



A Union of Professionals

**Shoreline Community College Federation of Teachers
Local 1950**

SCCFT President Eric Hamako

Statement to the SCC Board of Trustees

2023.04.26

Permalink: <https://bit.ly/SCCFTtoBOT2023-04>

I ask that my comments be read into the record.

Trustees of the Board:

My name is Eric Hamako. I am the President of the faculty's union, the Shoreline Community College Federation of Teachers (SCCFT), Local 1950 of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

Recently, a series of train derailments made national news, with burning wreckage, destroyed homes, and threats of explosions and toxic clouds making headlines. The investigative journalism organization, *ProPublica*, recently published a longform investigation of such derailments – finding that their history stretches back numerous years. The toxic combination of corporate greed and neoliberal government deregulation contributes mightily to such train derailments and their effects. Together, that poisonous combination produces problems that seem not unfamiliar: increased working loads, decreased staffing, and decreased attention to necessary preventative maintenance and safety precautions. And, as a consequence, increased harm to communities, with costs tallied in homes, health, lives, and financial well-being as corporations devolve risk and expenses onto the communities they crash into. At the same time, the Federal government has recently turned its back on railroad workers' labor unions, who have been trying to restrain corporate greed, advocate for workers, and keep trains from going off the rails. Here at the College, we can hear echoes of deregulation and the screaming rails in our collective bargaining, in the ongoing ransomware debacle, and in the similarly ongoing accreditation debacle.

Our faculty union is in the midst of bargaining with the College over our next Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), which regulates the College's actions, restraining the College from making unilateral and arbitrary decisions about many of our working conditions. So, it's notable that several of the College's proposals would, if agreed upon, reduce such regulations. For example, the College suggested eliminating the Priority Associate Faculty status and replacing it with Associate Faculty Annual Contracts – in effect, wiping out a status that provides a measure of seniority and job security to long-time Associate Faculty and replacing it with year-to-year contracts that would be available to an ever-decreasing pool of faculty and that would increase the College's impunity in hiring Associate Faculty. Or, for example, the College has proposed reducing regulation of Faculty Program Coordinator (FPC) work – such as the rule that FPC work is categorically separate from faculty service work. This, at a time when we can ill-afford to have any more faculty service work soaked up by additional tasks. We need that faculty service work for *faculty* work, not quasi-administrative work. We need faculty service work hours for mission-critical work, such as Accreditation, responding to the additional demands created by the ransomware attack, and participating in the governance of the College. And, at the same time, the College has resisted union proposals that would increase the College's accountability for Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion (DEI) – such as resisting DEI training for the people who evaluate faculty members and resisting DEI accountability measures that would govern how the College distributes workload to Associate Faculty.

The recent ransomware attack has been another shock that has threatened to further derail the College. The College has said that it will ask the Board of Trustees to release Reserve funds for technology and security upgrades. The College's response is akin to closing the barn door after the horse is out. If the College had been providing more attention and funding to mission critical matters, such as our technology & security, then the risks and current effects could have been reduced. The things the College is saying it will *now* do to prevent future attacks are also things the College *could* have previously done to prevent the recent attack. But, instead of prevention, we have remediation – which, as with the railroad corporations' responses to train derailments, the insurance claims and payouts will not actually cover or remediate all of the damages – particularly the damages to students and workers. Our faculty union has surveyed faculty members, asking them about how the ransomware attack and the College's responses have affected faculty. Among the most reported effects are increased workload, lack of access to necessary tools (not least: functional internet access), concerns about increased risks of future identity theft and fraud crimes, and a general increase in stress and anxiety. So, our union is exercising our right to collectively bargain with the College for remediation of some of those effects. Without our union, faculty members would be left to accept whatever the College might see fit to provide. But, as a union, we're able to bargain, not beg, for redress.

And, on the Accreditation front, our faculty union continues to flag concerns about unregulated workload, lack of College accountability, and lack of investment in labor needed to maintain our accreditation. Recently, the College has added more accreditation tasks to faculty members' workload as the College tries to speed-run in a few months work that should've been managed over the past decade. Our faculty union has asked the College to provide basic accountings for how the College intends to manage faculty's accreditation labor in alignment with our Collective Bargaining Agreement's workload regulations. In our Joint Union/ Management Committee (JUMC), our faculty union has, for example, asked some foundational questions about the College's management of faculty labor, such as:

1. For each of Spring and Summer quarters 2023, what is the approximate number of faculty work hours the College will need to complete the student outcomes assessment work necessary for the College's accreditation work?
2. What are the various roles in which faculty will be performing accreditation work in Spring and Summer quarters 2023?
3. In Spring Quarter, given approximately 120 full-time faculty, the College will have approximately 9000 hours of full-time faculty service work. How many of those hours will the College be allocating to its accreditation work for Spring 2023?
4. How much money is the College allocating to fund additional faculty work on accreditation work, for Spring and Summer 2023? For example, for:
 - Associate Faculty for service work
 - additional Full-Time Faculty service work during Spring quarter
 - Full-time Faculty service work during Summer quarter

Our faculty union asked these questions of the College one month ago. We have yet to receive responses to what seem to us basic questions about project management.

However, we *have* seen indications of the College's lack of sufficient investment in faculty labor needed to maintain our accreditation. For example, a lack of investment in Associate Faculty members' labor. As context, Associate Faculty are almost two-thirds of the total faculty body. There are approximately 213 Associate Faculty to the 126 Full-Time Faculty. And, because Associate Faculty contracts do not pay for service work, such as Accreditation work, the College would need to invest additional funding to involve Associate Faculty who are, again, two thirds of the faculty body. Yet, for one of its recent surveys, which is a precursor to additional

Accreditation work, the College said it would pay only the first *seventy-five* Associate Faculty who participated in the survey – and then only for one hour of work each. That’s 75 hours of Associate Faculty labor, total – representing an investment of only \$4,500. As a point of reference, that \$4,500 is less than what the College would pay one Associate Faculty member to teach one five-credit class. To be clear, maintaining our College’s accreditation will require a significant amount of faculty labor – this work is urgent and necessary. And, because of the College’s increasing reliance on contingent workers, Associate Faculty, the College will need to pay for the Accreditation labor of two-thirds of the faculty as add-on labor, in addition to the duties for which they’re already paid. The Board of Trustees might well consider using some of its Reserves to provide additional funding for the additional faculty labor – and for a larger number of Associate Faculty members’ “contingent” labor – both to better distribute the workload burden and also to gain the benefit of including and involving more of the two-thirds of faculty who are treated as “contingent” labor. If ever there were a “contingency” that might warrant the Board spending from our Reserves, I suggest that maintaining our Accreditation is one such contingency.

Over years now – and in a variety of arenas – the College’s decisions have contributed to a series of crises that threaten to derail us from our mission, further harming students and workers in the process. As a labor union, our faculty union is here to advocate for faculty and, where we can, to regulate the College’s actions so that we’re able to stay on track and so that this workplace can be a bit less like a trainwreck.

Good night.

###