



The Faculty Gathering

A Publication of PCCFF, AFT Local 2277/AFT-Oregon/AFL-CIO

Volume Number 3

Alan Cordle, Editor

December 15, 2004

Governor's Budget Falls Short

As you probably know, Governor Kulongoski released his proposed budget for the 2005-07 biennium last week. Let me take advantage of being between stacks of term papers right now to take a few minutes to give you an explanation of what it means, and what it means for us at PCC.

First, some background. The Legislature is currently looking at a budget hole that is approaching \$1 billion. I know this may strike you as odd, since Oregon's economic decline seems to have moderated or even turned around. The reason is tied to the defeat of Measure 30 last year. Rather than commit to a temporary tax surcharge, the voters (with the encouragement of many anti-tax legislators) gave the Legis-

lature the green light to balance the budget by dipping into a number of one-time-money sources. The good news is that necessary services were continued. The bad news is that the money to pay for them will not be there in the next biennium. To continue the current level of state services, adjusted for inflation, we need, somehow, to find more than one billion dollars. The exact amount is unclear due to a variety of factors. We don't yet know how the Oregon Supreme Court will rule on the PERS reforms (their ruling should come sometime late this month or January). We don't yet know how the passage of Measure 37 (which is intended to compensate property owners for the impact of environmental regulations) will eat into state and

local budgets. On the other hand, if the economy picks up some, that will reduce the hole a little.

In preparing his budget, the Governor decided to build the budget without any reliance on borrowing or one-time funding schemes. As a result, cuts from existing service levels were inevitable. Rather than make the cuts across-the-board, however, the Governor decided to make them "strategically," by prioritizing certain government functions over others. His goal was to "do things differently."

Well, somehow things didn't turn out all that differently. Although his first strategic area was "Education and Workforce Development," the only education sector to receive a cut from its current allocation was us, the

Continued page 2

Meet the Federation Bargaining Team!



The Team

Clockwise from right: Martin Kaplan, Eddie Lincoln, Marge Dulaney, Frank Goulard, Michael Morrow, Michael Dembrow, and David Rives.

Continued from page 1

Executive
Council Officers

Michael Dembrow
President X5213
mdembrow@pcc.edu

Maurge Dulaney
Exec. VP X4060
mdulaney@pcc.edu

John Sparks
Secretary X4565
jsparks@pcc.edu

Amy Potter
Treasurer X4853
apotter@pcc.edu

Judy Zimmerman
VP Member FT
jzimmerm@pcc.edu
X7083

Eddie Lincoln
VP Memb. AP
elincoln@pcc.edu
X2141

David Rives
VP Memb. PT
drives@pcc.edu
X4482

Frank Goulard
VP Grievance FT
fgoulard@pcc.edu
X4781

Davina Ramirez
VP Grievance PT
dram1rez@yahoo.com
503-975-4511

Alan Cordle
Publicist x4592
acordle@pcc.edu

Michael Morrow
Cope VP x4366
mmorrow@pcc.edu

Campus Reps

Sylvania FT
Linda Eby X4526
Claire Oliveros x4112
Rowan Wolf x4083

Sylvania PT
Mort Bohn
Andrew Butz
Open

Rock Creek FT
Toni Garreton X7041

Rock Creek PT
Martin Kaplan

Cascade FT
Roberto Suarez
X5291

Cascade PT
Open

Extended Learning FT
Jaime Rodriguez
x2766

Extended Learning PT
Susan Griffiths

community colleges. K-12 and Higher Ed were both increased slightly (about 2%), which was nowhere near meeting their needs, but at least they were increased.

Community colleges were cut by \$20 million for the biennium (from \$404 to \$383), which is approximately 5.5% of state support. For PCC, which receives approximately ¼ of the state allocation, this means a cut of about \$5 million for the biennium, or \$2.5 million each year. This amounts to about 2% of our \$120 million budget (not including salary increases or other necessary inflationary increases).

And it's not as if we haven't already been cutting. Remember that at the end of the 2001 Legislative session (prior to the multiple special sessions that reduced budgets), our allocation was \$462 million per biennium. That means a reduction in real dollars (not taking inflation into account) of nearly \$80 million for the biennium, or \$40 million less per year--\$10 million per year less for PCC than was allocated in 2001.

The Governor's budget document is frank about what this means for community colleges: "As locally-elected community college boards consider program reductions and other actions, high-cost professional technical courses that represent an important part of Oregon's workforce strategy are at risk."

You can look at the Governor's proposed budget on his website at <http://egov.oregon.gov/DAS/BAM/GRB0507.shtml>. You can watch a video of the governor's budget presentation at http://egov.oregon.gov/Gov/gov_budget_adrs2004.shtml.

Having said all this, I need to also tell you that the final state allocation for us will likely be higher than the Governor is proposing. This is just the first step in a long process. Historically, the Legislature provides more money for the colleges than the Governor proposes. In the last biennium, for example, the Governor's initial budget proposal was approximately \$20 million less than the colleges eventually received.

To turn this around, though, will take intense advocacy work (i.e., lobbying) by us, our students, and our business advisory committees during the winter and spring. You'll hear more about how you can be involved in that effort. I do feel confident that by the time this all shakes out, we will be at least back at the status quo and perhaps a little more—IF we participate fully in the process.

Finally, there was one piece of good news—perhaps—in the Governor's proposal. That was to double the amount of money going into the Oregon Opportunity Grants scholarship program. What this will mean for community college students, particularly part-time students, however, is yet to be seen. I'll be discussing this further—and the philosophy behind it—in a future communication.

So, let me say that personally I'm VERY disappointed in what Kulon-goski has done here. He asserts that he is following the will of the people in causing government to "live within its means." To my mind, he is using this budget to invest in his own political future instead of investing in the future of Oregonians. We should expect more leadership from our governor.

If you have any questions or would like more detail about any of this, please let me know.

Michael Dembrow, President
Portland Community College
Faculty Federation

Contact the editor at
pccgathering@gmail.com
or call 503-977-4592

Academic Professional Dinner Meetings in January

Express Yourself!

Reserve a spot at one of the dinners for Academic Professionals in January.

What would you like to see in the next contract? Come to one of the dinner meetings and share your ideas.



Tuesday, January 11

McMenamins Cornelius Pass Roadhouse
4045 N.W. Cornelius Pass Rd.

Wednesday, January 12

Anne Hughes Kitchen Table
400 SE 12th (corner of 12th & Oak)

Dinner Meeting: 5:30- 8 PM

We are buying dinner, so you **MUST** reserve your spot for one of these meetings.

Call 503-977-4178 or email mcannare@pcc.edu

Issues: PERS: Q & A

Many things are in limbo due to the current PERS litigation. It has been difficult to obtain accurate information on the current state of our retirement plan—the PERS representatives have not answered many of our questions. However, this FAQ (frequently asked questions) will attempt to answer inquiries employees have asked and possibly raise a few more. Please e-mail David Rives at drives@pcc.edu with your questions and comments for future PERS FAQs in this newsletter.

Portions of this FAQ were written by AFT-Oregon and excerpted from their website: <http://www.aft-oregon.org/jnkedlitLegislativeWrap-Up2003.htm>. Thanks also to Frank Goulard, Contract Administration Officer, for his contributions.

What were the major PERS reforms passed into law in 2003?

The major reforms were contained in two bills: HB 2003 and 2004. In order to slow or freeze the growth of members' accounts, HB 2003 made three major modifications on PERS benefits calculations. These included:

- Reinterpretation of the so-called "8 percent" annual assumed rate guarantee for Tier 1 members into an annualized average over a career
- Shifting the 6 percent employee contribution into a transition account (the IAP, see below) beginning January 1, 2004
- Temporary suspension of cost-of-living increases for certain retirees who retired prior to April 1, 2004 in order to address PERS Board "over-crediting" of member accounts in the 1990s

Losses for mid-career Tier One employees due to this legislation have been estimated at upward of 30 percent of their anticipated benefit.

HB 2004 updated actuarial tables for the calculation of PERS benefits. In essence, since people are living longer, this legislation stretched the retirement benefit over a longer period of time, thus reducing retirees monthly benefit. However, the legislation included a so-called "lookback" provision, whereby no retiree was intended to receive a benefit lower than that would have received if they had retired on or before June 30, 2003.

What about the lawsuit?

AFT-Oregon, in association with the PERS Coalition of public employees, is challenging this legislation in federal and state court with a direct appeal to the Oregon Supreme Court. A decision is expected from the Or-



egon Supreme Court in mid-January. Most observers are assuming that the Justices will uphold some of the reforms and throw out others, but nobody is certain which changes they will uphold and which they will strike down.

What is OPSRP?

The new "Oregon Public Service Retirement Plan" is the successor PERS for all new employees hired after August 29, 2003. OPSRP exists as a hybrid between a defined benefit plan, i.e., a pension, and a defined contribution plan, i.e., a 401(k). The employer is responsible for a core

defined benefit plan, as well as a defined contribution plan with the existing 6 percent employee contribution directed into an "individual account program" (IAP).

Under existing actuarial assumptions, a 30-year employee would expect a tax-free benefit of approximately 73 percent of final average salary, in addition to social security. Retirement age is 65 years or 58 with 30 years of service. Finally, a provision exists whereby the employer has the option of contributing an additional 6 percent of salary into the IAP.

So, at PCC, where exactly is the 6 percent of salary going which PCC pays on behalf of the employee?

For Tier 1 and 2 employees, it is going to their IAP accounts. New contributions to variable accounts ceased on January 1, 2004.

What are the current contributions earning?

Current contributions in each employee's IAP are earning close to what the regular account earns (see the link below). The exact IAP earnings will be released by PERS early in 2005.

What is the money in the past accounts for Tier 1 and Tier 2 earning?

This informational summary of earnings for Tier 1 and 2 regular and variable accounts comes from the following PERS link: <http://www.pers.state.or.us/aboutpers/section/financials/index.asp>

Regular accounts earned 22.00% for 2003, and are up 7.11% for the first 10 months of 2004; remember that Tier 2 employees continue to be credited the regular earnings, while Tier 1 employees are credited 0% until such time the PERS board declares earnings to be credited.

Variable accounts earned 34.77%

Continued next page 5

forts to make part-time pay and benefits more equitable with full-time, commit to a process that will restore full-time faculty positions, and make sure that workload is at a level that people are able to do professional, quality work. And we must make sure that our Classified friends and colleagues also get a fair contract this year.

Where will the money come from to accomplish these goals? To what extent can tuition be raised any further than it has been? To what extent, and where, can cuts be made in a way that allows us to meet our fundamental mission as a college? How can any cuts be made in a way that is least disruptive and most humane? These are all questions that we'll be wrestling with over the coming months.

And when I say "we," I mean "all of us." Faculty and academic professionals must be part of this conversation. You can do this directly with management and you can do it via the Federation. In any case, the Federation will be there to hear your needs and work to have a positive impact on the decisions that are made.

-MD

Contract Corner



Working for the Numbers

How do we measure work? How is work quantified? How do we measure a job well done?

The Workforce Training Centers at PCC have captured most of my attention in this on-going debate/dispute regarding how to measure work.

Academic Professionals working on a variety of grants, many through the Department of Labor, deliver a patchwork of programs for displaced workers: welfare to work, laid off workers, workers in need of new skills and training programs, those needing guidance and help or to improve their language skills while looking for work. In addition, the Training Centers market and provide services to employers, matching employer needs with workers who have the necessary skills.

Typically, the Academic Professionals at the Training Centers work intensely one-on-one with their clients. As you can imagine, the work load is heavy and those looking for work outnumber the job opportunities. Matching the needs and abilities of the client with the different programs and opportunities offered through the various grants requires some time and investment from both parties. The Academic Professional must interface with myriad social service agencies because the programs that are offered only address some of their clients' needs. The eviction notice, putting food on the table, child care needs, and transportation issues can all impact one's ability to successfully participate in the programs offered through the Training Centers at PCC.

The grievances, conflicts, disputes and debates that I see occur

because management relies heavily on numbers to quantify the quality of work done by the Academic Professional at PCC.

The management team states that the contract for their grants requires statistics: numbers of people who get a job, numbers of contacts with the clients, numbers of "success" stories generated by each program.

How does a worker measure their success with a number when each person walking through the door of the center is different? The conflict for the Academic Professional is that the tool used to measure their productivity has little to do with the professional service work they must provide in order to be successful in the eyes of their clients. It is easier for the manager to measure with numbers than to evaluate the Academic Professional looking across the desk at a client.

Being treated "like a number" in a bureaucracy is a cliché in our culture. I will argue that imperfect measurement tools for a professional service job, going strictly by the numbers, is both demeaning to the person seeking help and to the professional service worker trying to assist.

The main point here is how we define success, the tools we use to measure a program, to measure a worker's efforts and influences rather than how the program is administered.

The bigger question one might be tempted to ask is how do the measurement tools used for these programs support and fit the mission of the college? -MC

In the Deep Freeze

PCCFF President Michael Dembrow met with PCC President Preston Pulliams and Vice-President Randy McEwen for their monthly meeting on November 16. This time, the Federation was informed that six of the seven full-time positions that were “frozen” last year in order to help balance the budget and generate money for new Management positions would continue to be filled by part-time faculty throughout the year. Last year, Interim President Jerry Berger had told the Federation that these positions would most likely be filled during the fall or winter with full-time temporary faculty as long as enrollment did not drop dramatically or some unforeseen shortfall hit the college.

Dembrow objected to this latest decision, pointing out that the administration was renegeing on a commitment that had appeared to be genuine. He reminded Pulliams that district-wide enrollment has stabilized (even increasing slightly fall term), and last year had ended with a higher-than-anticipated ending fund balance and did not see why the administration could not keep its promise. This decision would further erode the already-abysmal FT/PT faculty ratio, bringing it below 45%/55% dis-

trict-wide in terms of courses taught by FT vs. those taught by PT.

Pulliams heard those objections, but gave no sign of changing the decision. Despite Management’s prior assurances that “bringing back the frozen positions is our #1 priority,” other positions are being filled while these are not.

The positions frozen last year were in Geography, Math, English,

PE, Building Inspection, Business, and History. (The English position at Sylvania was the one position to be unfrozen this year). They were in addition to three faculty positions that were permanently eliminated. There has not yet been a final decision made as to whether or not the frozen positions will be filled next year either.

Meet the Team

Michael Morrow



I’ve been an AP at PCC going on 11 years, active in the Federation for about seven, as ETS VP, *Gathering* editor, and currently the Vice President for COPE. I participated on the 2000 and 2004 bargaining teams, as well as the major 2002 effort to re-vamp our ETS system into the much better Academic Professional classification. Each of these experiences gave me more information about the bargaining process, and a greater determination to both work with management in achieving a fair contract, while also maximizing the benefits to our members. This year we know resources will be tight, and we’re facing an uphill battle to maintain, much less increase, our benefits--especially around health care. My commitment is to work diligently, cooperatively, and creatively in bargaining, while never losing sight of our ultimate goal: an improved contract package for all APs, Part-time Faculty, and Full-time Faculty.

Talk Back



Your letters, questions, and comments are welcomed. Please address them to "The Gathering" SY ST 01

The Federation's Ironman



It's reassuring to know that Frank Goulard will again serve on the bargaining team when negotiations begin in January. He is in his eighth year as faculty chair of the mathematics department at Sylvania, and a longtime Federation member, dating to 1981 when he began working at PCC. Goulard and I recently soaked in the ambience of the River City Café, pretending we were people-watching on the Left Bank.

Now a husband and father of three, Goulard was born to French parents who immigrated to Canada and then later moved to Purdue, Indiana, where he grew up. He still has many relatives in France and feels lucky to travel to his "second home." Last summer he braved the French roads by car and followed the Tour de France throughout the country. His interest in cycling gets him out of the driver's seat and on to his own bike.

A triathlete, Goulard has completed ten Ironman Triathlons and though he did not mention it, recently placed first in the Masters Males category of the 2003 Tri Northwest Rankings. He lives a few miles from the Sylvania campus, yet runs there a few times per week, swims in the pool, and runs home. And that's before coming in to work. He also trains on his bike

several times a week. While sipping my mocha latte, I grew tired just hearing about his training. Goulard says that exercise helps him to feel good physically, but more importantly, it makes him content and peaceful. And it keeps him sharp. This balance has served the bargaining team well since the first time Goulard assisted with negotiations in 1992.

He reminded me that the Federation enters bargaining with an idea that has been written into the contract since 1995: The Federation and Management "work towards consensus or mutual agreement" and find "a solution we can live with and work with." The goal for everyone at the College is our students' education, so it is important for bargaining to have a collegial atmosphere, Goulard explains.

He brings to the table nearly ten years of experience as the Vice President for Full-Time Contract Administration. As faculty chair, scheduling about 120 math sections per term, he also has a strong understanding of part-time needs. Five years ago, the part-time and full-time faculty created a single, combined contract to strengthen their position as a unified local.

Now for the first time, faculty

will be bargaining simultaneously with classified employees as a united front.

His experience with grievances will also benefit us at the table. Goulard said that personnel issues rarely reach the grievance stage; in most cases there is an informal resolution. Federation members often start with a complaint and instead work with Goulard and management to find ways to make their department run more effectively.

--AC

Meet the Team Frank Goulard



I began serving on our bargaining teams in 1992. I've kept involved through being the grievance and contract administration officer for our Federation for the past nine years. I've appreciated and learned from that perspective as well as from being mathematics faculty department chair. It is important to me to represent our faculty & AP body with this experience and integrity. Thank you.

President's Corner

Michael Dembrow

The election is over, and now it's time to look around and see what its results mean for Portland Community College. Will there be new money to help get us out of our funding doldrums? Will we have more sympathetic ears in Salem for the issues that affect education, that affect our students and their families, and that affect those like us who believe in collective bargaining as a means to create a more just and democratic workplace?

The answer to the first question—Will there be new money?—is, I'm afraid, no. The Legislature is currently looking at a budget hole that is approaching \$1 billion. I know this may strike you as odd, since Oregon's economic decline seems to have moderated. The reason is tied to the defeat of Measure 30 last year. Rather than commit to a temporary tax surcharge, the voters (with the encouragement of many right-wing legislators) gave the Legislature the green light to balance the budget by dipping into a number of one-time-money sources. The good news is that necessary services were continued. The bad news is that the money to pay for them will not be there in the next biennium.

For us to continue the current level of services in the state, adjusted for inflation, the result is a need somehow to find somewhere between \$600 million and \$1 billion. The exact amount is unclear due to a variety of factors. We don't yet know how the Oregon Supreme Court will rule on the PERS reforms (their ruling should come by the end of January). We don't yet know how the passage of Measure 37 (which is intended to compensate property owners for the impact of environmental regulations) will eat into state and local budgets. On the other hand, if the economy

picks up some, that will reduce the hole a little.

Legislators may be able to raise a little money via the cigarette tax and perhaps be able to close some tax loopholes. But anything substantial will most likely have to go to the voters for ratification. In short, we cannot count on much help in that direction. The experts are suggesting that we must be prepared for flat funding from the state for the next 3 to 5 years.

In fact, it appears that we'll most likely be fighting hard just to hold on to our current allocation from the state. We will do that. I believe that we can make that case if we commit to vigorous, sustained advocacy with the governor and legislators. The Federation will be committing substantial time, energy, and financial resources towards this end. (Remember, by the way, that none of this important work can be funded by money that comes from non-members. This is why it is so very important for non-members to join and be part of this effort.) You'll be hearing more about how you can help with this effort.

We do have a friendlier Legislature with whom to make our case. The Democrats, who are traditionally more sympathetic to our position, will have solid control of the Senate. They picked up two important seats in the House (including our own Larry Galizio), but it will continue to be a struggle for us there. I would predict that with a split Legislature we will not see any major changes coming out this session. Which can be both a good thing and a bad thing. (Let's hope the same holds true on the national level!)

Sooooooooooooo, now for the big question—how is all this going

to affect our success at the bargaining table this year, how will it shape the nature of our proposals? This is something that is very much under discussion at this time. It will continue to be discussed in our campus meetings and within the Executive Council. I encourage you to contact me or any of the other negotiating team members to let me know your thoughts.

We won't be doing another global bargaining survey this year. Last year's survey was the basis for the issues that remain on the table as holdovers from last year. Rather, we'll be doing a series of focused, targeted electronic surveys to Federation members on the key issues that we know will be controversial and for which we MUST have a clear sense of the members' current thinking. You'll hear more about this new electronic survey process soon.

Let me just say that last year we acted in good faith by agreeing to temporary wage restraints that held salary increases to 1% for those full-timers at the top of the schedule (which is almost half of us), with more for part-timers and for those moving up the schedule. It made sense at the time, and in hindsight I still believe that we did the right thing. (In hindsight, though, I would say that Management has not acted in good faith in its subsequent decisions, which I'll discuss in a future column.)

However, that was a one-time solution. At the time, we thought we'd be looking at increases in state money beginning this year. Now it seems clear that increases won't be there for several years at best. So, temporary restraints are no longer a solution. We must insist upon salary and benefit increases that keep up with the cost of living, continue ef-

Continued from page 4

for 2003, and are up 3.72% for the first 10 months of 2004. Tier 1 and 2 employees' variable accounts continue to be credited these earnings.

How did the changes affect part-time teachers?

In the rush to pass legislation to reform PERS, language allowing FTE (Full-Time Equivalency) calculations for part-time teachers was deleted. The PERS minimum to be eligible for retirement contributions was .5 FTE (half of a full-time teaching load) for three terms a year or .375 FTE over four terms a year. The OPSRP minimum to be eligible for retirement contributions is 600 hours of work per year with no mention of FTE. So far this year, the college has not calculated PERS contributions for any part-timer who is not an existing PERS Tier 1 or Tier 2 member. It appears that the college is still using FTE calculations for Tier 1 and Tier 2 members, since the 6% contribution on behalf of the employee has been listed on their pay stubs this year.

Just last month, AFT-Oregon was successful in convincing the PERS board to inform colleges that they may still do FTE calculations under the current OPSRP. The Faculty Federation is currently talking with the HR department at PCC to do the right and ethical thing and continue calculating FTE for contributions for all part-time teachers as recently permitted by the PERS board. In addition, AFT-Oregon is working to put the FTE equivalency back into state law. -DR

Issues: Workload

Although contract talks were put on hold this year, and the old contract remains in effect for one additional year, much work has been done to pinpoint areas for discussion once negotiations resume. The issue of faculty workload is one of these problems, and within this category there are several subsets of questions we hope to resolve. Some of these challenges are outlined below.

Science Labs: The PCCFF negotiating team is concerned with the fact that workload distribution in different academic disciplines and on different campuses is not equitable. Do instructors in one science have more grading and preparation than those in other sciences, and does work at Sylvania, Cascade and Rock Creek differ substantially? If so, how can we remedy this? Should work outside the classroom (e. g. preparation and coordination work, paper grading) be given equal weight to work inside? How can workload differences between part-time and full-time staff teaching lab courses be made more equitable?

Distance Learning and Hybrid Classes: One problem that has arisen in DL classes is over-enrollment, where class size is often very large. The amount of work is magnified to such an extent that a pay differential is called for to equalize things with non-DL instructors. In the case of hybrid classes (i. e. those consisting of a mix of regular class work and DL work), a clearer definition of this classification is needed. Should a course be considered hybrid when DL is merely a supplement to regular class time? Should the extra work that an instructor puts developing appropriate DL modules be specially compensated?

Credit Conversion: With the impending conversion of most college transfer courses from three credits to four, several issues need to be resolved. What will be the effect on designated writing courses? What will be the effect on the maximum number of courses that part-time fac-

ulty can teach in various disciplines? Will there be compensation for faculty who must now spend added time in the classroom (e.g., 16 hours vs. 15 hours per week)?

These and many other questions on workload problems remain to be discussed when negotiations start again. -MK

Meet the Team Maurge Dulaney



My family is union; my hometown was union. I have lived firsthand the benefits of belonging to the union. I have seen the hard times during negotiations, and I have seen the gains. I believe the process really does work; together we can make a difference. I am pleased to be on the negotiating team again; it was a good experience last time and I think it will be again this time. Besides, the team needs the rational, good sense thinking of a female.

Issues: Cultural Competency

For the purposes of this article, the working definition of cultural competency is the one used by the Oregon Department of Education (www.ode.state.or.us):

Cultural competence is a developmental process occurring at individual and system levels that evolves and is sustained over time. Recognizing that individuals begin with specific lived experiences and biases, and that working to accept multiple world views is a difficult choice and task, cultural competence requires that individuals and organizations:

a.) Have a defined set of values and principles, demonstrated behaviors, attitudes, policies and structures that enable them to work effectively in a cross-cultural manner.

b.) Demonstrate the capacity to 1) value diversity, 2) engage in self-reflection, 3) facilitate effectively (manage) the dynamics of difference, 4) acquire and institutionalize cultural knowledge, and 5) adapt to the diversity and the cultural contexts of the students, families, and communities they serve, 6) support actions which foster equity of opportunity and services.

c.) Institutionalize, incorporate, evaluate, and advocate the above in all aspects of leadership, policy-making, administration, practice, and service delivery while systematically involving staff, students, families, key stakeholders, and communities.

Building cultural competency (CC) at PCC is one of four major themes to be addressed in upcoming negotiations. Instead of cultural competency being “negotiated” in the traditional sense, I believe close collaboration between the Federations and Administration is essential in addressing this critical issue at PCC. Resistance to diversity work is a natural part of building cultural competency. Close collaboration between the Federations and Administration will demonstrate the seriousness of PCC leadership in building a school that more effectively supports a greater diversity of students and staff.

The following are some ideas that I have developed through ongoing discussion with colleagues at PCC and PSU. This article is meant to continue a discussion that began at PCC years before I arrived and does not encompass all that needs to be accomplished.

To effectively build CC at PCC, a CC advisory committee could first be developed, similar to the EAC. This advisory team would include

members from both federations, the administration, and faculty and staff. A critical first step for this committee is to establish CC guidelines and definitions. PCC has among our faculty and staff a wealth of resources; people who are passionate and knowledgeable about how to build CC and their skills should be sought after and respected throughout this process.

After establishing guidelines, CC can then be integrated into each job description and job performance evaluation. An analysis of the current contract for barriers to CC should also be conducted. This will allow the committee to further address potential difficulties to honoring diversity at PCC.

More ideas for consideration:

- Based on established guidelines, SACs could identify needed areas of curriculum revision and implement a plan for continuing professional development and anti-bias curriculum revision.

- SACs should utilize the expertise of colleagues from different departments to exchange ideas about department plans and their implementation of anti-bias pedagogy and structural reform.

- Supervisors might receive extra support to increase understanding of how CC intersects with employee management and evaluation.

- Our community is becoming more language diverse every day. PCC must begin hiring more bilingual people in the Admissions, Counseling, Business, Advising, and Registration offices. At least one position in each department at each campus should be identified as a bilingual position, reflecting community needs of each campus.

- Continue this discussion in a public forum, such as the Federation newsletter, to insure that many voices and ideas are heard and considered.

The Faculty Federation welcomes your ideas and expertise in further addressing this goal at PCC.

-AP

Meet the Team



One Additional Member will be added to the bargaining team before negotiations begin.

Issues: Health Care

Many part-time teachers work schedules approaching or equivalent to full-time workloads yet receive substantially less compensation for their efforts than full-time employees, yet part-time teachers are not eligible for any of the group health plans provided by the college. Instead, PCC allots \$132,000 a year to reimburse part-time teachers for privately purchased health insurance. The reimbursements average out to approximately \$60-\$70 per month per eligible employee. The problem is that private health insurance is often not affordable nor available to everyone who needs it. Many part-time teachers have voiced their support for gaining access to the group health insurance plans offered by the college. The Federation is fighting for this access in our next contract.

Eligibility for private health plans often requires applicants to successfully answer over 50 questions relating to past and present conditions. For those on group plans, COBRA legislation guarantees continuing coverage through periods of unemployment, while private health insurance plans have no obligation to continually cover a client. As those who have paid for health insurance under a COBRA know, premiums are not cheap. Private insurance premiums actually increase in cost as the applicant gets older. Margaret H-Akbari, ESL instructor, found that it was “nerve-racking because you have to shop around, discover how expensive it is, and then worry about a hike in prices. We’re already struggling, and it’s an additional struggle.”

Private insurance is a huge cost for many part-time teachers. Esther Hinson, a part-time GED instructor, commented that for a single person “coverage is pretty expensive—more expensive if you have pre-existing conditions.” She holds that health coverage is “essential if you are fully capable of working and enjoying it... to continue working and successfully teaching.” She found that private

health plans were fine for maintenance and “well-care, but were not designed for any situations that one would actually need treatment.” Hinson concludes, “if PCC cares about their employees, not only with a paycheck but also keeping them healthy, they will have to consider or plan for part-time teachers to participate” in group health plans.

In the United States' health system, people rely on their employers to help provide them with health insurance. Richard Lazere, psychology instructor, believes it is an issue of morale, and that if the college were to “subsidize, if not provide, group health insurance for part-timers, it would be a good investment,” since it would build “goodwill, loyalty, and peace of mind” among all part-time teachers. PCC has ignored this vital issue for part-time teachers for too long and the time has come to deal with it this contract. -DR



Meet the Team

David Rives



I have taught at PCC for over 9 years and served as a Vice-President in the Federation since our previous contract. In our next contract, it is my goal to make progress on important issues for part-timers such as group health care and stronger safeguards for job security. I also believe we have to make sure the contract provides for equitable treatment for all part-time and full-time faculty and academic professionals.

The Gathering

This edition was produced by:

Alan Cordle
David Rives
Martin Kaplan
Michael Morrow
Michael Cannarella
Amy Potter
Maurge Dulaney
Frank Goulard
Michael Dembrow

Holiday Greetings



Best wishes for a peaceful new year to you and your family from the Faculty Federation.

Become a Member!

Membership Application

Local 2277, Portland Community College Faculty Federation, AFT, NOLC, AFL-CIO

Yes, I want to join Local 2277, Portland Community College Faculty Federation, AFT, NOLC, AFL-CIO, and show my commitment to positive changes in working conditions. I authorize Portland Community College to deduct from my paycheck the appropriate amount of monthly membership dues, as designated by the treasurer of the PCC Faculty Federation.

Address . . .

City . .

Campus Address Dept. Campus Phone
e-mail

Full-Time Faculty

Academic Professional

Part-Time Faculty

I understand that union dues may not be deductible for federal income tax purposes; however, under limited circumstances, dues may qualify as a business expense.

Sign this membership form and return it to us at SY ST 01
(or PO Box 19389 Portland, OR 97280)