



ACE
Association of College Educators
West Valley Mission Community College District
Office at Mission S3-204A (408-885-5339)
or send email to: ace@wvm.edu
Web Site <http://wvm.edu/ace/>

APPROVED MINUTES
Thursday, May 7, 2009
Mission College W1-602 at 3:00 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT

Present	Member	Present	Member
x	Roberta Berlani, WVC, FT Rep, Vice President	x	Susanna Pancella, MC, Secretary
x	Randy Castello, WVC, Chief Negotiator, Budget Analyst	x	Eric Pape, WVC, FT Rep
x	Donna Frankel, AF Rep At-Large	x	Rod Pavao, MC, FT Rep, Grievance/FSA Specialist
x	Richard Greco, WVC, Grievance/FSA Specialist	x	Leslie Saito, WVC, FT Rep
x	Ed Kleppinger, MC, FT Rep, President	x	Ashley Sousa, WVC, FT Rep
x	Pat LaVallo, MC, FT Rep		Doug Temkin, WVC, Newsletter Editor (attendance optional)
x	Rob Leadbeater, MC, AF Rep	x	Marge Thronson, WVC, AF Rep
x	Louise Lodato, MC, AF Negotiator		Jim VanTassel, MC, FT Rep
	Ellen McAlister, MC, Negotiator		Sallie Wisner, Web Master (attendance optional)

Guests: None

CALL TO ORDER The Vice-President called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. The President arrived at 3:15pm; he was at a meeting at WVC.

ORGANIZATION

AGENDA: modified closed agenda to include a presentation from the Load Committee

MINUTES Motion: To approve the April 16 minutes. (M/S/P) (Pavao/Thronson)

REPORTS

President:

- Since last meeting we have been focusing on the organizational structure. Attended Senate meetings at both colleges on this matter. Have reviewed documentation concerning the original structure organization committee and shared that information with the Senates.
- The MC DCs brought forward a proposal for discussion on the DC structure at Mission.
- The District sent letters concerning negotiations. Our response: we will start negotiating after we have received District financial information.
- I will attend the CCCI Conference in Sacramento May 8 and 9. There will be a presentation on the accreditation process and a discussion about how each district is handling the deficit.

Vice President:

- Attended the WVC DC meeting. Compelling reasons were presented for maintaining the present DC structure. VP Fishbaugh distributed information about reassigned time for DCs, department

chairs and “others”. It was interesting to note that the “others” group used about half the amount of department chair reassigned time. The amount of reassigned time is not consistent. All of the reassigned time at WVC and instructional administration for DC and department chairs comes to about \$700,000. The information distributed about other structures doesn’t include the cost of salary or reassigned time for the VP, the deans or the SOCs. If we were to eliminate every DC and department chair we would fall short of the \$1.5 million that the “Brain Trust” suggested we would save. Something just doesn’t add up.

Secretary: the announcement for a WVC FT rep has been sent.

Treasurer: The union must keep financial records, which it has done since its inception. A CPA report is issued every year based on the financial records. We must be consistent in reporting this information – often at the meetings we don’t get to the treasurer’s report. My recommendation to Council: at the first open meeting in the fall and spring semester on the agenda should be a treasurer’s report. This information and the CPA’s complete report could be placed at the ACE web site. There is no need to have a treasurer’s report at every meeting.

Budget Analyst: None

Newsletter Editor: the next newsletter should come out before the end of the semester. Doug Temkin is stepping down as newsletter editor. He has sent a letter of explanation; this letter will be sent to the Council.

Associate Faculty: there is some extra CPFA material if anyone is interested. The CPFA conference went well. Alan Fry gave an excellent presentation. He talked about the budget. He presented budget information covering six years for every district present. He pointed out some interesting facts: in our budget you must add columns 11 and 12 to obtain the information in column 10; LA has an emergency slush fund which appears and disappears from their budget – the money disappears when negotiating salaries; a very small district’s chancellor broke the \$300,000 salary ceiling; chancellors in many of the other districts make more money in perks than in salary.

CLOSED SESSION

- A. Confidentiality
- B. Negotiations: questions and outstanding issues, next contract
- C. Committee issues
- D. Personnel Matters/Grievances

REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION:

- Negotiations: brief discussion on future negotiations matters.
- Load Committee: a question was brought to the Council; it was discussed and a recommendation made.
- General information on status of 50% lawsuit and PERB suit.
- Personnel Matters: there are no grievances at this time.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Negotiations:

Organization of the 2005-08 contract: There was discussion as to how to organize the articles and the table of contents (TOC).

Comments/Ideas:

TOC: We will create two TOCs: one by article number with article name (traditional) and the second organized by major topic alphabetically, e.g. Compensation followed by all of the articles both full and part-time that are compensation articles. We will keep the articles in their numeric order.

The traditional TOC could be at the front of the contract and the non-traditional TOC could be at the back.

In the traditional TOC we could list each section heading in each article; in the non-traditional TOC we will have each article subsection number and heading listed.

Any suggestions for topic organization and titles should be sent to Randy.

Do we want the forms incorporated into the contract? Yes, all of the forms. Everything under the umbrella of the union contract should be in the contract – forms, job descriptions, etc.

We will have any signed Letters of Understanding appended to the appropriate article.

Index: There is software that can be used to create an index; MS Word can be used to do this.

Problem with creating an index for this contract – many of the sections do not have headers.

We need to know the type of index we want before we create one. What key words do we want to index? Creating an index could be labor intensive.

General: the contract should be available at the beginning of the fall semester. We will work with HR to prepare the contract for printing. How many copies of the contract should there be? The District pays for the printing; the District is responsible to provide each member with a contract. The complete contract will be placed on the ACE webpage in PDF format for anyone who wishes to use the contract electronically.

Ideas for future contracts:

Change the organization by topic.

Have them setup in binder format by section so that only those articles that change need to be duplicated and only those pages that change switched in the contract.

Develop a process to create an index.

Winter Session Compensation: winter session compensation is supposed to be negotiated according to the contract and to this point in time it has not been negotiated.

Health Benefits: Foothill is searching for a large group to join to keep the health benefit costs low. We should contact them and express interest in doing this.

Benefits Committee: it is obvious that the District is guiding the consultant down a single path – for cost savings benefits have to be paid for by the faculty. We will contact our benefits consultant to see what cost savings ideas he has.

Foothill/DeAnza has open bidding on their benefit contracts; this saves money. Our District does not go out to bid; this makes no sense.

“Brain Trust Matrix”:

Item 1.1 Restore FTES: this affects departments; at present we will monitor how this is being handled.

Item 1.8 Student load, short term classes, and late classes: this will be handled via PGC, an ACE committee. It was noted that work has been going forward on this; the colleges are handling this up to the extent that they can. It is FTEF dependent. Will FTEF be reallocated to do some of this? This is a PGC determination.

We would like to reiterate that if a department is making their WSCH/FTE goal then they, through the department chair, determine the classes that could/would be cancelled.

Item 1.11 MC consider reestablishing HBA: we were under the impression that HBA is gone and it would be replaced by Supplemental Instruction (SI). This is a department and curriculum issue.

Item 1.13 Academic Calendar: ACE has asked other districts for information on five-week intercessions. Has anyone in our District proven that there should even be a winter session? Has there been any research on this? At DBAC it has been reported that it is profitable. For whom is it profitable? It is supposedly profitable at WVC. Five-weeks could be more profitable than a four-week intercession; it would be possible to get “more bang for our bucks.” Santa Monica has a six-week winter session. Why don’t we just go to a tri-semester? It appears that this is a statement from the “Brain Trust” and no one has proven the logic behind the statement. The Calendar Committee

should be looking into this and then reporting back to all of the groups involved. Remember the Calendar Committee provides recommendations and then ACE negotiates the calendar. We will forward all of the information we have gathered on this matter to the Calendar Committee. The Academic Senate should also be discussing this to see if it is pedagogically sound. We will communicate with both Senates about this matter.

Just because a consulting firm called the “Brain Trust” was hired doesn’t mean that we have to trust them or follow their suggestions.

Items 1.31 – 1.33 all pertain to Article 20: one of the suggestions is laudable – we should offer courses when students want to take them. The reorganization discussion is concerned with who will decide when courses are offered. It is maintained that departments will know what to do; they know their students. The “Brain Trust” findings indicate that they made a leap that the problem is with the administrative structure. This is not necessarily true. We understand that there are issues with Article 20 and going away from DCs doesn’t solve any of these problems. In fact it creates worse problems – does the VP of Instruction know about every department and when classes should be offered? We should urge the Chancellor and administration that the time would be better spent convening a task force to look at the issue of efficiency.

One of the other suggestions is to jump the efficiency to 595. There is no physical proof that Mission can even do that many students per section. The discussion of a fair efficiency should involve the departments. What is a fair efficiency? What are the implications if you go over or under the efficiency number? The Council is ready to help solve the problem but we are not presuming a specific solution as the administration is doing.

The Academic Senate should also be looking at this in terms of programs.

We are asking faculty to be more responsive about the number of students they let into their classes, however no one has looked to see if the physical plant is being used efficiently. It is troublesome that we do not use our classrooms at full capacity throughout the day. We are a ghost town during winter session. We do not have an equivalent number of students in some sessions that we have during other sessions. Why are we asking instructors to have huge classes during the fall, spring and summer on Monday through Thursday while Friday, Saturday and winter session are light or just not happening. If we are 10% more efficient than 10% more of our classrooms will be empty. Some departments are more efficient than others. The topics that are being raised over and over are concerning minimum class size and class cancellation. The contract handles this now – do we change it? Do we list criteria?

Do you know at what point your student ratio indicates that you are breaking even for an average district for an average instructor? It is 4.5 students for part-time and 14.5 for full-time faculty. Why are we being told that the number is 20 or more? The reasons: the administration, which brings in no money, is working on our backs; there are fixed costs that occur whether we teach or not. Local control and discretion should go into specific classes. By making rules we take away the local control. The department should decide if a class is to go or not. There have been some problems with this but it is better than having an absolute standard. Many classes should go for the good of the students.

To work with Article 20 we must have to look at it carefully especially if we set a class size, e.g 35. If faculty say they must be able to do less than 35 then the burden is on another department to do more than 35 – faculty need to be aware of this. Also the faculty must know which classroom they are going to teach in; the room should be able to handle all of the students in the class. There are: educational issues; compensation issues for the extra workload. There are tradeoffs. PGC does their best. Their practice seems to be like our District’s budgeting, it is based on history – whatever you did last year sets your efficiency for this year. Does this really set the efficiency if we use 35 as a starting point? We haven’t ever zero based ourselves after we went to using PGC. This is a real issue.

Class cancellation – how could we ever say that at or below a specific number a class is cancelled? A percentage of your efficiency might make more sense. A class cancellation policy would be nice for some because it takes some of the pressure off; sometimes it could make the department chair's work a little easier just to point to a rule.

When there are multiple sections of the same class and one is small then it is reasonable to replace that section with a class that is needed. We could accept part of the recommendation but not the entire recommendation.

The MC PGC did an excellent job last semester looking at classes but some departments didn't like it. Some of the classes to be cancelled were taught by full-time faculty. This caused another issue about bumping. Classes will be reviewed earlier before the semester starts so that if classes are cancelled then students can move into another available class or section.

There are departments that have many singleton classes. These departments are given undo pressure to cancel sections – at times this is detrimental to the department's programs and certificates. It also causes a great deal of conflict.

PGC looks at efficiency and has no knowledge of the instructors who are teaching – neither name nor status, nor does any of this come into their decision making. They look at the number of sections and they consider how a program is supported and the frequency a course is offered.

Item 2.1 suggests a change to the limitation on overload. We have heard two things – a decrease to .2 and an increase. Which is it? The contract already handles this. The “Brain Trust” suggested that full-time faculty be allowed to teach more overload. The District is concerned with 75/25. The more sections full-timers teach then it is easier to make 75/25; when full-timers teach an overload these sections do not count in the 75/25 accounting. Why would the District ever consider lowering the amount of overload? Is it because of salary or banking cost? Does the District want to change the banked leave policy?

Assignment for next meeting: continue reviewing the Brain Trust recommends.

Information from another Community College: Foothill/DeAnza is not replacing three positions in their top administration due to the budget crisis. They are combining two administrative positions into a single position. They have stated that their administration needs to be more efficient – we have heard nothing like this in our District.

FUTURE BUSINESS

Next regular ACE meeting: Thursday, May 21 at Mission College at 3pm in W1-602.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting ended at 5:25pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Susanna Pancella, Secretary