

# FACULTY VOICE

CCFT NEWS

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

NOVEMBER, 2011

## President's Report: Soon Comes Winter



CCFT President  
Paul Harvell

Last weekend (from when I wrote this) was sunny, even in the early morning, and warm. I had all my windows open until late on Saturday. It made me think that winter is still far away. That lull is how I'm feeling about the budget and the state. The time line moves forward even if no news is breaking and my mind is occupied with midterms (we just closed the 9<sup>th</sup>

week). Thanksgiving will be here very quickly, and finals soon after that.

The district is still planning to cut about \$3.5 million from our budget for next year. There are about two more months until the early proposals have to be floated. Then another month or so to respond. Those months will come very quickly.

At the state level, the

governor will announce next year's budget in mid January. The more important event is one year away: the 2012 presidential election. This is shaping up to be a very important election, beyond the selection of our next president, with a number of state initiatives directly targeted at unions, teachers, and the funding of schools.

Continued on page 5



## in this issue

PROGRAM REDUCTION & ELIMINATION	3
ADJUNCTS AND PROGRAM CUTS	3
PART-TIMER COFFEE BREAK	3
FACULTY OPINION	4
PENSION REFORM	5
OCCUPY WALL STREET	6-7
COPE	7
WITHOUT ART	8
SDI FOR ADJUNCT	8

## Frequently Asked Questions CCFT and the College Budget



### 1) What role does CCFT have in the college budget process? What kinds of expenses are negotiated by the bargaining units?

CCFT bargains wages, benefits and working conditions. The wages and benefits of Cabrillo faculty make up over half of the college's base budget. Though the union negotiates faculty compensation, it does not directly determine the number of faculty.

The union does have some avenues to express our opinion on the budget process. Two CCFT members sit on the Central Planning Committee (CPC) which makes budgetary

recommendations to the president. Two obvious budget issues are how many TUs to allocate and how many full-time faculty to hire.

### 2) When will the budget decisions about 2012-2013 be made and what is the process? What is the college's target reduction for 2012-13?

The administration's current target for reductions is \$3.5 million in cuts. Note: that is not CCFT's target. We have no position at this moment. The \$3.5 million target will change as state conditions evolve. The current plans call for reviews of program

reductions to take place in December through February with the plans going to the Board on March 5<sup>th</sup> of next year. Plans also call for negotiations to take place with bargaining units from January through June of next year. Though there is a state requirement to notify tenured instructors of a possible lay-off by March 15<sup>th</sup>, the process does not end then. The decision is made in May, and the decision can be rescinded any time after that up to 3 years after termination.

The Senate is currently working on program reductions and ranking of program for possible elimination. By mid November the

Senate plans to have an estimate of the savings that can be realized by program reduction of non-core courses.

### 3) How much savings will the 10 full time faculty retirements generate?

Two of the retirements were in categorical programs, so those don't save

Continued on page 2

## CCFT and Budget

Continued from page 1

anything from the general fund which is what we focus on. The college may hire some 4 tenure track faculty next year to meet the Faculty Obligation Number (FON). That means a net reduction to the general fund of 4 faculty members. That generates about \$160,000 of savings for the district. Why so little? New faculty will be cheaper than retirees, but that savings is partially off-set by the district needing to pay two health plans, one to the retiree, one to the new hire. Second, the 30 TU's that full time faculty member worked are not part of the savings because TU allocation is a separate budget decision that is connected to maintaining our CAP. What this will mean is that TU reduction will not impact adjuncts as much if there are full time retirements in the right programs.

### 4) When the college reduces courses taught and the TU's paid for instruction, how much money is saved? How much can be saved through program reductions or elimination?

When program reductions are made, all adjunct unit members in a program must be let go prior to layoffs of full-time faculty members. The cost of a TU at an adjunct rate is about \$1,700; the cost of a TU at the full-time rate is about \$3,600. Reducing one standard 3 TU lecture course will save about \$5,000 in adjunct TUs. Cutting 200 adjunct TUs will save about \$340,000. And 400 TUs eliminated will save about \$680,000.

The savings from eliminating a program depends

upon the program. Some programs are very small and their elimination would save very little money. Think of a program with no full time faculty and few expenses. Savings might be less than \$40,000. If the program has several full time employees, a number of adjuncts, classified workers, and large expenses, savings could be a half a million dollars.

### 5) How much do medical benefits cost this year? What increase is expected next year? What can be done to minimize this expense?

We won't know this year's medical benefit costs until the end of the year. Last year, the cost for ALL benefits (this includes benefits beyond medical benefits) for ALL non-categorically funded employees was \$12.6 million (total expenses in the general fund were \$58 million). About half of that was medical insurance. The medical insurance cost (for the low HMO) rose by 4% this year. The district is planning on an increase of 10% next year which amounts to about \$600,000. We won't know the actual increase in premium costs until the end of this school year (probably in May). The district will move forward in finding some way to either reduce that increase in cost or finding other offsets, such as program reduction or elimination.

What can be done to minimize this expense? CCFT has been modifying the plan to move to a cheaper low-HMO with more co-pays. There is only so far we can go with

that strategy and we may be close to the end now. What many other colleges have been forced to do is negotiate cost sharing. Part of the increase in medical cost is shared by the employees.

### 6) What is the total salary cost to the District for full-time faculty? Part-time faculty?

We don't yet have figures for the current year. Estimates: \$8 million a year for adjunct salary, (including overloads), and about \$15 million for full-time salaries, for a total of roughly \$23 million a year for all faculty salaries.

### 7) How much money would be saved if step and column raises were suspended for a year? How much would a 1% faculty salary cut save the district?

Negotiated salary increases of steps and columns for ALL employees is estimated at \$350,000 for next year. A 1% salary cut would save roughly \$230,000. (Again, we don't have updated info for this year, so it's a best guess at this point.)

### 8) What is NEB and how does it affect budget planning?

NEB is the Net Ending Balance. This how much revenue the college has that is unspent at the end of the year. It should be noted that it isn't all cash in the bank because the state now defers payments to the college (totaling about \$10 million). Furthermore, some, a small fraction, of that NEB does not belong to the district and cannot be spent by the district. The NEB is accumulated and built by

spending less than the college takes in over the years. The current NEB (unrestricted) is \$16.3 million which is 28% of the college's annual expenses. The state recommends the college to have a 5% NEB, so we're way above what is necessary. What this means for budget planning is the college does not need to reduce spending now as much as revenues have declined because we can draw down our NEB.

It needs to be understood that the NEB is "one-time" money. Once it's spent, it's gone. The metaphor is often a plane landing. You want to reduce that NEB slowly over a longer time period, a soft landing. Don't spend it all at once in one a single year because that would lead to extremely large cuts the following year, a crash landing. A big part of the consideration about how much we draw down the NEB is how long we expect state finances to remain tight. If we expect funding to rise next year, we could draw down more this year. Many expect that we're looking at years of very tight budgets. Right now, the district's plan is to draw down about \$3.5 million of the NEB this year. It may not turn out to be quite that large, but if it is \$3.5 million, we could maintain that for two more years. Maintaining a \$3.5 million draw down would still require budget cuts every year of around \$1.5 million. In three years (2014-15), we'd need to cut \$5 million.



## Notes on the Program Reduction/Elimination Task Force

Steve J. Hodges, Computer Science, Faculty Senate President

The following notes represent my own thoughts and are not intended to represent the Cabrillo Faculty Senate, the Program Reduction/Elimination Task Force, or their members.

More than a year ago, an analysis of the budget situation suggested that there was some possibility that instruction programs could be threatened. The situation is not without any guidance: the college mission suggests principles

and core values; there are some policies that cover the elimination of programs; there is precedence in the elimination of an instructional program that no longer meets the needs of its students and community. But the potential elimination of otherwise healthy programs due to college resource constraints is something new.

In the fall of 2010, extensive discussion at the Faculty Senate determined general principles and

metrics as well as the need for a taskforce to complete the development of a numeric matrix to rank instructional programs. This taskforce is a joint Faculty Senate/Office Of Instruction committee.

A balance between three administrators on the committee and three faculty was set and a seventh committee member was to be an institutional researcher to help with the collection and analysis of the large amount of data

and metrics to be considered.

At the senate, we wanted to make sure that the three faculty represented programs as diverse as possible. The committee was advertised and volunteers solicited and then the senate executive committee weighed the possible combinations before making a selection early during the summer. Renee Kilmer appointed two deans to serve on the taskforce.

*Continued on page 6*

### The Adjunct Corner: Adjuncts Continue to Get Slammed by Budget Cuts

Eric Hoffman, ECE Adjunct Instructor

Another year, another proposed budget cut. Past rounds of cuts to the faculty portion of the College budget have been accomplished primarily through unit reductions—eliminating class sections—with reductions scattered throughout the divisions. These cuts have been born almost exclusively by adjunct faculty, who have seen reduced assignments or, in some cases, no assignments at all. These are “silent layoffs,” colleagues who have disappeared with little or no recognition.

This year, it appears the state budget cuts will force the College to look at reducing units in a more systematic way. Two main methods have been proposed: program elimination and program reduction. If the College chooses program elimination entire departments will disappear, and all faculty in those departments will be laid off or, in some cases, transferred to other departments where they are qualified to teach. If the College chooses program reduction, some departments will see major reductions in classes while others may



receive additional units to add more efficient (read, “large enrollment”) classes. The College could, of course, choose a combination of these methods. Faculty Senate has produced a program rating system that will be used as part of the process.

Program reduction has the advantage of saving all or most of the existing programs at Cabrillo, but it will most likely result in the layoff of fewer contract/regular faculty. And who will lose jobs instead? Adjuncts, of course!



### Adjunct Coffee Break

PT reps from Council will host a casual, drop in coffee break for Part-Time faculty on

**Wednesday, November 16  
from 10-12 in the faculty  
mailroom at Cabrillo Col-  
lege.**

In these times of cutbacks, reductions and possible program elimination, your PT colleagues want to be there to support you. Spill your beans, ask questions, share your perspective, and get info about the program reduction process—or just come by to say hi and grab a cup of tea. Hosts include CCFT VP and Faculty Senate rep John Govsky, PT Chair Sadie Reynolds, Grievance Officer Eric Hoffman, and Director Maya Bendotoff.

**Hot beverages, fruit  
and pastries to be served**

*Adjuncts make up 2/3 of the faculty, teach about half of all units, and earn less than 2/3 of what contract/regular faculty earn per unit. By law all adjuncts in a program must be cut before any contract/regular (“full time”) faculty have their loads reduced or eliminated. (Note that this law does not cover overloads for contract/regular faculty—the administration could legally choose to reduce these along with adjunct loads.)*

## Faculty Opinion

### Budget Cuts: At What Cost?

Julie Ann Hanks, Ph.D., Reading Department

I just finished perusing Cabrillo's website, seeking information about Cabrillo College's deficit and finding figures that are all too familiar to most of us. However, the most interesting information came not in the figures themselves, but the text: "Our people are our most important resource!...How will we improve student success and preserve people with fewer dollars from the state?" Taken out of context, these concerns sound sincere, but, in reality, these words are just that—words. The need for a rich, scholarly, and diverse faculty and staff does not end when a budget deficit is in place, nor does the need to provide essential services to all our students. Recently, our administration has made some decisions that have saved the college money, but at what cost?

For starters, instead of replacing retired faculty and staff, the administration has chosen to replace two deans, in VAPA and HAAS, with a salary range of \$93,576 to \$131,670. Had Cabrillo waited one more semester, even a full year, the college could have save \$100,000 to \$200,000. If really necessary, even hiring a temporary dean would have defrayed the higher salaries.

In addition, with stopping duplication delivery to the mailroom at Aptos campus and reducing delivery to twice weekly in Watsonville, our administration has decided to save a pittance at the expense of overworked, underpaid adjunct faculty members. With longer turn-around time and limited delivery,

many part-timers will have neither the time or ability to provide duplicated materials. We do have some significant, new income coming in from rentals in Watsonville. Can't we spare a few dollars here and there to provide our adjunct faculty with adequate access to the materials and services they need to teach their classes?

The good news is that at the price of parking, dust, noise, and other inconveniences, the Watsonville Campus was expanded by a \$3.2 million grant for the Green Technology Center and an additional \$865,000 grant to fund an upgrade to Leadership in Energy and Environment Design (LEED) for a platinum certification. Sounds like a minor sacrifice for such an acquisition, right? Wrong. The Watsonville CC students will not use these buildings until Fall 2012, and in fact, have also given up the day use of one of The Center's buildings for additional revenue. For one building CC receives \$80,000 annually, and for the use of the new building non-profit organizations usually pay \$300-\$500 or more annually to use rooms.

In exchange for their sacrifice, Watsonville staff and students lost their bookstore, their snack bar, and a lot of student parking. In addition, mail, warehouse, and duplications delivery for faculty and staff has been reduced to Tuesdays and Thursdays. If the needs of students are the most important focus in our Mission Statement, then does meeting those needs pertain only to some students at some locations?

Cabrillo's Latino population (28% Hispanic) has enabled our college to obtain a Title V Grant for five years of \$575,000. Most of our Latino students come from Watsonville and southern Santa Cruz County. The Title V grant provided for Smart classroom upgrades in many classrooms on the Aptos campus (Watsonville acquired Smart classrooms when The Center was constructed in 2000), student information kiosks in Watsonville and Aptos, circulating reading collections on both campuses, a First Year Experience Program with Supplemental instruction, and a Faculty Inquiry System that will benefit both campus faculties. Ironically, even though Latino students made it possible for the college to have all these benefits, the Watsonville Center has lost its bookstore, a snack bar, and the use of one of its buildings during the day.

The closing of a bookstore to some may seem like a simple inconvenience. For first year Watsonville students and adjuncts, the removal of a bookstore in Watsonville is a debacle. Many of our first year students do not feel comfortable traveling to the Aptos campus. There are several reasons to explain this apprehension: Bus travel has become more limited and more expensive,

first year Watsonville students are apprehensive at the thought of travel to a new community where many feel unwanted, and finally there is the time factor necessary to make a trip to Aptos—all of these factors make books and supply purchasing overwhelming. Most of us take purchasing online for granted but online bookstore purchases for students without credit cards or checking accounts are another obstacle. And finally, those uninformed adjuncts that arrive to class and find their students without books feel frustration and anger. Oh yes, and the rest of us faculty felt that same anger and frustration when we arrived to class and find the same lack of books.

I would never compare our administrative decisions to those of our Congress—a balanced budget at the price of its most vulnerable citizens without the effort to curb their own spending—so I think in conclusion, I will simply ask the powers that be to restore mail delivery and bookstore operations to Watsonville Center. If people are our most important resource, and we're obligated to provide an accessible and effective learning environment that enhances our cultural vitality and respects people of all cultures, how much will it cost to continue to provide Watsonville Center students with the resources they deserve?

#### Mission Statement

The mission of Cabrillo College is to enhance the intellectual, cultural, and economic vitality of our diverse community by assisting all students in their quest for lifelong learning and success in an ever-changing world.

Our purpose is to provide an accessible and effective learning environment that aids students in their pursuit of transfer, career preparation, personal fulfillment, job advancement, and retraining goals. Our core values are academic freedom, critical and independent thinking, and respect for all people and cultures....



## President's Report

Continued from page 1

There are almost a half a dozen initiatives being peddled about the state. Some are in the process of collecting signatures. Whether any of them make the ballot is unknown. Some are extreme in altering STRS – for example, capping salary benefits at \$55,000 a year (an implicit suggestion that no teacher or college professor should be making more than \$55,000 a year). Some are complicated with various formula of reducing benefits depending upon the actuarial estimate of net present value of liabilities against the current value of assets.

The governor has yet to chime in on pension reform as promised, but a state committee is meeting to investigate pension issues and make recommendations. People are betting that buying air-time will disappear and there's a rash of state employees making additional contributions to STRS and PERS to purchase additional service credit. A recommendation by an accounting practice group may have STRS re-estimate their unfunded liability, potentially increasing it three-fold. That will fuel those trying to restrict and reduce the state pensions.

On the revenue front, CCFT is developing an

initiative that will raise taxes on the highest income earners in the state. Discussions are underway with CTA and other groups. Also, polling is being done to see what the voters of the state would be willing to do. Early results suggest that voters would support a tax increase to support education, health services, public safety and parks, but not new prisons.

There's another attempt to alter how unions identify members (versus fee-payers). Unions may be forced to have the members sign-up as members every year. In the past, CCFT required fee payers to identify themselves every year. This was seen as wasteful and foolish

and now the identification of fee-payers is carried over year to year. This idea is being brought to you by people who believe union members have to be protected from themselves.

Next year's budget, next year's election will be here soon enough. With initiatives that may affect your pension and can change revenues which will impact salaries and employment, the next twelve months will not be a time to sit on the sidelines. These initiatives will impact the lives of every Cabrillo employee. With everyone contributing, the impacts can be to the betterment, not the detriment, of all.



## Governor Brown Proposes Pension Reform

Scott Lay

President/Chief Executive Officer Community College League of California

**Editor's note:** Governor Brown's proposal applies to the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS), and **not** STRS, the retirement plan which includes most Cabrillo faculty. According to CFT rep Jim Araby, "While the plan is only a proposal, we can also count on reforms that will ultimately impact the way STRS is governed as well." Ed Derman, deputy CEO at CalSTRS, says Brown's 12-point plan "is the beginning" of the debate, not the end.

(Dale Kasler, Sacramento Bee).

On October 27, Governor Jerry Brown proposed a pension reform package. Since the issue affects all of us whether we're looking at the funding of our colleges or of our own retirement, I wanted to give you a quick summary. We will be providing more analysis after the Legislature returns in January and begins to consider the proposal.

Here is the governor's 12-point pension plan:

1. Equal sharing of pension costs - 50%/50% sharing of employer/employee contributions (current and new employees)
2. "Hybrid" risk-sharing pension plan - pension, social security and 401(k) combination (new employees)
3. Increase retirement ages - raise retirement age to 67 (new employees)
4. Require three-year final compensation to stop spiking (new employees)
5. Calculate benefits based on regular, recurring pay to stop spiking - only normal rate of base (new employees)
6. Limit post-retirement employment - limit all employees to 960 hours of post-retirement employment (current and new employees)
7. Felons forfeit pension benefits (all employees)
8. Prohibit retroactive pension increases - prohibit the change of retirement formula for previously served years (all employees)
9. Prohibit pension holidays - prohibit retirement boards from suspending employer and/or employee contributions in good years (all employees)
10. Prohibit purchases of service credit (all employees)
11. Increase pension board independence and expertise
12. Reduce retiree health care costs - require state employees to work 15 years (rather than 5) to begin to earn retiree health benefits, and require 25 years of service before maximum state contribution. Encourage local governments to adopt similar provisions. (new employees)

12. Reduce retiree health care costs - require state employees to work 15 years (rather than 5) to begin to earn retiree health benefits, and require 25 years of service before maximum state contribution. Encourage local governments to adopt similar provisions. (new employees)

Dave Low, chairman of the labor-backed Californians for Retirement Security said today that the proposal "will undermine retirement security for public employees." The League has supported reasonable changes to ensure the ability to continue to provide retirement security for community college faculty and staff, although I imagine we will have a robust discussion about whether this goes too far.

## Program Reduction Task Force

Continued from page 3

The Program Reduction/Elimination Task Force members are: Steve Hodges, Peter Shaw, Michele Rivard, Renee Kilmer, Wanda Garner, Kathie Welch, and Rick Fillman.

The committee met throughout the summer and fall. The meetings and work have been filled with interesting discussion and investigation, thoughtful consideration and deliberation. The meetings were very collegial and the results were achieved through consensus. Through the entire process, the group has worked with anonymized data, so even though each metric has been validated, we don't know how individual programs will be ranked.

During the ongoing work

and discussion (and due to changing external conditions) it became clear to the committee that the need for program elimination could be greatly reduced (or perhaps eliminated entirely) if programs with greater percentages of non-core course offerings were reduced towards a core program and if fewer retiring faculty than usual were replaced. The task force produced a position paper that came to the senate in September, and the paper was adopted as a work-in-progress in October.

The task force had an initial goal to report results at the first senate meeting of the fall semester. We worked diligently, but there were so many details to be worked out, data requests that

couldn't be fulfilled immediately, etc., that the final results weren't reported until the October 18<sup>th</sup> senate meeting. On November 15<sup>th</sup>, the criteria will be coming back to a senate meeting for further discussion and action. Meanwhile the document is going to the Instruction Council for discussion.

After the final criteria have been approved, they will be used to create a numeric ranking of instruction programs. It is expected that no program elimination will be necessary this year, so programs will have some time to use the information in the results for planning purposes.

You can get involved in the process by participating in the ongoing discussions that happen at Faculty Senate meetings. You can and should be in contact with your division senate representatives and at-large representatives, both to receive senate updates and to discuss and provide input regarding current topics. Both documents from the task force have been published, and you can review those online. I also welcome you to contact me directly (email works best!) with your thoughts.



## California Federation of Teachers Endorses "Occupy Wall Street" Movement

Press Release from California Federation of Teachers, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO

CCFT's statewide affiliate, The California Federation of Teachers, issued the following statement on Friday, October 14:

"The California Federation of Teachers endorses the 'Occupy Wall Street' movement. Occupy Wall Street, and its local variations, represent the legitimate response of the 99% of us adversely affected by growing wealth and income inequality in America. One percent of the population now owns close to 40% of the country's wealth. Each year, the richest one percent of the population takes in a quarter of the nation's income, representing a doubling of the one percent's share over the past twenty years.

During this time the wealthy received massive tax cuts, both in California and at the federal level, a major cause of public budget shortfalls that hurt students, make our streets less safe, and harm the health of children and seniors.

"Instead of investing its newfound wealth in productive enterprises in the United States, the top 1% moved it offshore or into financial speculation, which ultimately crashed the economy. The 1% also took large amounts of this money and poured it into a public relations effort to blame teachers and other public servants for the economic problems the 1% created.

"Occupy Wall Street redirects the attention of the public to the actual causes of the economic crash and

recession and to the parties responsible. The California Federation of Teachers embraces the call of Occupy Wall Street to raise taxes on the rich, to reregulate the banks, and to enact a financial speculation tax. We encourage our members to participate in the OWS actions in their cities. These actions will help restore public budgets for schools and other vital services, and set our state and our country back on a road to democracy and prosperity."

In addition, CFT president Joshua Pechthalt noted that "The women and men who are participating in Occupy Wall Street have given voice to the suffering and economic uncertainty felt by millions of Americans. One of the main messages of Occupy Wall Street is the

need to restore tax levels on the rich and corporations to support public education at all levels. Another is to redirect investment to benefit the 99% of us who aren't the 1% wealthiest Americans. Educators are proud to stand in solidarity with these principles and this important movement."

### Monterey Bay Central Labor Council Supports OWS

Monterey Bay Central Labor Council, of which CCFT is a member, has publicly announced its support for Occupy Wall Street, explaining that the movement represents, "a legitimate, peaceful response to the deepening economic crisis in this country."

## Support COPE

*Sadie Reynolds, COPE Co-Chair*

Many CCFT members are unaware that CCFT has a Committee on Political Education (COPE). This short informational piece is intended to educate membership about COPE and its important work. First, members should know that COPE is funded through voluntary monthly payroll deductions. These are separate from CCFT membership dues and are used expressly for the purpose of promoting the interests of members in the political arena. In the past, COPE

donations have been used primarily to support Cabrillo College Governing Board candidates. COPE has also contributed to Cabrillo students' marches in Sacramento, protecting STRS, the Community College Initiative (Prop 92), Monterey Bay Central Labor Council events, the Reel Works Labor Film Festival, and US Labor Against War. COPE expenditures must be approved by CCFT Council.

In a context of shrinking budgets, attacks on labor and teachers, and the lead-up to the 2012 elections, it is vital for our COPE to be strong. In 2012, not only

will we be in a position to support four selected Governing Board candidates, but to promote our interests at the statewide level. For example, our parent union (CFT) is currently building toward putting a progressive tax initiative on the California ballot that would tax millionaires to pay for education, social services, public safety, and other public goods. There are several regressive pension reduction initiatives in the works that we will want to defeat if they get on the ballot. Through COPE, we can influence the trajectories of these and other political efforts at the local, state,

and even national level.

Together, we can take an effective stand to promote our best interests as teachers and workers. In so doing, we will be promoting the interests of students, workers, communities, and families more widely.

If you are not currently a COPE member, please consider joining and making a small monthly contribution (COPE recommends \$2-\$20, but no amount is too large or small). You can obtain a COPE card from one of your Division Representatives, COPE Co-Chairs Enrique Buelna or Sadie Reynolds, or CCFT Director Maya Bendotoff.

## Editorial: Occupy, What's the Plan?

*Jefferson Hancock, Editor*

I've been thinking a lot this month about the Occupy Wall Street movement. Many (including your parent union CFT) have endorsed it. The reasons for the movement, of course, are good ones. The top 1% of the population is receiving most of the money while the rest of us suffer through home foreclosure, bankruptcy, and slashed public services. OWS says the economic inequity needs to stop.

But some have historically argued that it's not fair for the top strata of society to pay for the rest of us. The logic here is that they've earned their money (have they?) so why should the rest of us leech off them? They argue that rich folks shouldn't have to pay for subsidized public services — rapid transit, roads, schools, government cheese, and so forth — that they may not even use. The presumption here is that they pay their own way and if others can't, that's life. If

rich folks choose to contribute to charity that helps those less fortunate, they're free to do so— *voluntarily*. Remember those "thousand points of light" from the first Bush regime? How well did that work out?

Then, there's the fear factor. Many say that if we tax the rich, the jobs will disappear. Whenever somebody proposes reform on Wall Street, the market drops and the TV talking heads scream "Jobs! Jobs!" It used to be called "trickle down economics," the idea that if the rich make money the entire economy benefits as the money trickles down to the unwashed masses. Feels like extortion to me. Early on in the financial crisis — in 2009 or so — I can recall Alan Greenspan saying that he was surprised that all those CEO's took the money and ran. He hadn't counted on the extent of corporate greed that resulted from the lax policies of governmental regulators. Meanwhile the CEO

pensions and bank bailouts continued, the middle class fell further into debt, the poor got poorer, and governments — state, local, federal — still struggle to make ends meet. No bailout for them.

So the OWS's frustration and anger is obviously justified, and they are right to want the top 1% to start giving back. But how?

Here lies the worrisome aspect of the Occupy Movement. I see no clear plan for addressing the economic inequity and convincing the corporations to give up their cash for the benefit of the general public. Some of the more militant revolutionaries want to break windows and destroy property and fight with police. Other more peaceful folks want to march make their voices heard. Still others encourage us to invest locally and stop patronizing multinationals. One point to me is clear: Camping in a park or plaza for six months won't make the problem go away. Occupy Wall Street movement needs clear political objectives. Without

it, I worry that the movement will disintegrate and, ironically, the general public — the 99% they represent — will come to view all of them as just "protestors" used in the pejorative sense, not to be taken seriously, as spray painting hooligans who damage public property that belongs to the 99%.

But perhaps I'm impatient. Paul Harvell sometimes uses the phrase, "It's a process." What he means, I think, is that change often doesn't happen as quickly as we'd like and the results aren't always readily apparent, but eventually, the job gets done. This is an election year, so perhaps the OWS movement will develop some goals. Perhaps the president is listening and perhaps some of those job plans he's putting out will make it through Congress as a result of this movement. Or perhaps OWS doesn't need objectives. Maybe visibility is enough to let America see the extent of its problem. I remain cautiously optimistic.



Phone: 831-464-2238

Fax: 831-464-2283

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

<http://ccftcabrillo.org>

## Without ART

Artists Respond to Life Without Art

November 14 – December 16, 2011

RECEPTION: Thursday, November 17, 5:00-7:00 p.m.

PERFORMANCES: Thursday, November 17, 5:30-7:00 p.m.

The Cabrillo Gallery hosts the exhibition, *WITHOUT ART: Artists Respond to Life Without Art*, with an opening reception & performances on **Thursday, November 17, 5:00-7:00**. Curated by gallery director, Tobin W. Keller, this multidisciplinary exhibition includes thoughtful two and three-dimensional work, dance performances, short theater and vocal performances. The exhibit continues through Friday, December 16.

Artists from the Visual and Performing Arts division of Cabrillo College respond with visual and performance commentaries on what life may be like without art of any

kind. Numerous events will fill the month long exhibition including a "Day Without Art" on Thursday, December 1<sup>st</sup>, an international observance of the AIDS epidemic and the toll it has taken on the arts community. The Cabrillo Gallery is also partnering with [SCAARF](#), Santa Cruz Artists' Assistance Relief Fund. All donations made during the exhibition will go directly to this beneficent organization that assists artist with medical emergencies.

Events include vocal performance by Cheryl Anderson and the Cabrillo Chorale, dance performances by Helen Jackson-Jones and her students, and related performance

by Cid Pearlman and Sharon Took-Zozaya. A theatrical piece by Sarah Albertson and her students round out the performances during the exhibition. Exhibiting artists include: Jody Alexander in collaboration with Janet Fine, Sandra Frank, Gordon Hammer, Andrée LeBourveau, Brian Legakis, Lesley Loudon, Victoria May, Ron Milhoan, Sean M. Monaghan, Faculty from Digital Media, Dawn Nakanishi, Sylvia Rios, Gail Ritchie, Rose Sellery, Claire Thorson.

Please visit the Cabrillo Gallery website for a complete listing of events: [www.cabrillo.edu/services/artgallery](http://www.cabrillo.edu/services/artgallery)

MORE VALUE FOR YOUR MEMBERSHIP

THE AFT MASTERCARD

# GET THE CREDIT YOU DESERVE



FINANCIAL SERVICES

### Credit Card

- No annual fee and low-rate balance transfers.
- Includes protection features for disabled workers or those facing financial hardship or large hospital bills.
- Secured credit card allows members to establish or rebuild credit through a secured credit line.
- Disaster Relief Fund for members affected by a natural disaster.

+ For more information about this and other savings, go to:

[aft.org/members](http://aft.org/members)



A Union of Professionals

**AFT +**  
Member Benefits

The interest rate a member receives is based on the member's credit history.

**AFT +** is your advocate. For information on all **AFT +** programs, call 800/238-1133, ext. 8643, or e-mail [aftplus@aft.org](mailto:aftplus@aft.org). The AFT has an expense reimbursement and/or endorsement arrangement for marketing this program. For more information, please contact AFT Financial Services at 800/238-1133, ext. 4493; send an e-mail to [disclosureinfo@aft.org](mailto:disclosureinfo@aft.org); or visit [www.aft.org/benefits/disclosure](http://www.aft.org/benefits/disclosure).

## SDI for Adjunct Faculty

In accordance with a vote last spring, CCFT moved forward with negotiation and implementation of State Disability Insurance (SDI) for adjunct faculty members. Payroll deductions for SDI began on October 1, 2011.

- The SDI Withholding Rate for 2011 is 1.2 percent. The SDI taxable wage limit is \$93,316 per employee for calendar year 2011. The maximum to withhold for each employee is \$1,119.79.
- The soonest you will be able to collect SDI benefits is April 1, 2012. If you earn at least \$300 in this quarter, Oct.-Dec. 2011, it will be the first qualifying quarter in your base period. Learn more about the base period: [http://www.edd.ca.gov/disability/base\\_period.htm](http://www.edd.ca.gov/disability/base_period.htm)
- SDI deductions will not be made on overload units.

### Questions?

- Payroll-specific questions: Roy Pirchio at 479-6307
- General questions: Maya Bendotoff 464-2238

