

# FACULTY VOICE

CCFT NEWS

A UNION IS ONLY AS STRONG AS ITS MEMBERS ARE INFORMED AND ACTIVE

APRIL 2006

## Health Benefits, CCFT Elections, and Proposed Changes to CCFT Contributions

Greetings and welcome back! By the time you read this, spring break will be a memory and we will all be setting our sights toward graduation.

It has been a busy semester for CCFT. Here is an update on a couple of important things that we have been working on.

**Health Benefits.** The college has formally left the Santa Cruz Schools JPA and is in the process of working with a large JPA called SISC (Self-Insured Schools of California) and their consultant group called Driver-Alliant to determine what health and dental benefits will be offered at Cabrillo starting in July 2006. This change affects contract faculty, management and classified employees. It does not change the part-time faculty health benefits currently available. The dental plan is not expected to change.

The benefits committee has agreed that it is a priority to minimize the disruptions of yet another change by keeping the plans as close to the ones currently offered through Health Net and Blue Shield. The dis-



trict stipend will continue to cover the premium cost for the

"lowest cost HMO." People may choose to pay more for a "richer" HMO plan, or the PPO plans. Exact information about the plans will be available by the end of April and there will be an enrollment period in May.

The change that will be most dramatic is that SISC uses a calendar year for the benefits plans. Therefore, we will be changing the timeframe of the plans (and the Section 125 savings) from fiscal to calendar year. For those enrolled in the PPO plans with Blue Shield, this may again mean a "double deductible" situation, with one period between July 1-Dec. 31, 2006 and another from Jan.-Dec. 2007. There is a "fourth quarter" carryover for deductibles paid from Oct. 1-Dec. 31, 2006, but it will be important to check with the Blue Shield agents to be clear about your own personal situation.

One new feature of the Blue Shield PPO plans will likely be an office co-pay for routine visits. These visits will not be

subject to the deductible. Expenses such as lab tests, procedures or hospitalization costs will be subject to both deductible and co-insurance. However, for members who use the plan infrequently, the co-pay feature avoids paying deductible and co-insurance for a simple doctor visit.

A change in the Health Net plans may improve the drug benefit plan by allowing coverage of generic, brand and non-formulary drugs with different co-pays for each type of medication. Our previous Health Net drug benefit only covered formulary (meaning a specific list of accepted drugs) drugs, either generic or brand. This new feature extends coverage, though with a higher co-pay, to drugs that are not on the approved list.

From the perspective of negotiations, the change to SISC is good because the cost of the HMO benefits plan will increase less next year than it would have with the old JPA. This keeps the district stipend costs lower, leaving more funds available to negotiate for other improvements. However, the Blue Shield PPO plans will go

(Continued on page 3)

### IN THIS ISSUE

**EDITOR'S MUSINGS** 2

**A LOOK AT THE 60% LAW** 2

**CCFT COUNCIL RECOMMENDS DUES INCREASE AND CHANGE TO PERCENTAGE DUES STRUCTURE** 4

**CFT CONVENTION** 5

**WHERE IS ALL THE MONEY GOING? STUDENT ENROLLMENT, COST OF LIVING, AND NEGOTIATIONS** 6

**REELWORK MAY DAY FILM FESTIVAL 4/20-5/1**  
[www.reelwork.org](http://www.reelwork.org)

## Editor's Musings

One of the undying topics we anthropologists inflict upon our students is that of marriage. People form all kinds of unions: monogamous (which actually occupies a minority status among the world's societies, at least as far as prescriptive marriage rules are concerned), polygynous and polyandrous, both serial and concurrent, same sex, as well as any number of domestic partner combinations. The one characteristic they appear to have in common is that commitment to the partnership is avowed, if it are to be entered into seriously. Why do people marry, or form committed relationships? Because it makes for a better life to create alliances—better emotional, economic, social lives.

One may also view marriages metaphorically, as well. We marry people, but we're also wedded to beliefs, values

and institutions.

If you accept this, then probably most of us are in some sort of plural marriage. I, for instance, am first and foremost married in the conventional sense, but I'm also wedded to the idea of unionism. It's not that unions embody an ideal of perfection, in the same way that we sometimes view our human Significant Others (in the first blush of romantic enthusiasm. Give me a break—it's springtime, OK, at least in theory!) No, unions are, like all other creations and their creators, inherently flawed, some more than others. This is why, in my internal oath of fealty, I swear loyalty in good times and bad, through thickness and thin, just



as have sworn in my primary marriage. In their imperfection, unions stumble along towards the ends of worker justice, employing the means of collective bargaining, etc. When I think of where I—we—

would be without CCFT, I am reminded of the benefits of all such relationships, how life is better with them than without. To take one small example, when I was first hired as an adjunct instructor in 1986 (step 2/column 3), my pay was \$444/unit. CCFT was just a few years old then, and not much headway had been made towards adjunct pay increases. I currently make \$1,459/unit, and this despite the fact that I have been frozen at the cap for eight years. (That's another battle, but

there's intent language in our current contract (§13.1.2.1.1) to increase our pro rata formula from 60% to 80%—something that I doubt would have occurred without tough negotiation.) Need I say more? Look back at your own situation and try to imagine where you'd be without a collective voice.

So, right now things are tough. The national health care system is broken and costs are going through the roof. Enrollment is down and threatens the fiscal well-being of the college. CCFT is in a hole, for reasons that are spelled out in this issue. We need a dues increase. Any cuts in our checks hurt, but there's a little pain in all of our marriages, right? But it's nothing like the pain of divorce court. We hang together or we hang separately. Think sun!

~Allan Lönnberg

## A Look at the 60% Law

The California Education Code limits part-time community college instructors to a maximum teaching load equivalent to 60% of a full-time load. This law is unique to California; no other state limits the number of hours that part-timers can teach.

This "60% law" was added to the Ed Code in 1967, when part-time instructors were viewed as truly temporary workers who served in spe-

cialty areas. Now, almost 40 years later, the community college system is entirely dependent on these "temporary" workers, a situation that was not envisioned in 1967.

The numbers at Cabrillo are fairly typical: part-time instructors make up about 2/3 of the faculty, and teach approximately half of the units. Many part-timers have been teaching here for more than 20 years. And Cabrillo part-timers are

paid 60% of what full-timers make, unit for unit—less if they've been at the adjunct salary cap for over a year. (Many other districts in the state are a bit closer to parity than 60%.)

Needless to say, the 60% law has resulted in problems for part-timers, as well as for the system itself. Many part-timers have become "freeway flyers" that, unable to support themselves by working at

one campus, are forced to teach at two or even three schools at a time. The 60% law also makes it difficult for part-timers to get health benefits. For example, at Cabrillo one must teach at a 50% or greater load for two full years just to initially qualify for benefits, which means squeezing through a narrow window of 50-60 percent for

(Continued on page 3)

## HEALTH BENEFITS, CCFT ELECTIONS AND PROPOSED CHANGES

(cont. from p.1)

up considerably (though less than the 37% proposed by the old JPA), so out-of-pocket costs will be higher for PPO users next year. Stay tuned for further information.

**Proposed increase for CCFT contributions.** As treasurer Alex Taurke has explained on the next page, CCFT is asking members to vote to increase CCFT contributions and to change the method of contribution.

If you look closely at CCFT finances, you will learn that the majority of funds collected go to our state and national organizations, the CFT and AFT.

A much smaller share of your contributions goes to cover the cost of running our own local union. Although the district provides some reassign time for officers, the CCFT pays for additional teaching units to compensate faculty for time spent producing the newsletter, representing faculty in grievances, bookkeeping, and other duties. Other costs include rent

and utilities, audit and legal fees, and part of the executive director's salary.

The simple reality is that our own internal costs have increased over time, and we are now asking you, the members to continue to support your union.

In addition to asking for this increase, the CCFT Council is recommending that we switch from the current multi-tiered dues structure to a simple percentage-of-gross formula. It is also recommended to include overload pay in this calculation. Most unions use this approach, seeing proportional contributions as the most fair way to deal with pay inequities. Currently, those with the lowest income are paying the highest percent of salary.

CCFT officers, representatives and staff work hard to represent faculty interests on numerous committees, in grievances and other individual matters, and in negotiations. Show your support by acknowledging the need to

keep us solvent and vote yes to increase your contributions next year. THANK YOU!

**Elections.** Expect a ballot later this spring that will ask you to vote on the above changes. In addition, there will be an election of most of the officers (depending on length of term, and some replacements) and all of the division representatives.

Many thanks to faculty members who have agreed to serve on CCFT next year. When negotiations are completed (we are currently working on a reopener for salaries for 2005-06 and 2006-07), there will also be a ratification vote for these provisions. Keep an eye on your mailbox! All members will receive a ballot. If you are not a member, you can join by filling out a blue membership card (in the mailroom) or contact Maya Bendotoff at 464-2238 for information.

If you have any questions, please call me at 425-0622 or email [debone@cabrillo.edu](mailto:debone@cabrillo.edu).

~Debra Bone

## CFT AND AFT: SERVING US ON THE STATE-WIDE AND NATIONAL FRONTS

Our state-wide and national affiliates:

- monitor legislation
- advocate for teachers working conditions, compensation, and job security
- provide legal and other consultation to local unions
- organize union leadership trainings
- produce and distribute publications and periodicals relevant to teachers
- provide networks for the entire educational community at a state and national level
- play a critical role in assuring adequate funding for schools and scholarships
- protect academic freedom
- develop policy on such matters as tenure, online courses, and occupational education.

## A LOOK AT THE 60% LAW (cont. from p.2)

four semesters. Of course, changing the 60% law is somewhat controversial. Opponents of raising the limit argue that this would result in a permanent underclass of workers, erode the tenure system, and reduce

the incentive for districts to hire full-time teachers. Supporters of changing the law argue that there already is such an underclass but that raising the limit would make some of their lives more bearable, and that full-time

tenured status will not be undermined given the 75/25 law which mandates that, under certain circumstances related to funding, districts make progress towards having at least 75% of the total

(Continued on page 8)

*Note: Photos appearing on page 5 of the last issue with the labor history article were from the CFT website*

## CCFT Council Recommends Dues Increase and Change to Percentage Dues Structure

At the CCFT Council meeting on March 27, 2006, the Council voted to recommend a 'yes' vote on three resolutions:

1. Increase total CCFT deductions (dues and agency fees) in order to raise an additional \$17,000 per year. This increase would represent a 7.5% increase to the current dues structure. (See chart.)
2. Change the way dues and fees are collected from the current flat-rate structure to a percentage-of-salary structure.
3. If number 2 above passes, apply the percentage to overload as well as to base salary. (The vote on this item will be moot if number 2 fails to pass.)

These resolutions will proceed to a vote of the general membership before the end of this semester. Please note that in accordance with our constitution and by-laws, only CCFT members are eligible to vote.

### Background and Explanations of the Resolutions:

#### 1. Revenue Increase:

We project ending fiscal 2006-2007 with a structural imbalance of \$7,100. Additionally, we anticipate a cash deficit of \$1,040 by the end of August 2006. A prudent reserve of about \$10,000 would provide for equipment replacement, potential legal expenses above our annual levels, and cash flow reserves. So the total revenue increase we need for 2006-2007 is \$17,000. To raise \$17,000 we need to increase deductions by about 7.5%. (FYI, CCFT has not raised local dues since 1997-1998. Also, salaries have increased by over 27% since 1997-1998.)

If you add the proposed CCFT increase to the CFT increase—\$3 per full-timer per month, approved at the March 24 CFT convention—then dues would increase by about 11.3%.

#### 2. Changing the Flat-Rate Structure to a Percentage

**Structure:** *Our current deduction structure is regressive.* Full-time faculty members at the beginnings of their careers pay a greater percentage of their salaries to the Union than higher paid senior members of the faculty. Worse yet, the average adjunct pays 1.091% of his/her total gross income to the CCFT whereas an average full-timer pays 1.022%. Contrast this to the way we increase salaries—we apply any percent increases equally to everyone, so those in the highest salary brackets get the biggest dollar increases. We would like to make our deductions philosophically consistent with our salary increases.

We propose making our dues structure equitable by changing the way we collect dues from flat rates to a simple unified percentage of salary. Thus, no matter your placement on the salary

schedule, no matter how many units you teach as an adjunct, we would take the same percentage from everyone. The CCFT deduction would remain a simple constant percent of salary, however much that salary may vary from month to month, semester to semester, or year to year.

Excluding overloads, our current best estimate is that we collect 1.051% from the total of all salaries paid to faculty.

If the increase to CCFT revenues meets approval (and given CFT's increase) then the percentage we would apply to all salaries (excluding overload) would become 1.172%. This could result in *decreases or increases* to your CCFT deduction, depending on your particular salary level—ranging from a decrease of about \$23 a month for the lowest paid full-timers to an increase of about \$29 per month increase to the highest paid full-timers.

#### 3. To Include Overload or

**Not to Include Overload:** When the CCFT council debated a possible change to CCFT collections, the prevailing opinion was that the percentage structure would be more equitable than the current flat-rate structure. Additionally, council felt very uncomfortable excluding overload from the overall percentage. Most felt it unfair to exclude a major category of salary from a percentage collection structure. So the Council recommended overload be included in the percentage. Thus this third item is up for a general membership vote. If overload were to be included in the percentage structure, then the overall percentages would decrease—but the percentage would apply to overload. We are still gathering the necessary data to provide the resulting percentages.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions about these proposed changes (x6320 or [altaurke@cabrillo.edu](mailto:altaurke@cabrillo.edu)).

~Alex Taurke

At the CFT Convention held over the weekend of March 24<sup>th</sup>, the CFT elected to raise their affiliation fees by \$3 per full-time person per month. (This is \$2 less than they initially proposed.) Hence the CCFT deduction from your paycheck will increase next year by at least \$3 if you are full-time, and by various lesser amounts if you are teaching less than full-time. Please note that the AFT also usually increases their affiliation fees—typically by less than a dollar per full-timer. Increases from our affiliates do not increase revenue for CCFT. We just pass along the increases to them.

### CCFT DEDUCTION AMOUNTS WITH LOCAL AND STATE INCREASES UNDER THE CURRENT FLAT-RATE STRUCTURE

	CURRENT	PROPOSED				
	2005-06 Tenthly	Proposed Local Increase	CFT Increase	Total Increase	Total Amount	% Increase
		\$ amount	per person	\$	Dues/Mo.	
<b>CONTRACT</b>						
> 75%	77.67	5.83	3.00	8.83	86.50	11.36%
60 - 75%/All Sabbaticals	61.42	4.61	3.00	7.61	69.03	12.38%
< 60%/CC Teacher	44.88	3.37	1.50	4.87	49.75	10.84%
CC BY PETITION	20.67	1.55	0.75	2.30	22.97	11.13%
<b>ADJUNCT &amp; OTHER</b>						
> 5 Units	20.67	1.55	0.75	2.30	22.97	11.13%
2.5 - < 5	12.41	0.93	0.38	1.31	13.72	10.56%
< 2.5	8.00	0.60	0.38	0.98	8.98	12.25%
Voting Emeritus						
Non-voting Emeritus						
Associate Members	3.00				3.00	

This table shows what the local increase would amount to with the CFT increase (which has already been approved at the state-wide Convention). If our membership approves a change to a percentage structure excluding overload units, then your dues will equal 1.172% of your gross pay. If we include overload units, the percentage will be lower (we have not able gather the necessary data to run those numbers).

Compare what we may be asking from you next year to what we achieved for you in the last eight. In very rough numbers, full-time monthly gross salaries ranged from \$4,000 to \$7,000 eight years ago. Gross salaries today are roughly \$5,000 to \$9,000 monthly. So, full-time salaries have increased by \$1,000 to \$2,000 per month since 1997-1998. In contrast, CCFT has neither asked for nor received any increases to our local dues since 1997-1998. If the general membership approves the increase to CCFT deductions, then full-timers will see their dues increase by about \$6 per month, under the current structure. If the percentage structure is approved as well, then some full-timers would see a decrease to their monthly CCFT deductions, while others would see an increase.

## CFT Convention: Students Are Our Special Interest

*"Governments come and go, but teachers are here to stay."*

*Mayan saying*

So commenced the address of Jinny Sims—a truly inspirational and gifted labor leader who led the teachers of British Columbia through an act of civil disobedience last October—to delegates at the CFT Convention. The teachers, who had seen students' learning conditions erode for some time, had been stripped of the possibility of negotiating improvements—which led them to decide that the only thing they could do at the time was to walk out on an illegal strike.

President of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, Sims was, for many, the highlight of this year's annual CFT Convention. She shared her gripping story of teachers fighting to protect education for students, of solidarity among workers, and of the decision to walk out on an illegal strike being made democratically by a membership vote of over 90 percent. As Ginny explained, they were up against a wall, and there was nowhere to move but forward.

Speaking of direction: the main purpose of the annual CFT Convention is to serve as a democratic mechanism whereby direction for the year is cast by delegates from CFT locals throughout the state. A sampling of the some 35 resolu-

tions presented and debated on the Convention floor this year demonstrate where we are headed on various fronts:

- Build coalition support to challenge the No Child Left Behind Act,
- Require adequate nursing care for children with diabetes,
- Promote health standards for school children,
- Restore injured worker benefits, and
- Support a reordering of US policy in Iraq,

Of particular interest to higher education were 1) a resolution to support a to change the 60 percent law for community college part-time faculty and 2) a resolution to support the exploration of alternatives for evaluating and accrediting community colleges. The proposal to change the 60% law to 80% was brought forth by the CFT Part-Time Faculty Committee as a way to immediately improve the livelihoods of community college part-time faculty. This measure was debated on the floor and defeated (talk to John Govsky for an in-depth update). The proposal to explore alternatives to accreditation did pass (see sidebar for partial text).

Four constitutional amendments were the focus of great scrutiny and debate. The most contentious was a proposal to increase per capita (dues/

agency fees) by \$5.00 a month (to be

prorated for those less than full-time). After considerable discussion, the resolution was passed as amended to \$3.00. Another hotly debated amendment would have changed the name of the California Federation of Teachers to 'California Federation of Teachers and Related Professionals.' The intent of this amendment, which did not pass, was to include classified staff in the name of the organization (the four main branches of the CFT are: K-12, classified staff, community colleges, and UC lecturers). Amendments to reduce the number of Conventions and state council meetings (as a way to save money) also failed, as members pointed to the need to maintain grassroots participation.

On the political front, delegates marched to the capitol building to rally for a restoration of funding for education. There we were joined by gubernatorial hopeful Phil Angelides, who has committed himself to closing tax loopholes and raising taxes on the highest income earners in order to increase funding education. CFT went on record as one of the first organizations endorsing



"Whereas, ACCJC-WAC is a private organization that is accountable to no one it serves and is loosely supervised . . .

Whereas, all commissioners and evaluators are appointed either by staff or by other commissioners, and

Whereas, some accreditation teams have not included faculty participants at all (as occurred within the recent Compton College accreditation process), and

Whereas ACCJC-WASC routinely evaluates and makes recommendations that are within the scope of collective bargaining and may be in conflict with existing California law, and

Whereas denying or terminating accreditation is tantamount to killing an educational institution (as is presently happening to Compton College), and

Whereas, ACCJC-WASC has arbitrarily denied accreditation to Compton College without sufficient cause and without taking into account either the satisfactory level of instruction at this institution or the terrible effect the termination of accreditation will have on the students and the entire community . . .

Therefore, be it resolved that CFT advocate that the California Community College Chancellor's Office and other appropriate bodies investigate the operations of ACCJC-WASC and consider possible alternatives for evaluating and accrediting the state's community colleges.

(Continued on page 8)



## WHERE IS ALL THE MONEY GOING? STUDENT ENROLLMENT, COST OF LIVING, AND NEGOTIATIONS

As most of you well know, the number of students we have, frequently referred to as FTES (for full-time equivalent students), has a significant impact on how the college is funded. This year, in the final budget, about one million dollars was taken from the proposed 2005-2006 budget to address decreased funding due to a 2.42% decline in FTES over 2004-2005 (see "Decline in FTES" below for more detail).

While the general idea of "decrease in students = decrease in funding" seems to make sense to most people, few grasp the effect that this decrease in funding has on negotiations. For each 1% COLA, the District receives about \$458,479. Thus, the decrease in funding due to enrollment for this year is equal to over 2% COLA.

Over the years, faculty have generally expected to receive COLA from the District to cover cost of living increases—isn't that, after all, what COLA is for? Well, hypothetically—and in good years—that is the assumption we would like to make (see sidebar). However, when enrollment is down, college revenues decrease—and all of the other costs still have to be covered.

Highlights of the "2005-2006 Final Budget," as provided by the District (in modified version), help us understand what a huge impact this decrease in FTES has:\*

Recent History of Salary increases		
Year	COLA	Salary Increase
1998-1999	2.26%	2.26%
1999-2000	1.41%	1.41%
2000-2001	4.17%	4.17%
2001-2002	3.87%	8%
2002-2003	2%	4%
2003-2004	0%	3.50%
2004-2005	2.41%	1% on schedule; 1% off schedule
2005-2006	4.23%	1% off schedule agreed to as on schedule; negotiations still underway

### Additional sources of revenue for 2005-2006:

COLA:	COLA, or cost of living adjustment, is provided in the final budget at 4.23%, estimated at \$1,939,368 for the college.
Equalization:	Cabrillo's share of \$30 million in equalization funding was \$421,895
Growth:	None
Decline in FTES:	FTES declined by 2.42% in 2004-2005. Although the decline occurred in 2004-2005 the District will receive full funding for 2004-2005. The District has one year to make up the decline before a permanent reduction in funding is instituted. The decline in revenue is currently estimated at \$1,004,082 for 2005-2006.
PFE:	The state restored the \$31.4 million in PFE (Partnership for Excellence) funding vetoed in 2004-05, an estimated increase of \$314,723 for the college.
Total increase:	\$1,671,904

### Additional expenditures for 2005-2006:

Full-time positions:	26 new full-time positions were approved for the year, 18 of which were replacements for faculty who retired in 2003-2004. The District estimates the total cost of the 8 new hires (estimated at \$80,000 roughly each) and the replacement of the 18 faculty members (for which the District paid adjunct unit costs over 2004-2005) at \$1,045,332.
Salaries:	The 2005-2006 final budget included a 1% 2004-2005 off-schedule salary increase as on-schedule for 2005-2006 at a cost of \$436,000.
Benefits:	For all employees increased \$340,016. Benefits adjustments included a 15% benefit increase and a decrease in worker's compensation of .66%.
Operating costs:	Increased by \$301,471
Total increase: \$1,717,487	
The final budget for 2005-2006 was left structurally out of balance by \$964,536.*	

Revenue Adjustments 2005-2006	
4.23% COLA	\$1,939,368
Equalization	\$421,895
Growth	\$0
Decline in FTES	-\$1,004,082
Restored PFE	\$314,723
Total	\$1,671,904
Expenditure Adjustments 2005-2006	
New FT positions	\$1,045,332
1% Salary increase for all	\$436,000
Benefits	\$340,016
Operating costs	\$301,471
Total	\$2,122,819

Although this snapshot surely does not give one a thorough understanding of an extremely complex budget, hopefully it is useful in providing a rough guide to the main sources of increased revenue and expenditures for this year. It may also help faculty understand that, while the union strongly believes that the 4.23% COLA for this year and the proposed 5.18% COLA for next year (which would translate into a revenue increase of \$2,500,000) should be passed along to address actual cost-of-living increases, the increases that will be negotiated for faculty for this year and next will most certainly be affected by the decline (or recovery of) student enrollment, actual COLA for 2006-2007, equalization funding, and other factors.

\*Most of these numbers as well as part of the summary text come directly from the "2005-2006 Final Budget," which can be found online at <http://www.cabrillo.edu/internal/businessoffice/documents/Cabrillo%20College%202005-06%20Final%20Budget.pdf>. The breakdown of costs for full-time positions and salaries was provided to the CCFT negotiating team in February 2006. The total amounts for benefits and cooperating costs reflect the increase in the final budget numbers for 2005-2006 over 2004-2005.

~Maya Bendotoff

## CABRILLO COLLEGE FEDERATION OF TEACHERS



Phone: 831-464-2238

Fax: 831-464-2283

E-mail: [ccft@ccftcabrillo.org](mailto:ccft@ccftcabrillo.org)

Web: <http://ccftcabrillo.org>

### CFT CONVENTION *(cont. from p.6)*

Angelides for Governor.

When it came to endorsing legislators, the topic of war loomed over the discussion, with one amendment not to support any legislator who supports the current course on in Iraq. Although the amendment was defeated (a more general resolution passed), floor discussion on the issue demonstrated widespread concerns about the current policy and its impacts (such as the funneling all of our resources away from social programs and education into a destructive war).

Other highlights of the convention included workshops on issues ranging from

legal matters to part-time parity to NCLB, awards ceremonies, and the showing of "Granito de Arena," a film about the grassroots struggles of Mexican teachers (which will be shown as part of the ReelWorks film festival, don't miss it!). A short film on Hurricane Katrina was also shown, after which participants contributed some \$9,000 in a show of heartfelt solidarity and compassion.

Overall, the convention provided an invaluable mechanism for grassroots participation and networking on issues that touch our work, our communities, and most importantly, the stu-

dents that we serve.

What happens on a broader level does affect us, and, as the teachers in British Colombia have demonstrated, through great shows of solidarity teachers can significantly change the course of efforts to commodify, under fund, and destabilize education. As one of Canada's Supreme Court judged ruled on the BC case, "What could be dangerous about an informed and articulate teacher talking about what is happening in our schools? And *who better to tell what is happening in our schools?*"

~Maya Bendotoff

### A LOOK AT THE 60% LAW *(cont. from p.3)*

faculty workload hours taught by full-time faculty

Statewide, the California Part-Time Faculty Association (CPFA) is spearheading the move to change the 60% law. The CFT Part-Time Faculty Committee is also in support of this change. Here at Cabrillo the Part-Timer Committee supports changing the law, and recently brought the issue to Council, which voted unanimously

to support raising the limit to 80%.

Earlier this year State Senator Ducheny introduced a bill to raise the 60% limit to 80%. The CFT's Part-time Faculty Committee responded by drafting a resolution in support of this bill and sending it to the CFT convention where it was defeated by a 3:2 margin. Supporters of the resolution were nonetheless encour-

aged, given that the opponents used up most of the 10 minutes allotted for the floor debate, allowing little time for supporters to present their case, and that the majority of delegates, representing K-12, had little interest in or knowledge of the issue.

The Ducheny bill, SB 847, is currently in the Higher Ed. Committee.

~John Govsky

#### ELECTED OFFICERS

President	Debora Bone
Vice President	Michael Pebworth
Historian	Michele Rivard
Treasurer	Alex Taurke
Membership Chair	Sylvia Winder

#### APPOINTED CHAIRS

Chief Negotiator	Debora Bone
Adjunct Committee Chair	John Govsky
Grievance Officers	Winnie Baer
Newsletter Editor	Allan Lönnerberg
COPE Co-Chairs	Julie Hanks & Bill Stamos

#### DIVISION REPRESENTATIVES

BELA	Winnie Baer
	Mo Hassan
	Nancy Stucker
	Elissa Wagner
Counseling	Mario Garcia
	Shawn Ogimachi
HASS	Michelle Chao
	Matt Escover
	Michael Mangin
	Michael Pebworth
	Vicki Shook
	Chuck Smith
Health Services/Library	Sylvia Winder
HWPEA	Leanne Albers & Cheryl Lemon
	Bridgete Clark
	Shawn Houghton
	Beth McKinnon
	Merritt Tucker
Instructional Development	Helene Jara
NAS	Jim Griffin
	Joe Jordan
VAPA	John Govsky
	Tobin Keller
	Michele Rivard
Watsonville	Shirley Flores-Munoz
Newsletter Design	Maya Bendotoff