sessions to discuss the issues. The District had its Chief Negotiator, Joe Crossett, and three administrators at the table. They also provided an Administrative Secretary to take extensive notes of the meetings. These minutes legally could not be shared with our membership. However, almost weekly, we produced a bi-monthly UFO Missile (our newsletter) called “UFO Close Encounters.” This missive kept the membership informed of the general issues we were discussing plus any other union matters. For example, we told the membership in our second “UFO Close Encounters” that “the salary package currently being negotiated by the UFO is based on attaining parity with the average basic salary scale of the 10 other Bay Area community colleges. . . . For Part-timers the UFO was seeking establishment of steps based on quarters of teaching experience at Ohlone and higher per hour rates.” The Ohlone Way recognized the legal concept of secrecy at the table, but held that our membership should always be informed of the basics we intended to achieve. This did not mean we would reveal our bottom line. This was kept within the negotiating committee and candidly upset a few faculty members who failed to understand that for strategic reasons we could not publically reveal at what point we would say to the other side, “No way!”

I said earlier that Joe Crossett, the District’s Chief Negotiator, did lean toward interest based bargaining, but wasn’t quite there. Under his successor, San Diego Attorney Joe Zampi, we moved into a much more adversarial approach mitigated only by Bennett Oppenheim’s ability to keep the issues flowing with his wonderful use of the English language. With Zampi’s departure, the District decided to do more in-house bargaining bringing in an attorney only periodically—translation, once again we got close to interest based bargaining avoiding continuous game playing. Please note, I said close. Interest based bargaining attempts to bring understanding of the needs, desires and most of all the fears important to both sides out in the open thereby creating a win-win scenario.

On May 1, 1980, eight months after negotiations commenced we reached a tentative agreement with the District. The negotiating committee voted 8 to 2 to send the contract to the faculty for a vote along with a majority and minority report. The two dissenting members remain on the faculty today—Carolyn Strickler and yours truly. Sadly, none of the eight in the majority are still here and I do not intend to skewer their position because both Carolyn and I really felt the contract reflected the Ohlone Way of legal minimalisms, flexibility and collegiality. Certainly, we agreed that the unique establishment
of a Certificated Employer-Employee Relations Committee (CEER) guaranteeing faculty input into the decision process fit within the good will and collegial atmosphere that existed on our campus. Our main reasons for voting to reject the contract pertained to what we felt was a basic bottom-line principle—a grievance procedure that provided real due process. Our first contract had only in-house hearings and terminated a grievance with a Board of Trustee decision. We argued that most contracts without binding arbitration provide recommending arbitration or mediation that would provide a written record for the courts not simply conciliation. Despite our dissent within the committee Carolyn and I told the faculty that we did not recommend that the membership vote against the contract. Our first contract passed overwhelmingly.

Ten years later, in 1990-1991, Bennett, who had taken on the task of Chief Negotiator about 1985, due to personal reasons requested a short respite from the table. We hired a professional union negotiator and fired him after one negotiation meeting. He failed to understand the Ohlone Way and was confrontational to a fault. I resigned as President of the UFO and took the job of Chief Negotiator with a table team of Bob Bradshaw, Mikelyn Stacey and Carol Lawton (part-time representative)—I apologize if I forgot anyone. A number of other faculty acted in advisory capacities and when needed joined us at the table. I felt that one of my goals in my new role had to be the establishment of better protection in grievance procedures for the faculty. The committee agreed. While we were able to obtain advisory arbitration and got the District to add that the Board of Trustees would not argue that they were the final authority if the grievance went to court, we had to agree to expand the contract. We added into the contract most of the Board procedures, with some modifications, which we had been functioning under for the last 25 years. Our contract lost some of its minimalist flavor yet still avoided most of the legalisms, the wordiness and the minutiae of the vast majority of Community College agreements. I hope we can keep it that way remembering the Ohlone Way—a faculty and administration willing to avoid legalisms so we can be flexible and work together in a collegial atmosphere. And maybe, just maybe, move on to interest based bargaining.

ADDRESSING INEQUITIES IN OUR ADD/DROP POLICY
Sheldon W. Helms, Psychology

Over the past several semesters, I’ve found myself spending an inordinate amount of time dealing with enrollment issues. The recent addition of Waitlists to our online class rosters has made things run much more smoothly, and is a godsend when compared to the oldschool method of signing add cards and waiting for students to turn them in (only to find that they used the wrong student ID, forgot to sign it, have a hold on their account, or some other annoyance that sends the whole process into a tailspin).

Like you, I have enough on my plate, and don’t need to take on a second 40-hour per week job dealing with adds, drops, and other administrative tasks. I’ve found, however, that no matter what I do to create policies and procedures designed to minimize the amount of time I spend on these matters – and to streamline the process – it never seems to be enough to avoid the pitfalls.

Take this scenario for instance. Tommy Goode registers for Psychology 101 for Spring semester, a class that has a capacity of 75 students. For whatever reason, Mr Goode does not come to the first class, and does not contact the professor to let him know about this. The professor takes roll on the first day of the semester, and although the class is officially full, finds that he has 5 spaces available due to no-shows including Mr Goode. The professor returns to his office at the end of the day, and drops the 5 no-shows, making room for the five Waitlisted students who did come to class to “bump up.”

Mr Goode shows up on the second day of the semester, and asks the professor what he missed. The professor informs Mr Goode that he was dropped for not showing up, and after some debate and discussion during which Mr Goode explains that he got back late from a vacation, the student leaves upset and disappointed that he cannot be in the class.

By the third class meeting, one of the enrolled students has dropped the course. Another student approaches the professor and informs him that he has just added the class, and wants to know what he missed. The professor asks why he was not there on the first or second day, and this student, Mr Ignavus, says that he just got around to registering for his classes after a long vacation. The professor refers this student to his blog where he can obtain a syllabus, handouts, textbook information, etc.

Think about this scenario for a moment. Here we have two students. Both failed to follow through with their responsibilities due to putting vacation as a priority. One, Mr Goode, was on his game at the beginning, and at least enrolled in the class; but because he was enrolled and did not show up, he was dropped and cannot take the class. Another, Mr Ignavus, didn’t even bother to enroll, and also was not there on the first day (in fact, he didn’t even make it on the second day!), but he gets to stay in the class.

My question is, where is the justice in this? The way our system is set up, students are penalized for putting themselves on our radar by enrolling, and are rewarded for being lazy and adding into the class later. Although some of you with small class sized \( s \) (below 50 students) may find this much ado about nothing, those of us who bear the burden of large classes (sometimes more than 100 students in a single class) find it tedious, unfair, and crazymaking. We are often left with the choices of either enforcing no policy at all, thus giving in to the student with the best persuasion strategy (e.g., begging, crying, intimidating, or threatening), or enforcing a policy that seems incongruous with the mission of the college.

I offer this only as an expression of a serious problem, and not to lay blame or to suggest that there is an easy solution. I don’t even know if there is a solution. I am, however, open to suggestions.

So far, the advice given to me has been useless. One person suggested that I simply not drop anyone for the first week or so,
and then see where the chips fall. That may seem like a simple and fair solution on paper, but consider the students on the Waitlist who attend class for an entire week, hoping to get in, only to find that they have wasted their time and now have to a) return their books and other supplies to the bookstore, and b) find another class to fill that slot in their schedule. This solution also does not take into account the fact that most first day no-shows turn out to be “never-shows.”

I also know faculty who add anyone and everyone, even allowing students to sit on the floor, in chairs with no desk, etc. This is not only a safety hazard at times, but is also unfair to the students. Each enrolled student has the right to a proper learning environment, and even as filthy and embarrassing as our classrooms currently are, they should at least be afforded a comfortable chair and a desk or table to take notes on.

In short, I’m still seeking a solution.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AT OHLONE
Deb Parziale, Professional Development Coordinator

As a Learning College, the Ohlone Community College District promotes lifelong learning for all. To support this goal, the Professional Development Program encourages continuous learning to ensure that employees are prepared to meet the needs of students and the District now and in the future. Professional development outcomes support the college goals. Assessment of how we meet these outcomes is truly impressive!

Last year Ohlone College personnel attended over 350 workshops/conferences/courses either on or off campus. Administration continues to support professional development by providing $25,000 annually. All District employees are eligible to receive up to $500 each year (given fund availability) to attend a conference or complete an innovation project that contributes to student success and promotes the college goals and objectives. Additionally, faculty, staff, and administrators volunteer their time to provide workshops and/or assist others with just in time learning! We conduct a Learning College Week prior to each semester and last spring we offered the first annual Classified Flex Day. Full-time faculty are required by contract to complete 24 hours of professional development (flex) each year. Last year, faculty professional development flex hours averaged 48 hours per person, more than double what is required.

Kudos to all for being such wonderful role models to our students.

GRADING IN GREEN: HOW A TEACHER’S NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION IMPACTS STUDENTS
Ally Germaine, English Instructor

Did you ever turn in a paper only to get it back with comments, markings & a letter grade all written in red? I had that unfortunate experience while I was a student at Ohlone. Although I got a B (not a bad grade) on the paper, I felt horrible seeing all the red ink screaming “You did all this wrong!”

It wasn’t until I took classes with Mrs. Kawasaki-Hull that my “red ink blues” subsided. Mrs. Kawasaki-Hull returned papers with clearly-written comments, markings & a letter grade all written in green. Now, instead of red ink screaming, I saw green ink constructively commenting.

Often teachers will use a red pen when grading, but do we really think about our color choice & its possible impact on our students? I have asked my students if their teachers “graded in red” & how the color impacted them. They reported negative feelings associated with the color, explaining that even if they got a B, it felt like a C because the red writing so harshly pointed out writing flaws. I explained my positive experience in Mrs. Kawasaki-Hull’s classes & told my class that she inspired me to grade in green. When I returned their essays, my students truly felt the impact of the green pen, stating that they felt encouraged by the color, rather than discouraged by a “sea of red” writing.

This chromatic (nonverbal) communication impacted me when I was a student & now that I am a teacher, I am following in the footsteps of one of the best teachers I have ever encountered: Mrs. Kawasaki-Hull. I encourage my fellow faculty members to consider their color choice when grading; students may not tell us, nor even fully realize it themselves, but they truly are impacted by the color of their grade.

WHAT HAS THE UNION DONE FOR YOU LATELY?

Alan Kirshner, UFO President

Anu Ganguly, your Close Encounters editor, requested I inform you of what your membership in the UFO has done for you recently. A tough assignment considering that often faculty think of the union chiefly in the context of salary and fringe benefits. With the current economic atmosphere my answer on these narrow issues would have to be, "very little-so far." Yes, there is a little.

As all of you are aware, I hope, our revised contract passed with 93.44% of the faculty that voted in favor. The additions and clarifications included expansion of 15.2.3 "Leave for Illness of Family Member," domestic partners in 15.2.4 "Bereavement Leave," the banking of hours for baby bonding and academic leave, clarifications to 15.2.5 "Pregnancy Disability Leave," 15.2.9 "Child Rearing Leaves," 15.2.10 "Family and Medical Care Leave" and 15.4 "Academic Leave." A Memorandum of Understanding with District guarantees dedicated office space for Part-Time faculty. Our chief negotiators, Darren Bardell and Heather McCarty also came to a satisfactory arrangement with the District on how the faculty would help the college overcome some of the budgetary shortfall with as little impact as possible to our students. For more specific details of the agreement you can go to http://www.kirshnerisms.com/UFO/TentativeAgreement2009.pdf
The faculty have a long history of understanding that the Union and the Senate are the same people. Both groups are the faculty. Both groups strive to ensure that the college functions in a fashion that maximizes the educational experience of the students.

Editor: I am sure that in making Senate decisions, Union members who are also part of the Senate may have objections/their own ideas/amendments. How do you resolve such conflicts if any? (I must say that during my term as Senate Secretary, I observed that Alan Kirshner, UFO president used to initiate about 90% of the motions in the Senate)

Using the word "resolve" implies that there are differences between the Union and the Senate. I disagree. Faculty come to the college with a wide variety of experiences and opinions. The policies and decisions of both the Union and the Senate are always crafted with the intent of benefiting the students.

Editor: In these harsh economic times when core courses are being slashed, vital sections cut, summer school condensed, do you feel that academics has been compromised significantly? Don’t you feel that these measures ultimately hurt the students?

While the current budget situation is dire, I feel that the college has done what is necessary to maintain the best possible quality of education for the students. Of course there have been cutbacks in classes, and certainly the faculty would like more sections and better facilities. However, just like I do dealing with my personal budget, the college must deal with the reality of the state economy. The college has taken a balanced approach of furloughs, a hiring slowdown, and a reduction in sections. However, we still have a comprehensive academic summer session and have not had any staff layoffs.

Editor: How has the relationship been with the administration and the Senate? I notice that the administration is present in just about all the Senate meetings? Surely the administration does not agree to all the Senate decisions? How do you work out differences there if any?

I feel that the success of Ohlone is a result of mutual trust respect between the faculty, the administration and the Board of Trustees. In the past, we can point to specific instances where the breakdown of this mutual trust and respect is directly linked to difficult times at the college. As an example, Dr. Jim Wright (Vice-President of Academic Affairs) is well known for his support of faculty and the respect accorded to him by both the faculty and the Board.

With regards to administration being present at Senate meetings, I would much prefer to know the opinions of all involved so that we can address them. Every problem is a problem because it is complicated and multi-faceted. It is impossible for faculty (or the administration) to correct a problem without knowing all the facets and side issues. If members of the Senate wish to have a discussion without members of the administration present, that
is easily achieved. The mutual respect between the faculty and
the administration allows us to request some time for private
discussion without the creation of any hard feelings.

Editor: Your most rewarding/gratifying moments as Senate
President?

The most rewarding? That's easy. I enjoy coordinating the semi-
annual college barbecues. It is amazing the sense of good-spirit
that is created by a large group of people enjoying food. And the
success of these events is in large part attributable to master
cooks Ron Staszkow (Professor Emeritus of Mathematics), Jim
Klent (Professor Emeritus of Chemistry) and the members of the
SOAR committee.

Editor: Who do you think is going to be the next Senate
President? How do you think the next leadership of the
Senate will be different from yours?

The next Senate President will be Jeff O'Connell of the Math
Department. He is currently chair of the Technology Committee
and has extensive experience working with all levels of faculty
and administration at the college. How will his leadership be
different from mine? I have no idea.

Editor: Can you leave us with any other thoughts over how
we will weather the next few years? the direction that the
College will take academically? any other thoughts that you
would like to share?

I suggest that the faculty compare the autonomy and collegiality
they have at Ohlone with that available to their colleagues at
other schools. While of course we have internal differences of
opinions, the faculty have a remarkable degree of respect for
each other and for the administration. We do not have the deep-
rooted problems that unfortunately affect other colleges.

Editor: We have heard rumors that at the end of your term
as Senate President this Spring, you no longer wish to hold
positions (in any capacity) in either the Senate or the Union.
Any particular reason for such a decision?

I have spent the last six years as President of either the Union or
the Senate. I believe other faculty should have the opportunity to
interact with all levels of the college, to contribute their ideas,
and to fully participate as senior faculty members.

TRIVIA

Q: How does sick leave accrue when a person is
working in pre-retirement reduced workload? Does the
member earn a prorated amount of sick leave credit that
year or do they get full sick leave credit as if working
100%?

A: Since sick leave is a benefit, and reduced workload
should not affect benefits, the person should be credited
with a full year of sick leave. So, if someone is
working 50% on pre-retiree reduced workload (RWP),
their sick leave accrual should be as if working 100%.

ON THE SAME TEAM

Carol Lawton, UFO-Part Time Faculty Representative

The United Faculty of Ohlone is an organization that
represents both the Full Time and Part Time faculty.
Whether full or part time, we faculty are all working to
give our students the best learning experience possible.

The circumstances under which we do our job differ,
however, because of the amount of time we spend on
campus. Part Time Faculty time on campus is primarily
limited to the time spent in the classroom actually
teaching. This results in Full Time and Part Time
Faculty having very little opportunity to interact. We
don’t get to know each other. As a consequence there is
a tendency to develop an Us and Them attitude.
Regardless of hiring procedures, like Full time faculty,
Part Timer Faculty are well qualified and committed
instructors who care about our students. We all want
Ohlone, our students, and each other to succeed.

Both Full and Part Timer Faculty would surely benefit
from more and better communication. If you have any
creative suggestions about ways to improve
communication between Full Timers and Part Timers,
share your ideas with Carol Lawton, at
<clawton@ohlone.edu>

ADJUNCT FACULTY – ELIGIBLE FOR
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS!

Part-time faculty may be eligible for unemployment
benefits between semesters or terms. Even if you are
going to be teaching the following semester, you maybe
eligible for unemployment during the period spanning
your last day of service in the current semester and the
date of your first meeting with your assigned class the
following semester. In order to apply for benefits, you
will have to complete an application form with EDD.
Online application can be done at https://
capply4ui.edd.ca.gov/ or you may contact them by
phone (1-800-300-5616) Monday-Friday 8.00 am -5.00
pm. You will need to allow 2 weeks for processing and
you will have to go through a phone interview at a time
set by the EDD. The weekly benefit may range
anywhere from $40-$450. For more information about
current benefits look up the EDD website at
www.edd.ca.gov/Unemployment/.
EDUCATION ARTICLES

News From CCCI

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA POLL ON HIGHER EDUCATION.
November 11, 2009

The latest public opinion survey on the perspective of Californians on higher education can be found at:

http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=917

Some findings of the current survey as communicated by Scott Lay:

• Californians give high grades to their public higher education systems but are worried about increased student costs and state budget cuts.
• State leaders get record low approval ratings for their handling of higher education: 21 percent for Governor Schwarzenegger and 16 percent for the state legislature.
• Sixty-seven percent of Latino parents of children aged 18 or younger are very worried about being able to afford a college education, while 38 percent of white parents say the same.
• The public believes that CC’s are doing the best job of the three segments of public higher education. A full 65% of respondents rate the job that community colleges as “excellent” or “good.” CC’s are the only segment that has a 60% or better excellent/good rating in each of the five identified demographic regions in California.
• Californians are deeply concerned with budget cuts to higher education, with 70% finding the cuts as a “big problem” and an additional 21% believing that they are “somewhat of a problem.”
• 86% of respondents believe that overall affordability of education in California’s public colleges and universities is a problem.
• While Californians believe that budget cuts are devastating access and affordability to our colleges and an overwhelming majority (70%) believe additional state funding would lead to major improvements, they neither support increased taxes nor student fees to solve the problem.
• In addition to concerns with affordability and fee increases, voters are deeply concerned with enrollment limitations, course reductions and the sacrifices college faculty and staff are making during this crisis.
• With rock bottom Legislature and Governor’s approval rating numbers there is a huge belief that state government has enough waste to eliminate to fund priority programs, like community colleges.

CALIFORNIA’S EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN....IN DIRE NEED OF REVISION AT 50!


For a full report go to:

The Master plan, made 50 years ago, provides the blueprint for California’s Education system as it lays out basic state policies on higher education as follows:

• Assigns Missions to the Different Higher Education Segments. The Master Plan envisions the University of California (UC) as the state’s primary public research university and directs it to grant baccalaureate, master's, doctoral, and other professional degrees. The California State University (CSU) is to focus on instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and grant baccalaureate and master’s degrees. The California Community Colleges (CCC) are to offer lower-division instruction that is transferable to four-year colleges, provide remedial and vocational training, and grant associate degrees and certificates.
• Specifies Eligibility Targets. According to Master Plan goals, the top 12.5 percent of all graduating public high school students are eligible for admission to UC, the top 33.3 percent are eligible for admission to CSU, and all persons 18 years or older who can “benefit from instruction” are eligible to attend CCC.
• Expresses Other Goals for Higher Education. The Master Plan includes a number of other statements concerning the state’s higher education goals and policies. For example, it expresses the state’s intent that higher education remain accessible, affordable, high-quality, and accountable.

In an article last November in San Francisco Chronicle titled “California’s Gold Standard for Higher Education Falls Upon Hard Times” Josh Keller writes “even today, almost 50 years after it was written, the master plan retains a mythic status in California, where it continues to provide the foundation of public debate about higher education….but as California grapples with one of the worst financial crises in its history, the master plan faces criticism that it is irrelevant to the needs and means of the state. Many scholars and college leaders argue that the hallowed document that has served the state so well for decades needs to be rewritten.”

According to Patrick M. Callan, president of the National Center for Public policy and Higher Education, San Jose, Calif. “the state's higher-education system, once the gold standard for institutions from community colleges to research universities across the
Josh Keller mentions that the Public Policy Institute of California has reported that California will fall short of one million college graduates in its workforce by 2025. The issues facing us today are far different from the first time that the Master plan was written, in times where California was indeed the “golden State” with an overflow of prosperity and its main challenge was designing an educational system that would accommodate all the baby boomers and through a three-tiered educational structure provide an easy access to all high school graduates.

Today the plan’s focus on access at any cost has its downsides, says Jane V. Wellman, executive director of the Delta Project on Postsecondary Education Costs, Productivity, and Accountability. “Only about one-quarter of the state’s community-college students who seek a degree succeed in receiving one or transferring to a university within six years….the master plan was a good way to distribute resources and enrollment in a state that was increasing capacity and had an almost limitless pot of revenue to support it,” Ms. Wellman says. "It doesn't get to the deeper issue of how to increase educational attainment. The challenge now is how do you get more kids prepared for academic success, and how do you get more students who enroll focused on attainment? And California is falling down on both of those." As a result, she says, "the master plan has slowly become irrelevant."

Budget woes, which threaten generous programs such as the Cal Grants, and which proposes serious cuts to colleges and universities would not only reduce the system’s enrollment but drastically reduce the “low fees and universal access” the key focus of the Master plan. The three tier educational system proposed in the plan fails to work when the economy is weak and transfer rates poor.

Charles B. Reed, chancellor of the California State University system says, "There is no way to fulfill the master plan with the current financial capacity and structure that California has.”

Ms. Wellman, of the Delta Project, says that until California gets out of its fiscal crisis and restores some ability to make intelligent policy decisions, defining new state priorities around higher education will be difficult. Even if the master plan were revised, she says, the document carries so much baggage that it might be better to come up with a new name instead. Solutions that made sense 50 years ago, she says, are now getting in the way. "The last generation's successes," she says, "become the next generation's problems."

 Needless to say that the LAO recommends reexamination of higher education needs and priorities. The LAO states “the fiftieth anniversary of the Master Plan in 2010 provides an opportunity to focus attention on the the state’s educational needs in the 21st century.” The LAO thinks that three broad categories of higher education policy deserve special attention:

• **Participation and Learning**: Over the past decade, higher education policy discussions have been dominated by the issue of student “access.” The Legislature may wish to consider whether the focus on access has come at the expense of other critical goals, including student learning and degree completion. If so, the Legislature may wish to increase attention on student preparation, persistence, and success, as well as the more traditional concerns of eligibility and participation. Topics related to higher education learning outcomes are often discussed in the context of higher education accountability, which is a subject gaining attention nationally.

• **Governance and Organization**: The assignment of distinct missions to the three public segments was seen as visionary when the Master Plan was adopted. The Legislature may wish to assess whether the roles, governance, or coordination of the higher education segments may have, or should have, changed over the past 50 years.

• **Funding**: About 10 percent of the state General Fund is devoted to higher education. In general, this funding is not tied to specific goals, learning outcomes, or even level of instruction, but rather is based almost exclusively on student contact hours. Moreover, state policy provides little guidance on how education costs should be split between students and the state, nor how various financial aid programs should work together to ensure affordability. The Legislature may wish to examine the effect of funding mechanisms on higher education outcomes.

The LAO hopes that by releasing a series of publications and guidance on this topic they will hopefully help the legislature and other governing bodies to redefine and modify the current educational plan so that it addresses the States’s current needs more effectively.

**ACREDIATION**

**A HOT DEBATE AMONG EDUCATORS**

Accreditation – an official approval of standards maintained by an institution. The process currently is regulated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Traditionally, institutions work hard towards maintaining such standards and the accreditation boards do their parts to work as collaboratively as possible to ensure that such standards were met.

In recent years, the picture seems to have changed. In the last five years about 40% of all California Community Colleges have been sanctioned by the
ACCJC. A large number, if one compares data by CFT’s Community College Council President Carl Friedlander, which shows that the other five U.S accrediting commissions sanctioned only 15 out of a total 756 colleges during the same time.

Ron Norton Reel, President of the CTA’s Community College Association in an article in FACCCTS Winter Newsletter criticizes the Commission’s approach as “overzealous and out of control”. Many administrators think that the ACCJC has gone too far with it’s demands on SLO’s, others note that due to the recent pressure put on the institutions by ACCJC, faculty and administration are putting in long hours resulting in lengthy and unnecessary paperwork, documentation and accreditation reports. Eventually, this results in a situation where SLO’s turn into a nightmare of busywork that detracts from quality education rather than helping to enhance it. So high were the levels of frustration that in May 2009, CCCI (California Community College Independents) passed a unanimous resolution expressing “no confidence” against ACCJC and it’s President Barbara Beno.

Inspite of the growing complaints, the harsh reality remains that without ACCJC accreditation, a community college cannot receive state or federal funding.

In response to the uproar, last June, Chancellor Jack Scott and the Consultation Council created a work force to evaluate the situation. The task force developed seven recommendations to the Commission. They were (briefly):

1. Develop a means for colleges to provide periodic feedback to ACCJC on the accreditation process and their experiences.
2. Strengthen standards-based training of both visiting team members and Accreditation Liaison Officers.
3. Review the ACCJC visiting team selection process and consider means to involve a wider cross-selection of the individuals in our system who desire to participate.
4. Scale accreditation expectations of Western Region Colleges to benchmarks formulated relative to evidence of best practices documented in all of the accrediting regions in the country.
5. Consider lengthening the cycle of accreditation to 8-10 years.
6. Employ cooperative ways to have accreditation result in improvement rather than just compliance.
7. Avoid recommendations that encroach on negotiable issues.

In the FACCCTS winter newsletter, Jeffrey Michaels quotes that the task force “sums up nicely what many faculty have been feeling about the ACCJC’s approach – one that must be changed so the role is one of improvement instead of punishment. Until this happens, everything connected to accreditation, including Program Review and SLO’s will likely be tainted by a growing culture of fear”.

**UFO NEWSLETTER GOES GREEN**

All full and part time faculty at Ohlone College will be receiving an electronic copy of the newsletter by e-mail. The UFO is working on loading up the newsletter on a website some time soon. Some hard copies of the newsletter will be available outside the mailroom, in case you are not able to access the newsletter by e-mail. If for some reason, you are not able to obtain a hard-copy from the mail room, please e-mail the editor (aganguly@ohlone.edu) and request a hard copy.

**We want to hear from you**

Please send your comments and feedback regarding this newsletter to the editor at aganguly@ohlone.edu

This newsletter is a publication of the United Faculty of Ohlone