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Milestones
of our Glendale College community
I have to confess to you, dear reader, at the outset, that I am neither a skilled interviewer nor an accomplished writer and therefore the 'interview' that took place with myself as interviewer and Board of Trustee member Ann Ransford as interviewee on March 27th was more of a conversation than a formal interview. Even though I did manage to ask some prepared questions that came from the Chaparral editorial staff coupled with discussions between myself and Mark Maier, the other conscripted Trustee interviewer, a lot of the conversation came in the form of tangential remarks that were not directly related to any specific question. Consequently, I think it may be more interesting to you and more considerate of your valuable reading time, to give you more of a profile of the Trustee and what was discussed, the substance and the subtext if you will, and use the direct question/response format only when most helpful. This will also allow for me to alert you when as to how a response of one of the three interviewees I am reporting on (Trustee Tartaglia and Trustee Peroomian will be profiled in the next edition of the Chaparral) coincides with the other two.

So to begin with a little background, Ann Ransford and her mother were both born in Mt. Zion hospital in San Francisco. After doing a little calculus together we determined that that made Ann a second generation Californian. She has two sons who are, she is happy to say, doing well in their lives, and four grandchildren. She has a long history at GCC dating back to the BPT (Before Proposition 13) era when she was involved with Retirement Seminars through her time as Director of the GCC Foundation from 1986 through 2006. She came back to GCC when she was elected as Board member in 2009 and is just beginning her second 4 year term.

The first question I asked her, whether there were any decisions or actions that the Board took that she wished had been done differently, led to a very frank exchange about the four most recent GCC Superintendent-Presidents. I was a little surprised to discover that for the most part we held the same opinions about each of the four. Two of those opinions, by the way, are high. What eventually emerged as Ann’s answer was that she felt it would have been better when we last selected an interim President after Dr. Levy departed, that the same restriction as has been put on Dr. Riggs, that he agrees not to be a candidate for the permanent position, had been a pre-condition for that job.
The next question was: What qualities are most important in the next GCC President? Ann felt strongly that what is needed is intellectual ability. She gave the example of how Dr. Davitt was so adept in handling any subject that came up when she was with him out in the community. “That’s what a college president should be, someone everyone looks up to.” It was clear that Ann has a real respect for those with academic training and for critical thinkers. “We are supposed to be thinking about ideas.” Ann joked that in her family nearly everyone had a Ph. D. and she was the black sheep because she wanted to be a cheerleader. (Maybe she is now coming into her own.)

When I asked the next question about whether there were things the faculty could do and whether there were things the Board members could do to improve relations between the faculty and the Board, Ann immediately asked me if we were starting with the assumption that relations were bad. I had to backpedal a bit and say, well they could always be improved. Also, I pointed out, that perhaps there were still some resentments left over from things that happened in the past on both sides. Ann agreed that may be true, but believes that what helps is for faculty and Board members to find more opportunity to interact outside of Board meetings. She feels she has made room for that to some extent and would welcome more. (Incidentally, the other two Board members I spoke with concurred, so invite your favorite Board member to lunch sometime.) As a cautionary note, she mentioned she may have to stop getting together with an old faculty friend, if he doesn’t stop bashing the Board the whole time they meet.

Our discussion segued into the mandates that may be handed down to us from the Student Success Task Force. Ann feels we need to be proactive in considering how we are going to work with these legislative fiat. Although I feigned cognizance of these issues, I have to admit that I had not thought two minutes about SSTF since we had that panel presentation a while back. Are any of you, dear readers, happily in the dark on this as well? Ann is plugged into these issues, because she is an elected member of the California Community College Trustees, a Board of the Community College League of California. (She credits Dr. Lindsay for pushing her to run. It is a “great growth experience.”) Ann is trying to give a caveat emptor: We need to be aware and to prepare!

The next question had to do with how much hands on management (micro management?) the Board should have. I should probably mention here that throughout the conversation, Ann emphasized that she was speaking as an individual on the Board, not speaking for the Board. Accordingly, she felt the role of the Board was clear: to develop policy, not to implement policy. And, hands off the instruction program. “If you attend any State meetings they reinforce that to us,” she noted. And later, “I think the Board very clearly understands that piece,” but added “We also have the fiduciary responsibility for the college so it does relate to the instruction program – not in what is being taught, but in how many classes we can offer.” That led me to ask if she thought we would ever get the Winter session back. Although she elaborated as to why, Ann said no. One support for her view was that our local feeder schools were moving up their academic calendars. Losing the Winter session helps us align with them. (Both my other interviewees concurred.)
On the question of what change does GCC urgently needs to make, Ann felt that perhaps urgent was too strong a word, but that we needed to scale back our “Cadillac” health care plan. (The other interviewees said as much and may even have used the same word.) Just as an aside to you, dear readers, I had the distinct impression that at least the three Board members I talked to had the perception that we have some sort of grand health benefits. I didn’t have the temerity to ask if the lifetime health benefits for vested Board members needs to be scaled back as well.

Lastly, we discussed in considerable detail Dr. Riggs initiative to tackle the structural deficit in which the college operates. Without going into specifics about what programs should be downsized or re-thought, Ann seemed to display a lot of confidence in the outline that Jim had put forth. She is concerned about the same issues that were targeted in his analysis some of which she thought had come to light in the Marsden report, “Why are we so special?” She also agreed that the mission of the Garfield campus should include credit classes, which she thought was always part the plan; an educational master plan for Garfield is needed.

Before we stopped, not in response to any question, Ann wanted to make a point. “Today we are looking at education from the perspective of job training… The importance of the broadening of yourself is what a college education was designed for, so that your life is fuller… It is sad to see us moving so that people think the only reason you go to college is to get a better job and to make more money. It is to have a better life and a better balanced life.” A nice sentiment, no?
Speaking of The Senate (April 2013)

Speaking of the Senate
Catch the Bug, Join Leadership!

by Andrew Young
Academic Senate Treasurer

Normally your Academic Senate President, Michael Scott, would pen this column, but this month I am taking over in order to address an issue of importance to the college: the health of the Senate, and more broadly, of participatory governance at GCC.

After reading my annual requests for contributions to the Academic Senate Scholarship Fund and/or General Fund, you probably already know many of things that the Senate does on your behalf. We fund three major student scholarships that are awarded every fall. We recognize teaching excellence and service to the college through the annual Distinguished Faculty Award, Exceptional Adjunct Faculty Award, and the Parker Exceptional Service Award. We organize social events and parties to give the faculty an opportunity to relax and enjoy time with their colleagues without any work-related pressures. And that is just the start.

Though these are among the most visible of the Senate’s activities, they are not the most important. By law, the Academic Senate has specific policy development and implementation responsibilities (in conjunction with the college administration) over broad areas of academic importance. These areas include curriculum, degrees and certificates offered; educational program development; program review; grading policies; professional development activities; faculty roles in college governance and accreditation, and more. The Senate is responsible for establishing and maintaining the quality of the educational programs offered by the college, ensuring their academic integrity, and protecting the academic freedom of the faculty.

The elected Senate representatives and officers do their best to uphold these responsibilities, but they cannot do it alone. They need your help. Of course, one way to help is to make a modest financial contribution to the Senate. About 100 of our colleagues (including both full- and part-time faculty members) provide support for the Senate General Fund or the Scholarship Fund, or both, through modest monthly payroll deductions. Perhaps another dozen prefer to contribute by check. If you are one of our regular supporters, thank you very much. If you are not, please consider becoming one.

If we could double the number of full or part-time faculty supporters, even if they each contribute just two dollars a month, our fall scholarships would be fully funded every year. Currently we have to draw on our Foundation scholarship account to help cover part of the cost of providing these important scholarships to some of our most successful and promising students. This is okay for now, but in the long run we will need to generate more ongoing support from the faculty. Remember, it's never too late to contribute. Forms are still available in mailroom, if you are interested.
A second way to help the Senate do its important work on campus is to pick a governance committee (or two) that you would be willing to attend, and respond when the call goes out for volunteers. Counting both Senate and Guild appointments, right now only about half of the full-time faculty serves on governance committees. Those that do participate, on average, serve on two committees. Let’s spread the work around a little more. Most of these committees only meet for about an hour, usually once a month. With holidays and final exams, that really only means maybe eight meetings a year, sometimes even less. I know meetings may not be your preferred activity, but this is not an unreasonable commitment for any of us to make to keep the governance system running properly.

If you think you might want to delve even deeper, consider becoming a Senate representative from your division, or even running for an at-large seat. Speak to your current representative, or any Senator, about what it is like to serve on the Senate, or even attend a meeting. The Senate meets twice a month for about an hour and a half, and we have in-depth discussions on some of the most important issues that impact the educational policies and programs at this college. You do not have to be a member to come and observe what a meeting is like.

After serving on the Senate, if you catch the bug, you could then move up to a position as a Senate officer, or even Senate president if you really want to get intimately involved with the decision-making process at the highest level on campus. Being on the Senate is not for everyone, but like most anything, you get out of it what you put into it. I find it fascinating and rewarding. Maybe you will, too.

Visit us on the web: www.glendale.edu/senate

CSEA Connection (April 2013)
CSEA Connection: Be the Change (Management)

by Hoover Zariani
CSEA President

As we move forward with the search for a new Superintendent/President as well as with the upcoming changes in the academic year, reduction of staff, and new mandates from the state, many more issues are arising in all areas of the campus. Serving as CSEA President, unfortunately, reveals many of these issues. These are issues that we try to address as a team (of job stewards, executive board members, and negotiation team members).

However, I have to say that two issues stand as extremely important in both our search for a new leader and as well as for the health of the college and ultimately our students.

The first of these is more of a structural issue. Over the last six years, we have gone through many changes and have somehow survived. This is a testament to our strength as a college. Perhaps because of the short tenure of the two recent Superintendent/Presidents, there has not been a concerted effort to manage change. I
do not know if this was a lack of the ability of these individuals or simple neglect of the fact that change, in any organization, needs to be managed. I know it's easy to say this and people usually ask me “what do you mean by managing change?”

Most of the research on change management states that four basic conditions have to be met before employees embrace change. According to Denise P. Federer* these include:

1. **A compelling story** – People must see the point of change.
2. **Role modeling** – Employees must also see colleagues they admire modeling the desired behavior.
3. **Reinforcement systems** – Surrounding structures, systems, processes and incentives must be in tune with the new behavior.
4. **The skills required for change** – Individuals need to have the skills to do what is required of them.

Other than saying that indeed, managing change is perhaps the ultimate test of leadership, I will leave it up to you as the reader to assess whether these things are taking place (or will take place) in our campus community. But also remember, change not only requires leadership but also requires the followers to not resist and cooperate when things are done properly. We need to keep this in mind as we participate in the process of choosing the next Superintendent/President.

The second issue is more interpersonal in nature. When I first started working at GCC, I was fortunate enough to have two mentors who were both faculty members (Sharon Scull and Jo Van Dam) and were my immediate supervisors. Both of these individuals helped shape who I am. The one thing that they reinforced – almost daily – in their supervision of me, was a deep concern for me as an individual, not just as an employee.

They encouraged me to take chances and try new things; they taught me skills; they cared for my education and encouraged me to finish my education until I did; they encouraged me to stop smoking and gave me information and tools to do so; they modeled leadership for me and helped me develop skills; they taught me ethical behavior; they inspired me when I was down; and most of all, I always knew they genuinely cared for me as a person. This gave me the sense that I belonged to a community that was larger than simply our small office/department; that this was a place that cared for who I was and that I could thrive here (and I did) and in return care for it. I was/am perhaps extremely lucky that I felt this on campus. I know there are still managers who provide this type of support and growth for their employees, but I wonder if this was more of an exception to the rule? I base this not on emotions or nostalgia but on what I hear daily from my fellow coworkers. Again, I will leave it up to the reader to assess whether these condition currently exist on campus.

Maybe I'm naïve, but maybe we can once again (as a community of learners/teachers) get to this point. I don’t know how to achieve this but I sure can tell when I experience it. Until next time…

There has been a lot of talk lately at Glendale College about adjunct faculty taking a pay-cut in order to retain their “parity percentage” (which is what occurred in fall 2012) or the district including the “parity percentage in the base” as part of our current negotiations.

What is “parity” and why should adjunct faculty care?

Parity is actually a percentage comparison between what part-timers and full-timers are paid for the teaching, preparation and grading that both groups do.

A study that was done in 2001, by the California State government showed that adjunct faculty were being paid very poorly in relation to full-time faculty at community colleges, for essentially the same work. While full-time faculty were being paid not only for their teaching hours, they were also being compensated at a rate of one hour for each hour in the classroom, to cover preparation and grading. Part-time community college faculty, on the other hand, were only receiving half the pay because they received no compensation for hours of course preparation, lesson planning, assessment of tests or grading of papers.
The poor pay for part-time faculty in relation to full-timers, despite the similarity of their occupation, was recognized not only by unions but also by the State Chancellor’s office and finally by the state legislature. The rallying cry became “equal pay for equal work”. Finally in 2002 the State budget provided a $50 million categorical part-time equity line item that was distributed to community colleges to be used only to improve the “parity” pay of adjunct faculty. Part of the legislation also asked districts to come up with a parity percentage goal and definition so that, this small fund, would kick start an awareness that adjunct faculty pay needed to rise to a certain point to create pay equity among faculty.

Some districts immediately took the money and included it in the “base pay” for adjunct faculty and set goals for part-time pay parity of 70-100% of what full-time faculty were paid. “Base pay” is the foundational rate of pay that an employee receives. If raises are given then the base pay receives the raise. However in the Glendale College District, the equity money was put on the base pay as a “parity percentage”. At first this parity percentage stood at 13% which brought adjuncts a little closer to the rate of pay that full-timers enjoyed.

However over time, the equity line item was reduced in the state budget and with a few raises to the base pay (pre-2008), the parity percentage diminish to less than 10%. When another state budget came out in 2008 that further cut the categorical line items the district whacked a further 3.76% off part-time pay by cutting the parity percentage again. Today the parity percentage stands at a little less than 6% but the district claims that it should only be 4%. Meanwhile, other districts that had put the equity money in the base salary, continued to backfill the lost revenue from the state so adjunct faculty salaries kept step with the full-time faculty salaries. Not only that, but those who had the parity money in their base got raises on that parity money each time their district provided a raise to faculty. Not so at Glendale College.

So where are we now? GCC adjunct faculty have fallen woefully behind their full-time colleagues in the area of pay. There was always an understanding state-wide, that part-timers, who are not required to participate in professional duties such as committees, curriculum work and program review, should be paid around 87% of what a full-timer was paid. If office hours were not included in part-timer pay, then they should expect to be paid 75% of what full-timers in the district made. Many of our surrounding districts are working toward these goals. Rio Hondo College has set a goal of 82.5% and currently the district pays all adjunct faculty at 60% of what full-timers are paid across the board. Antelope Valley College pays all adjuncts at 66% of that full-timers make; with a goal of 100%. However if one looks at the top pay scale that a part-timer can expect to be paid at GCC, and one compares it to that of a full-timer (who still has one column of higher pay beyond Class IV) one can see that the percentages are well below...
the state-wide parity expectations of 75%. Moreover, the longer one teaches in the district the larger the disparity between full-time faculty and part-time faculty pay: What can be done?

- We need to set a parity percentage goal for adjunct pay in relation to the pay of full-time faculty salaries.
- The district needs to commit funds to raise the pay of part-time faculty over time so that their remuneration is commensurate with the job that they, and their full-time colleagues do.
- Adjuncts need a salary schedule that rewards them for pursuing more training and for the experience that they gain as they teach and work at the college.
- Adjunct faculty can always talk with their feet. When one looks at the surrounding districts (see chart below) one can see that most other colleges provide more pay for the work that part-timers do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$112.60</td>
<td>$70.09</td>
<td>62.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$116.83</td>
<td>$70.09</td>
<td>59.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$121.23</td>
<td>$72.59</td>
<td>59.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$125.79</td>
<td>$72.59</td>
<td>57.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$130.56</td>
<td>$75.70</td>
<td>57.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$135.50</td>
<td>$75.70</td>
<td>55.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$140.64</td>
<td>$78.91</td>
<td>56.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$145.99</td>
<td>$78.91</td>
<td>54.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$151.56</td>
<td>$78.91</td>
<td>52.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$157.35</td>
<td>$78.91</td>
<td>50.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$157.35</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>52.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$157.35</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>52.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$161.86</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$161.86</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$161.86</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$166.51</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>49.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$166.51</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>49.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$166.51</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>49.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$171.30</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>47.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$171.30</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>47.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$171.30</td>
<td>$82.16</td>
<td>47.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part-time faculty at Glendale College appreciate our beautiful campus, the excellent facilities, intelligent caring colleagues and enthusiastic motivated students. It is a joy to be working in this stimulating environment with wonderful people. However the cost of out-of-pocket medical premiums, gas and space in one’s home for an office (all areas that require additional outlay for part-timers) continue to rise while adjunct salaries at GCC seem to be going backwards.

The Glendale College district recognizes, for all other employee groups from classified office workers, to full-time faculty to management, that years of experience and additional training or degrees are worth more pay. Their salary schedules reflect this awareness and in retirement they benefit from it. It is only part-time faculty members who lose out as they extend their training and their teaching career at this institution. Isn’t it time we did something about that?
The community room at Garfield was packed with English as Second Language (ESL) Non-credit students. Teachers had given awards. Alice Mecom, Chair of Non-credit ESL Division, had explained to the students what an ESL Certificate of Completion approved by the Chancellors office of the State of California meant. Then one student from the higher level came to the podium and spoke in her best English about how important it was for her to take ESL classes and participate in the Parent Education classes for herself, her little boy, and her husband. Of course, all of this was being taped by her beaming husband, tot in tow.

Paradoxically, this short speech highlighted the achievements and the tragedies of various departments in Continuing Education. While the Level 3 Certificate of Completion approved by the Chancellors office of the State of California in ESL helped assure the continuation of Garfield Campus's ESL classes, and similar state certified certificates helped the continuation of business and education classes through the drastic and devastating cuts that others adult schools have seen in the last few years, the Parent Education class that this student found so valuable as an immigrant parent to a young child did not survive in the same manner. That program was slashed; fifty percent of the classes were cut, as were the programs at Lifelong Learning. As they could not give out state certified certificates to those who participated, they were not spared the chopping block in funds to adult education. In the hierarchy of values current in adult education, Parent Ed could not compete with job training and English language for immigrants.

That is indeed a sad state, but an excellent example of what happens when courses are judged by the dollar sign. Can Parent Ed be quantified? Perhaps, but it may take twenty years to have the data which could prove that indeed it is dollar sound, just as Headstart has shown itself to be. Happy faces, what was called in my home Shalom Bayit (peace in the home), immigrant parents who now understand a little more what their children are doing in American preschools and schools, American-born parents who just want to help their children grow happily and healthfully—these are being sacrificed to the dollar and the past budget cuts. Hopefully, with Prop 30 there may be a slow return to the former level of activity.

In contrast, State supported certificates are given upon completion of a program in many areas. This has assured funding in the last budget slashing years. According to Jan Young, Division Chair of Business and Life Skills, Continuing Education, over 100 students complete their GED high school equivalent exam, annually. In addition certificates are given in programs for computer training, office skills, medical and dental office and similar areas. In ESL, there are three levels; the two higher ones include conversation and a level of competency and literacy in computers. This year, so far, 29 students have received the certificate after the fall semester, an increase of 28% over last year. In the tight job market of today, these offer tangible state certified documentation that the student has achieved a certain level of proficiency.
Garfield Campus is in a process of reevaluation, and has to consider many issues, including coordination with other programs, as well as the usual financial and special issues. Alfred Ramirez, Interim Administrative Dean, Continuing and Community Education, has scheduled many open meetings to allow staff and students to learn more about possible plans and to express their opinions and share their ideas. The large departments were spared some of the ax last fall, although summer and winter were practically non-existent. They were also relieved just a few weeks ago from having to accept Governor Brown's plan to bring all state adult education into community colleges. While this may not be a bad idea in an overall long-range plan, a hurried adaptation would have probably robbed us of even more funds. With some intelligent plans, however, and assured funds for growth, the Garfield Campus and Continuing Education, wherever its classes are located, can serve the adults in the community in ever more creative and productive ways, including those that bring their tots that participate in Parent Ed classes with mommy and daddy, and caretaker grandparents.

**Milestones (April 2013)**

**Ellen Oppenberg**
Ellen Oppenberg’s (DSPS) youngest daughter, Alyssa, is graduating an LAUSD magnet high school on June 6th and looking forward to starting her path to becoming a criminal attorney.

Congratulations to Alyssa!

**J William Stinde**
J William Stinde (Accounting) has been invited to present a paper at the 71st Midwest Political Science Association Conference in Chicago April 11-14, 2013.

**Roger Porter**
Roger Porter (Art) was featured in the Spring 2013 issue of "Clay Times." The article was written by a GCC student, Tina McKenzie and photographed by Margaret Norton. Roger has been with GCC for many years and commands respect here and in the Ceramics community with his knowledge and achievements. Roger is a premier expert in the field of Ceramic Glaze and we are very fortunate to have him on our staff at GCC. He has recently donated his extensive library to The American Museum of Ceramic Art and the library has been named after him.

Please see the full article at: http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/claytimes/2013spring/index.php?startid=18#/32

---

We want your Milestones!
Do you have any milestones to share with us? Send them to: jgamberg@glendale.edu