

# THE SPARK HARPER FACULTY NEWSLETTER

Number 9 - Nov. 2012 \* Cook County College Teachers Union ~ American Federation of Teachers Local

## Harper Faculty Senate Executive

**President:**

Tom Dowd  
847.925.6695  
tdowd@harpercollege.edu

**Vice President:**

Sean Noonan  
847.925.6432  
snoonan@harpercollege.edu

**Secretary:**

Anne Abasolo  
847.925.6393  
aabasolo@harpercollege.edu

**Treasurer:**

Andy Kidwell  
847.925.6704  
akidwell@harpercollege.edu

**Grievance Officer:**

David Richmond  
847.925.6845  
drichmon@harpercollege.edu

Contents:

- 1.....From the President.....*Tom Dowd*
- 3.....Cross Currents.....*Sean Noonan*
- 9.....Contract Trends.....*David Richmond*
- 10.....Know your Contract.....*Sam Giordano*  
*David Richmond*
- 11.....Hidden in Plain Sight.....*Kathy Hanahan*  
*Caryn Levington*  
*Kathi Nevels*
- 13.....Quest for Student Success...*Dave Braunschweig*
- 16.....Harper Faculty Strike of 2002.....*Jim Edstrom*
- 18.....Photos: The 2002 Harper Strike.....*Jim Edstrom*
- 19.....Chicago Teachers Raise the Bar....*Theresa Moran*
- 21.....Photos: Harper Faculty Show Solidarity With CTU  
.....*Jennifer Bell*
- 23.....What We've Learned.....*Charles Tocci*  
*Melissa Barton*
- 25.....Multicultural Faculty Fellowship
- 26.....Winter Luncheon

## From the President — By Tom Dowd

I hope that your semester is going well and that you and your family enjoy a healthy and happy upcoming holiday season. As it is almost Thanksgiving, I was contemplating the many faculty who do so much to keep the college running smoothly. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but I wanted to particularly acknowledge a few groups that I am thankful for this year.

Thank You to our Faculty Senate Social Committee. Every semester they do a great job planning events for the faculty to enjoy some time together. And somehow these events always run smoothly and under-budget. All we have to do is show up and have fun. Thank you.

Thank You to all of the faculty who attended the Shared Governance meetings this semester and gave their feedback on the proposals to reform shared governance. This is perhaps the most important issue facing the faculty today. In January, we are expecting the Shared Governance Steering Committee to present a more detailed shared governance proposal and we will once again need as many of us as possible to show up and give feedback. Thank you in advance.

*Continued on page 2...*

*“From the President” continued*

And speaking of shared governance, Thank You to all of the faculty who continue to volunteer their time on committees to ensure that the decisions made on this campus are thoughtful and reasonable. I shudder to think of what this campus would look like without your involvement in shared governance. Thank you.

Thank You to the Faculty Senators. Every semester on myriad issues the Faculty Senate does its best to protect the interests of the faculty. It takes a lot of time and dedication to be a Faculty Senator. Thank you.

Thank You to my Executive Officers Committee. I have the pleasure of working with an incredibly talented and committed group of officers. They put in tremendously long hours on all of our behalf and most of their efforts go unrecognized. The fact that most of us don't realize how much they do is a wonderful sign of how well they do their jobs. I couldn't do this work without them. Thank you.

Thank You to all of my friends and colleagues in the faculty for all of the support you have given me over the years. I am eternally grateful that I work with such hardworking, talented, warm and fun people. I can't say that I've enjoyed coming to campus *every* day for the last 12 ½ years, but all of you make this a great place to work. Thank you.

There are many others who deserve our thanks. If someone or some group comes to mind, I encourage you to take a minute and send them a short email saying thanks. I'm sure they will appreciate it.

Have a Happy Thanksgiving everyone!



Clarke Street in Chicago Loop during CTU rally, September 10th 2012 — Sean Noonan

## **Cross Currents of Defeat and Victory — By Sean Noonan**

For unionized professional educators it has been an eventful autumn at all scales and levels of organization that shape our work (chapter, local, Chicagoland, state, national).

### **At Harper**

The administration's rollout of its "Shared Governance Review White Paper" in August was met with an encouraging combination of collegiality and critique. It was good to see colleagues discuss the appropriate role of faculty voice in a setting of shared governance in higher education.

Some of my favorite comments from the feedback sessions were:

*"How can the challenges identified with the current shared governance system be justified—we are complex and large but is that the real issue?"*

*"What problem are we trying to solve here?"*

*"The weaknesses of shared governance involve communication and education, operational issues, so why are we redoing the whole system?"*

*"Should governance be only for policy—at Harper it is more."*

*"Faculty voice is important in almost all decisions at the College"*

Tom Dowd and Anne Abasolo continue to meet with the Shared Governance Steering Committee on a weekly basis. Additionally, shared governance is a recurring topic at the monthly lunches the Senate Exec has with President Ender. We continue to advocate for a strong faculty voice in the shared governance structures.

### **At Local 1600**

Local 1600 President Perry Buckley and his team frog marched the City College of Chicago faculty and professionals into an unnecessarily concessionary contract. Concessions included inclusion in a "voluntary" wellness program where a private firm will monitor participants' health. Refusal to participate in the "voluntary" program will cost each member \$600 per year. Additionally, health insurance costs are driven up across the duration of the contract, and sick days applied for retirement are reduced. Most disturbing though, are the issues of steps, lanes and so-called "performance" or "student success pay." After the first year, steps are abolished in the CCC contract. Those steps are concrete expressions of increased experience and the union principle of seniority. Instead of steps the contract is moving to a Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) model. Under this model, there is no provision for rewarding increased experience, a diminished recognition of seniority, and an objective tendency for COLAs to put downward pressure on increases in (inflation adjusted) real wages over time; hence their popularity with bosses, managers and administrators across the private and non-unionized sectors. Furthermore, the new contract eliminates a lane, reducing the lane structure from 4 to 3.

*Continued on page 4*

*"Cross Currents" continued*

Under the new contract the graduate credit hours required for lane advancement to Lane 2 have been increased to 45 and Master's level faculty will not be able to reach Lane 3.

Most insidious of all, the new CCC contract introduces so called "performance pay" into the CCC system. Faculty and professionals who work directly with students will become eligible for a 1% non-recurring bonus at the end of the year based on eight metrics of "performance." These metrics are:

- The number of students who earn degrees or certificates.
- The number of at-risk students earning degree or certificates.
- The number of students who transfer to a four-year institution within three years of enrollment.
- The number of remedial students who advance to college-level work.
- The number of new full-time students who earn 30 credits in their first year.
- The number of part-time students who earn 15 credits in their first year.
- The percentage of former students who are employed in the fields for which they received training.
- The median earnings of graduates in fields that they studied.

Perry Buckley has embraced this model of public education deform. On an email list for Local 1600 leaders Buckley responded to my concerns about "performance" pay by writing: *"Those goals are the State ICCB guidelines passed by the legislature and written by Randy Barnette, our fellow Local 1600 member, in his capacity as an ICCB Board of Trustee Member."* Barnette is a former CCC administrator and now serves as Assistant to President Buckley. I am utterly mystified as to why a member of Local 1600 is working to undermine the foundations of quality public education in Illinois. So-called performance pay is antithetical to quality education, academic freedom, critical thinking and free expression in the classroom. Recognizing the harm such a grade-for-pay approach to faculty and professional compensation presents, the proposed contract calls for writing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and forming a joint administrator/faculty committee to hold back grade inflation.

A memo and a committee holding back grade inflation when the pay system is explicitly being tied to the grading system is simply stupid. The easiest way to prevent the perverse incentives of grade inflation associated with grade-for-pay is to not implement the "performance pay" system in the first place. Grade inflation is already a serious problem in higher education and this new turn towards performance pay will only exacerbate the situation. A meta-analysis conducted by Stuart Rojstaczer and Christopher Healy (2011) found that 'A' grades have grown dramatically over the past 50 years as grades of 'C' and 'D' have diminished. Additionally, this process of grade inflation has occurred even as students on average spend far fewer hours studying per week now than they did in the 1960s.

Creating incentives for further grade inflation is itself a strike issue, something we, as professionals, should be willing to burn at least one paycheck walking a picket line on strike to oppose. In a disturbing foreshadowing of what education deforms are coming in the future the CCC contract also contains language indicating that the MOU committee should "discuss additional ways to measure individual merit, such as assessments that go across departments."

*Continued on page 5*

*“Cross Currents” continued*

This approach to higher education is destructive for quality public education and unions in equal measure. Unions have a long history of opposing wage systems where compensation was tied to individual units of production (called piecework). Such piecework systems aren't only bad for the wages of employees but they also systematically mis-characterize the nature of labor processes in general and the labor process of public higher education in particular. Real laboring people are not atomized in isolation from each like a lonely castaway on an island. Rather, we are interconnected, interdependent, and cooperative in our educational practices. The students I teach are also working with other faculty across academic departments, the library and counseling services. Harper works because we work together.

The CCC contract is the most important contracts in our local and one of the most important in the nation. Now that so-called performance pay has been accepted in the CCC contract, it will surely find its way into other contracts within our local, around the state, and around the country. Boards and administrations will only seek to expand the influence and impact of grade-for-pays in future contracts.

The CCC contract puts higher education and teachers unions on a genuinely destructive trajectory. The process Buckley used to win the contract vote is also deeply problematic. On August 24<sup>th</sup>, with ten months left on the current contract, Buckley announced his support for a proposed contract extension in the City College system at the Local 1600 House of Delegates meeting. When, at that meeting, I heard Buckley's speech supporting the proposed contract I was struck by how Buckley talked more about what wasn't in the contract than what was in the contract. Buckley also invoked the demands of the City College Chancellor Cheryl Hyman as effectively “last best and final offer” language.

This kind of take-it-or-strike language should not be taken seriously by anyone who: 1) still has ten months on a contract, 2) hasn't yet organized the union to run even a perfunctory contract campaign, and 3) could wait and play for time as the largest teachers union in the state was gearing up for a serious strike with the same Mayor Emmanuel who you will have to fight in ten months. The smart strategy was to wait and see what the CTU strike yielded. Instead, Buckley embraced a weak contract and sold it to the membership by fear mongering. For example, Perry and his team went so far as to suggest that if CCC faculty and professionals went on strike, then Emmanuel would cancel the semester across the entire CCC system. Then, in turn, the state legislature would abolish City College of Chicago, leaving the third largest city in the country without a public 2-year community college system.

Although many faculty and professionals saw this for the asinine hysteria that it is, it still left the rank-and-file demobilized and demoralized as it signaled to the membership that the leadership had no intention of running a serious contract campaign or (if necessary) going on strike. Importantly, CCC faculty and professionals were not presented with actual contract language. Instead they were presented with a sparse outline of the proposed contract, so that many members were unclear of what exactly they were voting on. Then, Buckley compelled the membership to vote on the contract in one week. The contract passed with 75% support across both faculty and professionals.

*Continued on page 6*

*“Cross Currents” continued*

This contract was forced through with little information, in a short time-frame with dire predictions of educational apocalypse with a full ten months before the contract was to expire. Why the rush to run roughshod over democratic processes? Rahm Emanuel wanted to get a contract with CCC which contained many of the provisions he was trying to extract from the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU), the union representing educators in the K-12 Chicago Public Schools system. In agreeing to this tentative agreement and then brow beating CCC faculty and professional to get the proposal passed in one week, Buckley was willingly letting Local 1600 be used as a pawn to put pressure on our fellow educators in the CTU.

Taken together the content of the CCC contract eliminating steps, reducing lanes and introducing grades-for-pay alongside the roughshod, undemocratic brow beating Buckley engaged in to get the contract approved are a serious setback for Local 1600. In the Local 1600 Newsletter, *The Voice*, Perry Buckley suggested that this contract constitutes labor peace, which it does. This contract is a peace based on surrender before the fight even began. This contract is a peace where CCC administrators are empowered and faculty and professionals are disempowered. It is an unjust peace. Buckley and his supporters are now trying to assume the mantle of pragmatism, claiming that those who criticize the current CCC contract are wild eyed radicals who view the cost and conflict of contract campaigns and strikes as some kind of adventurous recreational activity. However, the measure of pragmatism is efficacy in getting results. The person who accommodates management and advocates for contracts riddled with major concessions does not automatically win the mantle of pragmatism. The concessions in this contract were premised on an assessment that assumed the CTU was going to be defeated in the strike of September. However, the CTU disproved the conventional wisdom and won a stunning victory. In light of that victory, signing a very weak contract just before the CTU strike has proven to be a disaster. If Perry Buckley and his team could have held out for a mere four more weeks, the CTU victory would have created the external conditions for a contract extension that was equitable, fair and did not undermine quality public education. And, if the forces could be mobilized, a contract campaign run by Local 1600 along the lines of the CTU contract campaign could have generated even more favorable results for faculty and professionals working in CCC. Pre-emptive surrender in the face of an assault that is bad for unions and public education is not pragmatism.

### **The CTU in Chicago**

Our fellow educators in the CTU have been under assault for years. In addition to teaching in some of the poorest neighborhood schools in the country, CTU teachers have been faced with eviscerating budget cuts, and the growth of selective enrollment and charter schools (undermining neighborhood schools). Then the state passed SB7, a law specifically designed to make it harder for CTU to strike (requiring a “yes” vote from a 75% supermajority of all members before going on strike) and requiring a mechanistic test-score driven teacher evaluation procedure. K-12 educators throughout the country have been told that corporate “school reform” was unstoppable and that merit pay had to be accepted. Locally, commentators in the chattering classes assured the viewers and readers of mainstream media that the public would never support the CTU if they decided to strike.

*Continued on page 7*

*“Cross Currents” continued*

In response to these manifold assaults and obstacles the CTU embarked on a campaign of school-by-school grass roots, rank-n-file organizing across Chicago, producing a strike vote where 90% of CTU members voted to strike in June, a vote that the conventional wisdom (and the leadership of our local, 1600) had predicted was impossible to win.

Then, after continuing to negotiate over the summer, the CTU finally went out on strike September 10th. The CTU held together a powerful strike by 25,000 educators for over one week. At schools across Chicago teachers and supporters marched, chanted, sang, and made some of the most creative picket signs I’ve ever seen. Then in the afternoons, up to 30,000 people crammed the street at CPS headquarters on Clark Street and marched around the Loop bringing even more public attention to their just cause.

Although by law the CTU could not strike over classroom issues the CTU was masterful in making the connections between teacher working conditions and student learning conditions. The CTU brought attention to the large class sizes CPS teachers have to deal with as well as the lack of libraries, air conditioning, counselors, and arts curriculum across the CPS system. Consequently, polls conducted during the strike found that over 60% of parents with kids in CPS supported the teachers strike. By mid-week the *Tribune*, *Sun-Times*, *WGN* and some segments of national media were turning on Emanuel.

Late in the week CPS came back to the table with a contract the CTU could probably live with. Then, rather than accept the contract without specific contract language or time to discuss and debate, the CTU delegates defied the conventional wisdom again and voted to stay on strike for two more days so delegates could meet with the membership and discuss the proposed contract. In insisting on a democratic and meaningful discussion about ending the strike the CTU demonstrated that it is the most genuinely rank-n-file driven union of any size in the United States.

The strike, pickets and street protests got results. The CTU stopped the CPS Board from imposing merit pay, and preserved the steps and lanes pay scale when the politicians and press predicted that the CTU would be compelled to accept a COLA or worse, pay increased tied to the consumer price index (CPI). The CTU also held the line healthcare costs, won at least of a modicum of recall language for teachers that have been laid off, and pushed the percentage of teacher evaluation tied to high stakes testing as low as allowed by law.

Overall, the victory of the CTU concretely demonstrates the efficacy of an ***organizing model of unionism***, where organizing the rank-and-file in order to advocate and (if necessary) fight for the interests of educators and public education. The CTU organized and led one of (if not) the most important strike in the labor movement of the United States in a generation.

The CTU strike was a defensive victory that beat-back some of the most vicious attacks against organized labor and the profession of public educator in the country. As the chant during the protest goes: When education is under attack: Teachers stand up and fight back!

*Continued on page 8*

*“Cross Currents” continued*

### **In Illinois**

The politicians in Springfield have been trying to figure out a way to renege on their pension obligations to us and thousands of other public sector workers across Illinois. The defeat in the election of CA 49 was a positive step and has bought us some time. The longer it takes Madigan to build a coalition for a “yes” vote on pension reform the greater the chances are that our side can make the case that public sector employees in Illinois are not the problem and our pensions are not too generous. A recent Chicago Tribune/WGN-TV poll found that 51% of survey respondents blamed politicians alone for the pension crisis, 2% blamed public sectors workers alone and 37% blamed both public sector workers and politicians for the pension crisis. Given the constant drum beat of frenzied calls for pension cutting from the Civic Federation, The Tribune and Sun Times, 51% blaming the politicians is good news. The facts are on our side. Regrettably, policy makers and the mass media see us as scapegoats for the budget crisis.

### **Nationally**

President Barak Obama defeated Mitt Romney. Democrats held the Senate. Democrats gained seats in the House and Joe Walsh is no longer congressman for this district. Importantly, the Senate and House added more old school genuine Democrats and shed a few of the Republicans in Democrat clothing. The party that thinks science and reason are useful ways of knowing the world won the national elections. This is undoubtedly less bad than the other option. Under the Democrats things are getting worse more slowly, but they are still getting worse. The middle class is still shrinking and vertical social mobility continues to decline. Median household income is lower today than in 2000. In higher education, low achieving high-income students have slightly better chances of graduating from college than high-achieving low-income students. Union density (the percentage of the labor force protected by a union contract) fell under President GW Bush from 13.3% to 12.3% in eight years and has fallen under President Obama from 12.3% to 11.8% in three and ½ years. We continue to become more unequal, less meritocratic and less democratic. A bigger, better and stronger labor movement will be a necessary component of the new political coalition required for returning the US to the path of growing equality, meritocracy and democracy.

The cross currents of success and failure, victory and loss, opportunism and standing on principle gives credence to the old Gramscian saw about the need to maintain both a pessimism of the intellect and an optimism of the will. With consciousness, intellect, and will we can learn from our mistakes and defeats, develop an accurate analysis of the context and terrain in which we are working, and organize to defend and advance both our profession and our union. We are in for a period of struggle. Although we are strong here at Harper right now, our local is weak and the state and national context is not favorable. Yet, we can see from the example of the CTU that the best way to build a “bigger, better, and stronger” union is through grassroots bottom-up organizing, meaningful participation of the rank-n-file, matched by robust advocacy for our profession and the principles of public education in a democratic society.

## **Contract Trends: CPI-Linked Raises** — By David Richmond

One of the trends that educational unions are starting to see locally and nationally is for Boards and Administrations to push CPI-language during negotiations. Most of the employee contracts at Harper College, with the notable exception of the full-time faculty, have at least some of their raises tied to increases in the Consumer Price Index. Linking annual raises to the Consumer Price Index should be unacceptable to the faculty for several reasons – even ignoring the entire debate over whether CPI is an accurate measure of cost-of-living increases.

Linking raises to CPI deliberately ignores any raises based upon increased experience. The explicit goal is to keep employees at their current inflation-adjusted salary level. As a union, our goal is to improve the quality of living for our membership by beating inflation whenever possible. The faculty contract is structured in a way that new full-time faculty start at a salary below “market value”. Even the Board’s own salary study of the faculty contract in 2010 came to this conclusion. The only way that a faculty member can achieve market value and make up some of the lost lifetime earnings potential is to beat the rate of inflation; and CPI-linked raises do not. The faculty should be unified in its commitment to protect the salary structure in the contract, which cannot happen if we agree to CPI.

In the current economic climate, CPI may seem to be a reasonable offer. However, even if CPI is reasonable today, the goal is often to establish a pattern of bargaining for the foreseeable future (presumably as long as CPI stays in the 2%-3% range). If salary increases “default” to CPI, then the Board has circumvented perhaps the most important aspect of collective bargaining. This could easily be interpreted as a form of “contract-busting”. The long term effect would be to make it more difficult for the union to bargain Board proposals for concessions from the contract. If CPI becomes the de facto raise at our chapter, it handcuffs the negotiations team putting future contracts in jeopardy.

I would rather bargain a lower number than bargain 3 letters. There is far more to lose than there is to be gained by the (possible) couple of tenths of a percentage point in salary. I would not recommend CPI-based raises to our membership and I hope that all of you will remain firm in your resolve if the time should come when we are presented with CPI proposals.

**Harper Workers Because  
We Work Together**

**American Federation of Teachers  
Local 1600**



## **Know Your Contract: Confused about your workload, reassigned time, or overload pay?**

— By Sam Giordano and David Richmond

The Faculty Contract delineates the normal workload for full-time faculty as thirty (30) instructional contact hours per contract year. A contact hour is defined as a minimum total fifteen (15) fifty (50) minute periods of instruction per semester or equivalent. If a faculty member teaches in excess of the normal workload, he/she shall be compensated as provided in the contract. The normal workload also requires a minimum of four (4) unique course sections per academic year except if otherwise specified.

Full-time faculty may satisfy up to four (4) hours of the workload by teaching continuing education course that are approved by the ICCB as reimbursable courses. Up to four (4) contact hours of continuing education may be applied toward any annual load within one (1) year after completing the course or the last of the courses.

Now there are many different exceptions in assignments based on a variety of teaching duties related to laboratory and individual learning in developmental education, math lab, English as a second language, adult educational development whereas faculty qualify for two (2) contact hours for one (1) hour of load equivalency. In addition, there are other specific assignment differences for faculty members teaching many of the English courses, the Dental Hygiene faculty, Library and Student Development faculty, as well as practicums, internships, clinical work studies and extracurricular assignments. Article III of the contract should be referenced for these situations.

Career program coordinators and department chairs qualify for reassigned time from their base workload. Depending upon your position (Coordinator or Chair) you can obtain anywhere from 1 hour up to 7 hours of reassigned time. For Career Coordinators it is based on adjusted unduplicated head count yielding reassigned time from 3 hours to 7 hours, and for Department Chairs it is based on adjusted contact hours yielding reassigned time from 1 to 7 hours. In addition, the College Administration can provide additional reassigned time to be distributed to faculty with unusual temporary or ongoing needs. The process for applying for these hours is spelled out in Article K Section 1.(b) of the contract.

Overload is defined as the contact hours in excess of the normal workload as stated in Article III-I. Overload pay begins after normal workload requirements are fulfilled and will be limited to fifteen (15) contact hours per year excluding summer session (applies to fall and spring terms). The newest pay rates for Overload rates are available on-line through the “Human Resources => Employee Contracts=> Faculty Contract through 2015” tabs on the Employee Portal. The rates increased with the contract extension that we signed in 2011. The bottom line with this subject is we have a contract that is over 80 pages in length with addendums that protects our rights and wages. Understand our contract and never hesitate to ask for Senate assistance when you believe you are not being compensated fairly.

## **Hidden in plain sight...**

— By Kathy Hanahan, Caryn Levington and Kathi Nevels

Your faculty counselor colleagues serve the campus in a myriad of ways, including:

Counseling students with integrative modalities ranging from academic, career, and personal counseling to psychotherapy and crisis intervention;  
assessing and arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities;  
offering consultation, outreach, and HEAT interventions;  
teaching classes and developing curriculum;  
doing social justice work;  
carrying out divisional initiatives and serving on divisional committees;  
and, of course, working alongside you, our faculty colleagues, in Shared Governance Committee work, Faculty Senate and Contract Committees, and Achieving the Dream Taskforces....to name a few.

In this newsletter we will begin a series of outreach activities to inform you, our fellow faculty colleagues, of the many activities Student Development faculty contribute to promote student success and maintain the strength and well-being of our campus community.

We'll begin with our central work...counseling our students and supporting their success, and what better way to take you "behind the scenes" than with a case study. Given that our counseling work with students is confidential, it's important you know that all identifying information has been altered in this description (without changing the substance or outcome of this material) to allow this case study to be shared in this venue.

Jane is a 36 year old partnered Hispanic returning adult student in a Health Career Program who was referred to a counselor by program faculty who observed that she lacked confidence in her performance during clinical rotations. When Jane met with her counselor, she described herself as uncertain about vocational goals and unsure as to whether she wished to pursue a four year degree in health care. She noted she was about to finish her current course of study at Harper with a 3.25 GPA. She shared that she had a history of recurrent depression, in addition to concerns about her relationship with her partner of 16 years. The issues arose when she had been diagnosed with stage three breast cancer four years ago (currently in full remission).

Prior to coming to Harper, Jane worked in a nursing home as an administrative assistant. Jane characterized herself as "having a sense of emptiness and sadness, and feeling a sense that life is passing me by...and feeling I'm not important to anyone, anymore". She noted that throughout her life she had always wanted to work as a health care provider, but was seriously considering dropping out of the program she was in at Harper, stating "I just don't know if it's who I am". Jane had experienced thoughts of suicide from time to time, and stated her surviving breast cancer was the main reason she had not thought more specifically about ending her life, adding "maybe I am still here for a reason I still need to discover".

*Continued on page 12*

*“Hidden in Plain Sight” continued*

Jane noted her partner had become physically distant from her around the time of her cancer diagnosis and treatment; the couple had not been physically intimate since that time, and did not openly talk to each other about the cancer or the effects the cancer had on their relationship.

So, how do the counselors work “holistically” with our students? Jane’s academic counselor was able to explore and normalize her concerns, discuss academic options, build trust, and refer her to the Career Center and Psychological Services where Jane could explore her questions about Health Careers as a vocation with a career counselor and receive in depth psychotherapy and ongoing assessment of her suicidal ideation from a psychotherapist.

The Career Center counselor Jane met with helped her explore the key values she holds regarding work – what it means to her, the role she feels it plays in her self-identity, and the rewards she hopes to gain from her career. The counselor also had her take a variety of interest, strength, and personality inventories to confirm Jane’s fit with the health care field, and to see if there might be better matches that Jane was not considering. Upon review and interpretation of the results, and an in-depth discussion regarding how she felt about them, Jane and her counselor were able to confirm that her interest in health care was indeed a good fit. Jane came to realize that her career doubts were most likely due to the trauma, anxiety and life transition created by the health scare she had experienced, as well as the change in her relationship with her partner.

Psychological Services provided Jane an opportunity to examine and define her sense of personal and spiritual purpose as a person, a woman, and a cancer survivor through psychotherapy. Jane and her therapist worked together to visualize and “redesign” her body as a sacred space, allowing her to live in her body with freedom, enjoyment, security, and peace. Therapy also focused upon how she could openly discuss her mix of love and disconnection in her relationship with her partner, who responded to Jane’s honesty with confusion and relief stating she was unsure how to best support Jane as a cancer survivor and “resume normal life again” when she had been so fearful of losing Jane to the disease.

At the suggestion of her partner, Jane and her partner did the Avon breast cancer walk in Chicago to celebrate her survivorship, and this helped her feel part of a survivor community, able to celebrate her femininity as strength and solidarity as opposed to “feeling broken”. It was also a chance for the couple to heal and renew their love, affection, and commitment to one another.

Finally, Jane’s performance in her clinical work improved steadily, and she decided that becoming a health care provider was “who I am now – it’s a life dream and a chance to help others who are suffering”. She earned straight A’s for her final semester at Harper, and transferred in to a baccalaureate degree upon graduation.

## **A Quest for Student Success** — By Dave Braunschweig

Hi, I am a faculty member in Computer Information Systems. Beginning in the fall of 2009, I had the opportunity to be a part of the Achieving the Dream (AtD) Data Team, and observed first-hand many of the metrics that are used to measure student engagement and student success across the United States and now here at Harper College. While there were literally hundreds of different measures identified, one area in particular stood out to me and my work in teaching at Harper College. According to the National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP) report available at the time, Harper College ranked in the bottom 1% of student success in distance learning, out of nearly 250 institutions reporting. Since a majority of my teaching is distance-based, I was greatly concerned by this finding, and began a quest to improve student engagement and student success in my courses.

My quest ultimately focused on four factors for student success:

1. Course Prerequisites
2. Course Design
3. Student Engagement
4. My Own Expectations

### **Course Prerequisites**

My first effort at improving student success was to ensure that students enrolled in our courses were prepared to be there. Through a combination of Cognos reporting and custom data queries, I looked at whether any particular course sequence improved success for students enrolled in previous semesters. Some results were confirming, while others were quite surprising. Some courses showed that students completing a prerequisite course had a 70% or 80% success rate, while those not taking the prerequisite only had a 30% success rate, and those failing the prerequisite only had a 10% success rate. In other cases, I found there was no correlation between previously assumed prerequisite courses, or that there was a correlation, but with a completely different course than our requirements indicated. Based on these findings, curriculum changes were brought to the Curriculum Committee in early fall 2010. Changes took effect immediately beginning with spring 2011 enrollment.

### **Course Design**

Now that I knew students enrolled in my courses were prepared to learn the material, I focused on effective course design by following the guidelines presented in the Illinois Online Network Quality Online Course Initiative (ION QOCI) available at:

<http://www.ion.uillinois.edu/initiatives/qoci/index.asp>.

The primary change in format was a switch to Blackboard Learning Modules rather than Assignments. Learning Modules allow the instructor to better sequence course material to ensure students complete necessary work before moving on to the next exercise. Also, because each item in the learning module design is displayed as a separate page rather than a separate paragraph, the design forced me to be much more detailed in my instructions and explanations than I had been in the past. Learning Modules are also more tablet-friendly, supporting students with a variety of learning devices.

*Continued on page 14*

*"A Quest for Student Success" continued*

As part of the course design, I added opportunities for formative assessments so students could validate their own learning prior to completing graded assessments. For courses with test banks, I added randomized review quizzes that the students can take as often as they like. Review quizzes are comprised of leftover true/false and fill-in-the-blank questions that I wasn't using for quizzes and exams.

Also included in the design is an extensive (21 screen) introductory module that all students must complete the first day of the semester, and before class meets if it is a blended or classroom class. This module introduces the course, the instructor, prerequisites and time commitment, the textbook and other required resources, the Tutoring Center and other support services, and the syllabus. It includes a syllabus quiz that students must earn 100% on, with multiple retakes allowed. It also includes a 10-question preparation survey that students must complete in order to self-assess that they are ready for the course. Through Blackboard Adaptive Release, I ensure that all students complete the syllabus review and preparation survey before they are able to see any of the other course learning modules.

### **Student Engagement**

Now that I had prepared students and what I believed to be an effective course design, I focused my efforts on student engagement. First, I made my courses available to students a few days before the semester started so they could review the materials and begin preparing for the adventure. I emailed everyone at their Harper address several times before classes started, and once at their personal address to ensure that they knew they had a Harper email address. I also emailed students daily during the first week of the semester with course updates. Finally, I followed up with students who did not complete the introductory module by the end of the first day, and made phone calls to any who hasn't completed the introduction by the end of the second day.

Once students are engaged in the course itself, there are activities designed to maintain their participation level. Discussion board participation is required on three or more days each week, and each week has a written assignment, the review quiz already mentioned, and a content quiz. I also have team assignments or projects included in several courses.

New for this semester is the addition of a first draft of the weekly assignment due by Thursday evening rather than just a final draft due on Sunday.

### **My Own Expectations**

While I anticipated that improving prerequisites, course design, and student engagement would improve student success, the fourth change I made was counter-intuitive. I raised my own expectations for the quality of student work. I now make it very clear to students that I have high expectations, and I require corrections on assignments that do not meet those standards. I encourage students to contact the Writing Center or Tutoring Center for assistance, make their corrections, and then submit the assignment again, but no later than by the assignment due date. Late assignments are not accepted.

*Continued on page 15*

## **Findings**

The prerequisites have been effective in ensuring only students prepared for the courses are enrolling. Enrollment is down, but the drop is consistent with the percentage of students who would not have met the new prerequisites in previous semesters.

The introductory module, preparation survey, and follow-up contacts have been effective in ensuring students enrolled in the course understand the requirements for success. I now have a 20% to 30% refund rate during the first week as students recognize the course will require more work than they may have scheduled time for. Students who remain are committed to the course and the learning experience.

The formative assessments are keeping students engaged and helping them succeed. On average, students attempt the review quiz two to four times before taking the graded quiz, greatly improving graded quiz scores. And while at the beginning of the semester approximately 50% of first draft assignments required corrections, approximately 80% are now accepted on the first pass, with only minor improvements typically necessary on the other 20%.

While every class is unique, overall success rates in my courses are up from the original below 50% earning a C or better to now over 70% succeeding, with some classes as high as 90%. The students are more engaged, working harder than they have in the past, and earning better grades.

## **Recommendations**

I encourage all departments to review and validate prerequisites for their courses. Contact me directly if you would like assistance in gathering any necessary data.

I encourage all faculty to review their course designs and ensure that they have prepared the best course they can to support student success. Include a variety of formative assessments so students can determine their own level of mastery before completing graded assessments.

For distance-based courses, include a variety of student engagement techniques so that students must participate in the course throughout the week rather than forgetting about it until the end of the weekend.

If you've resigned yourself to the idea that students aren't going to submit quality work, raise your standards. But also include a way for students to find out what improvements are required and give them time to seek assistance and make those improvements before the due date.

I would be happy to make a copy of my course design available to anyone who asks. Everyone is welcome to borrow from and improve the design for their own courses.

Please contact me with any questions at [dbraunsc@harpercollege.edu](mailto:dbraunsc@harpercollege.edu).

## The Harper College Faculty Strike of 2002: A Remembrance — By Jim Edstrom

The academic year 2012-2013 also marks the beginning of a new three-year contract for Harper College full-time faculty. This document is rightly considered one of the best labor agreements in force at any academic institution in Illinois, and certainly within American Federation of Teachers Local 1600. Reaching that point, however, has been a matter of hard work, adherence to the principles of our profession, and—most importantly—long-term solidarity. All of these qualities were on vivid display ten years ago this fall when the Harper faculty staged the first strike in the history of the College.

In retrospect the strike may in truth have been a long time coming. Previous negotiations in 1991 and 1996 had been difficult, and on both occasions faculty came close to going on strike. In 1996 the main points of contention had been salary increases and distance learning. With the arrival in 1998 of Robert Breuder as the new College President, it became increasingly clear that everything in the faculty contract was likely to be a target. The late Julie Fleenor, at that time the Senate Secretary and later President, remembered that at one early meeting with the Senate officers Breuder signaled unambiguously that he particularly had his eye on provisions governing summer pay.

He bided his time, however, and in 1999 the Board and the Faculty Senate agreed to a three-year extension of the existing contract. Nobody was under any illusions that conflict had come to an end; in 2001 the faculty approved a motion of “no confidence” in Breuder by a margin of over 90%, motivated in large part by what they saw as a high-handed management style and a complete unwillingness to collaborate. Breuder nevertheless retained the support of the Board of Trustees, and tensions were at a heightened level when contract negotiations resumed in the winter of 2002.

The issues on the table were primarily focused upon salary and health benefits. More than thirty long-time faculty had retired the previous year, resulting in substantial cost savings. The faculty had also recently prevailed in a grievance over healthcare contribution monies that had been improperly accumulated by the College, and they sought agreement on a remedy for that grievance. On the salary issue, the Senate negotiators were taken aback when the Board’s team not only offered increases that were substantially lower than those proposed by the faculty, but also insisted that the increases include monies for promotion—in other words, the increases would not be applied uniformly to all faculty base salaries. The College also proposed removing a 20% cap on faculty contributions toward healthcare costs, and they offered a minimal amount of money to remedy the health insurance grievance.

In the face of these conflicting proposals, negotiations dragged on at a snail’s pace through the spring and summer. On September 16<sup>th</sup>, with an overwhelming vote of approval from the faculty at large, Local 1600 filed a notice of intent to strike, which meant that a work stoppage could begin by the 26<sup>th</sup>.

*Continued on page 17*

*“...A Remembrance” continued*

Few were optimistic about the prospects for a successful contract being completed before the expiration of the old contract in August 2002, and faculty were hardly encouraged by Breuder’s observation in the *Daily Herald* on September 20<sup>th</sup> that they were in need of a “reality check when it comes to the wages they are seeking.” Any lingering hopes for a satisfactory resolution were further dashed on September 24<sup>th</sup> when the Board of Trustees approved a renewal of the President’s contract that raised his salary from \$176,000 to \$185,000—three times the average faculty salary—and maintained an annual housing allowance of \$15,000, \$2,500 for expenses incurred by his wife, \$15,000 for him to purchase any investment he desired, a 3% contribution by the College to SURS on his behalf, a car, and \$2,500 to reimburse any income taxes he incurred for these benefits.

In the wake of this development and the obvious continuing futility of further negotiation, the faculty leadership declared on Tuesday, October 8<sup>th</sup> that the strike would begin the next day. Picketing began early in the morning of Wednesday, October 9<sup>th</sup>. Tensions were high as Breuder initially attempted to restrict picketing to two of the College’s three entrances. After discussions between lawyers from both sides, picketing resumed in each of these locations. Faculty were carefully organized in teams that were scheduled to picket from early in the morning until late at night. All strike logistics were expertly directed from strike headquarters at the offices of Local 1211 (which represents teachers in District 211), just down the road from Harper. In retrospect, one of the issues that was most important to the eventual success of the strike was the refusal of our union brothers and sisters in the trade unions—our fellow members of the AFL-CIO—to cross picket lines. This proved to be particularly effective given that the Avante Center was under construction at the time and crucial contractual deadlines on that project were looming. Numerous picketers frequently ventured on campus to ensure that picket lines were not being crossed in spite of threats from Breuder to arrest members for trespassing.

Morale remained high in spite of the College’s effort to cancel faculty’s health insurance during the duration of the strike. Breuder had threatened to do so before the walkout began. Somehow he convinced Blue Cross/Blue Shield to carry out this threat on the first day of the strike. Local 1600 directly complained to the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board, and it was generally felt that the union’s position stood a good chance of prevailing had an agreement not been reached to drop the issue in the final contract.

Talks were stalled for the first several days of the strike. Picketing continued in spite of rising tensions between the faculty and the College. At one point two picketers were ticketed for trespassing on campus; more seriously, an altercation between a faculty member and a College public safety officer resulted in an arrest. The faculty continued to hold firm, bolstered by continuing support from the trade unions, our brothers and sisters in the AFT, IFT, and AFL-CIO, and by the refusal of adjunct faculty to return to work.

*Continued on page 18*

“...A Remembrance” continued

At various points the College, faced with the prospect of having to cancel the semester if the strike was not over by October 28<sup>th</sup>, threatened to resume classes with administrators, retirees, and part-time faculty. They even proposed holding negotiations open to the public. Eventually, however, both sides agreed to return to the bargaining table on October 18<sup>th</sup> with the continuing assistance of a federal mediator. Over the course of the next two days they hammered out a four-year agreement with pay increases acceptable to the faculty and that kept funds for promotions separate. The health insurance grievance—for which the College had at one time proposed a settlement of \$250,000—was settled for an amount of \$2.1 million to be refunded to *all* employees—not just the faculty.

That the Harper faculty ultimately prevailed in the strike was a tribute to effective leadership from the likes of Norm Swenson, President of Local 1600, and Julie Fleenor, our head negotiator. The strike was a crucial stage for introducing future leaders such as Linda Campbell, Patti Ferguson, David Richmond, and Sean Noonan. But most important was the support of our union brothers and sisters and the solidarity of our entire membership in ensuring a fair and equitable contract and in setting the stage for holding firm again in 2006, when we nearly went on strike once more. The fair and equitable contract we hold today is the direct result of our willingness to withhold our labor ten years ago this month, and our continuing solidarity will ensure similar contracts for many years in the future.

## Photos of the 2002 Harper Strike — By Jim Edstrom



## **Chicago Teachers Raise the Bar** — by Theresa Moran

*Reprinted with permission from the excellent Labor Notes*

The Chicago Teachers Union has done the seemingly impossible. At a time when teachers are attacked on all sides, they led a strike that challenged every tenet of the corporate agenda for overhauling education. Photo: CTU. The Chicago Teachers Union has done the seemingly impossible. At a time when teachers are pilloried in the press and attacked by Democrats and Republicans alike, Chicago teachers walked out for seven days in a strike that challenged every tenet of the corporate agenda for overhauling education.

Though on paper the strike was about teacher evaluations, in fact the battle was waged over conflicting visions of public education. Mayor Rahm Emanuel and his corporate cronies seek to privatize public education into oblivion, creating profit-making opportunities as new charters are opened and new curricula and tests are adopted. Pushing high-stakes testing is key, as student test results supply a justification for shuttering schools as well as firing veteran teachers en masse. CTU, on the other hand, says public schools are necessary community institutions. Class sizes should be small; students should study a rich curriculum with more art and music than standardized tests; social workers, nurses, and counselors should help students beat back the effects of poverty on their chances of academic success. Teachers should be respected as professionals, fairly compensated, and given the supplies and the breathing room they need to do their jobs. Teachers believed so strongly in this vision of education for all that they risked legal sanctions and financial hardship to brave further vilification. “They’re my heroes,” said Kerry Motoviloff, president of the Madison, Wisconsin, teachers union. “Because of what they’ve done, they’ve taken control of the debate. They are saying that teachers have ideas on what real reform looks like—you are just not funding them.”

### **NEW CONTRACT GAINS GROUND**

Teachers kept the percentage of a teacher’s evaluation that will be based on student test scores to 30 percent, the legal limit after the Illinois legislature passed an anti-teacher law last year. The board had sought 45 percent. The union also earned the first-time ever right for teachers to appeal a rating. The union forced merit pay off the table and maintained almost all the traditional salary structure, with raises for experience and advanced degrees. Teachers made major gains on recall rights, previously nonexistent. Seniority had existed only at the school level. Now, if a school closes, teachers will have the right to “follow their students” if a position opens up at the school where students are sent. Laid-off teachers will have 10 months of recall if their old position is reinstated. And at least half of all new openings must now be filled with laid-off teachers. Six hundred teachers will be hired in art, music, and phys ed. The union won break time for nursing mothers and a \$250 reimbursement when teachers buy supplies. Students are guaranteed to get their books on the first day of school. *Continued on page 20*

---

**Visit LABOR NOTES at: <http://labornotes.org/>**  
**SUBSCRIBE NOW!**  
**Putting Movement Back in the Labor Movement**

*“Chicago Teachers...” continued*

## IMPERFECTIONS

The new deal is by no means perfect. Teachers won a new evaluation system they think will be more objective. But despite the flaws in principals’ rankings, low-rated teachers will not have seniority protection when layoffs take place. Laid-off teachers will now get paid for just six months, down from 12. The contract does little to address class size—which state law forbids only Chicago teachers to bargain over—preserving toothless policies that have allowed classrooms to balloon to 40 or 50 kids despite caps of 35. Still, the status quo is a minor win given that the board wanted to gut it. A panel to monitor class size will get more funding and must now include a parent. The board agreed to hire more social workers, counselors, and school nurses, but only if new sources of revenue are found. Emanuel is pushing for a Chicago casino to bring in tax money, which Governor Pat Quinn has vetoed, but it likely will eventually be approved.

## NATIONAL RAMIFICATIONS

Teachers nationwide were elated to see someone resisting the tide of corporate-backed concessions teachers have accepted in recent years, often at the prodding of national Teachers (AFT) officials. The national AFT played a small role in Chicago. A senior staffer sat in on negotiations, but AFT otherwise deferred to the local, lending money and staffers to help with strike logistics. Once the strike started, AFT President Randi Weingarten “didn’t really have much choice,” said Debby Pope, a strike coordinator. Merit pay and evaluations based on student test scores were two national trends that Chicago teachers bucked. Teachers in Pittsburgh took a deal in 2010 that introduced merit pay for new hires and raised the number of years to gain tenure. When Baltimore members nixed a merit-based contract, AFT top brass swooped in to pressure members to change their votes. Weingarten touted the agreement, but earlier this year, an unprecedented majority of Baltimore teachers received unsatisfactory mid-year evaluations, in what teachers say was a deliberate attempt to avoid merit raises.

In the face of these defeats, CTU’s electrifying stand could spark resistance. Los Angeles teachers are now in negotiations over incorporating student test scores into evaluations. Union board member Joe Zeccola said, “One thing is for sure: it emboldened us in negotiations and we’re sticking to our guns more than we were.” After a favorable court decision, Madison teachers are seeking to reopen bargaining immediately. “Boy, is the shoe on the other foot now,” Motoviloff said.

## POLE POSITION

The strike didn’t come out of nowhere: Chicago teachers, energized by the Caucus of Rank and File Educators, have been organizing for years. “To watch the change in the national discourse just in the course of this week, it shows what the power of, first, a small number of people in our caucus and then a large number of people in our union could accomplish,” said Xian Barrett, a history and law teacher. They also built strong parent connections fighting school closures.

*Continued on page 21*

*“Chicago Teachers...” continued*

To cement relationships from school closure fights, the CTU developed a community board composed of neighborhood organizations. During the strike, these partners responded. Albany Park Neighborhood Council organized busloads to attend a 35,000-person rally on the strike’s first day, turned out members to picket lines across the neighborhood, and held a forum on the strike issues. A city-wide youth project organized a protest against high-stakes testing, highlighting how standardized tests misrepresent and punish students and teachers alike.

The Logan Square Neighborhood Association organized a “freedom camp” for out-of-school kids. A week of lessons on Cesar Chavez and Martin Luther King Jr. capped off with parents and students demonstrating in support. Waving handmade signs, the kids performed the civil rights classic “We Shall Not Be Moved” for beaming teachers.

## PARENTS KNOW

Ofelia Sanchez, mother of five, said she knows from her experience as a classroom volunteer that “you can’t teach a class of 40 students. It’s impossible. Students learn at their own pace.” She said she backed the strike because she didn’t want to see her children’s teachers beg for help from parents. Lauren Mikol, a Madison teacher, says other unions would do well to take a page from CTU’s community engagement playbook. “They’re showing the way,” she said. “We have to do the same thing—convince everyone that public schools have to be stood up for.” In Chicago, that fight will soon relaunch. By December the district is expected to announce 80-120 more school closures. “We lit a fire under parents and community groups,” Cavallero said, “and with our support, they can take on that struggle to fight for their neighborhood schools. People realize that this is just the beginning.”

## Harper Faculty Show Solidarity with CTU at Lane Tech

— Photos by Jennifer Bell





## **What We've Learned: Teachers Unions for the 21st Century**

— by Charles Tocci and Melissa Barton

The Chicago Teachers Union strike has been alternately characterized as a long awaited stand by organized labor and a self-serving choice to place teachers' needs above students'. As educators deeply invested in the success of Chicago's schools, we view both of these takes as simplistic and biased. Because teachers have to balance individual students' needs with educational policies and the realities of schools, their knowledge and interests are central education. We argue that teachers unions have played an important role in improving public education in the past, continue to do so in the present, and can do so into the 21st century.

Unions have long served as a much-needed counter-weight to politicians who seek to control our schools. In Chicago, our schools have spent most of the last century at the mercy of one mayor after another. Mayoral control may be a popular, politically efficient set-up, but it has proven time and again to be dangerous for schools and students. Mayors have used the public schools to dole out patronage (Bill Thompson and Edward Kelly), reinforce racial segregation (Richard J. Daley), and cater to middle class families with magnet schools at the expense of the poor (Richard M. Daley). At each of these points, teachers unions offered different visions that formed the foundation for successful public schools: professional standards for teaching, due process protections against arbitrary firing, and advocacy for equitable conditions across schools. Today Chicago's schools showcase the legacy of this contentious history.

The spread of charter schools, on which Mayor Emanuel has staked his battle with the CTU, has had the same mixed results here as elsewhere. Now, CPS plans to close up to 120 public schools and welcome 60 charters, even though a study by Stanford University's Center for Research on Education Outcomes shows 83% of charters perform the same as or worse than comparable neighborhood schools. And this, as analysis from Rutgers professor Bruce D. Baker suggests, is in spite of lower populations of low-income students and students with disabilities. Further, the UCLA Civil Rights Project's report "Choice without Equity" shows that charters increase segregation along racial and class lines.

A central issue in this strike was the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers. Numerous studies, including those by the Economic Policy Institute and the National Education Policy Center, assert that this "value-added modeling" is deeply flawed and unreliable at present due to large margins of error, small sample sizes, and numerous uncontrolled factors. The rush to use test scores despite significant flaws has been compared to IQ testing and minimum-competency testing, which had deeply negative impacts on children and schools. Around these issues, a new age of patronage has emerged: corporations, foundations like the Gates Foundation, and wealthy elites like Penny Pritzker and Bruce Rauner have financed charter school networks, reform organizations, and for-profit programs. Given these stakeholders' role in funding recent campaigns—like the Gates and Broad Foundations' "Strong American Schools" agenda, which poured \$24 million into the 2008 presidential and congressional campaigns—we should be deeply skeptical of their repeated claims to have students' best interests at heart.

*Continued on page 24*

*“What we’ve learned” continued*

This strike has had countless costs for the city of Chicago, not least its \$25 million expenditure on contingency programming and untold losses in productivity for the many parents who took time away from work to be with their children when teachers could not. But the strike has benefited the city as well, with the national attention it has brought to these issues, and the time it has given teachers, clinicians, and support personnel to enter the conversations that have gone on around and about them, but not with them.

Organized teachers provide a vision of public schooling grounded in the daily realities of children, communities, and schools that balance this unequal distribution of power. The fact remains that teachers have great expertise in child development, classroom best practices, and school organization. By contrast, only one of the seven appointed members of the Chicago Public School Board of Education has ever been an educator, and none of the other six has any real experience in the schools where we work. The career development priorities of unions, as reflected in recent contracts, support continued education and professional learning; teachers also innovate in their classrooms by reading and generating research. The only research-based proposal to come out of this recent contract fight came from the Chicago Teachers’ Union, which used its recommendations as a basis to argue against more charters and the start of value-added evaluations.

Unions will still need to fulfill their traditional role of guaranteeing better wages and protecting jobs through the due process guarantees of tenure. Backed by due process, teachers are partners in school improvement and strong advocates for good working conditions that are conducive to learning. But unions need to be granted a say in much more, rather than be gagged by laws dictating which issues merit a work stoppage: on Monday, Mayor Emanuel acted on his threat to file an injunction against the union declaring the strike illegal. Instead of passing laws to avoid the table, Illinois and other states should repeal recent laws limiting the bargaining rights of teachers and other workers and allow the democratic process to unfold through unions. It’s time to remember that the professionals who, in that well-worn cliché, are “on the ground” might know better than politicians how to run our fields.

It’s time to start trusting educators again. Teachers unions of the 21st century can evolve to become the backbone of better schools. Unions should collaborate with districts to put new tools of teaching, such as mobile computing, in all classrooms. But then districts and unions should both step back and allow teachers to experiment and find the best solutions to the problems children face. Teachers unions, as hubs of professional expertise, can cultivate innovation networks to share and refine the best practices of the future. This collaborative power will be enhanced by bringing online and “virtual school” educators into unions. And as we have seen too many smart people leave this profession out of frustration with being disrespected, unions can carve out new career ladders based on peer-certified mastery of key skill-sets: mentor for aspiring and new teachers, master teacher to coach colleagues, online educator, and so on.

All of this takes time, and we have heard over and over again that our most disadvantaged students don’t have it. But we also need to stop treating education as if it is in crisis. The patient is not bleeding out; she has a chronic illness. There is a big difference between doing something—whether to please those demanding something be done, or out of desperation for a solution—and democratically deliberating to find the right thing. It’s time to do the right thing for the children of Chicago and the United States.

*Charles Tocci is a Clinical Assistant Professor in the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago. Melissa Barton is a doctoral candidate at the University of Chicago as well as a teacher and union delegate in the Chicago Public Schools.*



**Center for Multicultural Learning  
2012-2013 Multicultural Faculty Fellowships  
Diversity Curriculum Development Opportunities  
Available for Full Time Faculty!**

**THE PROGRAM**

Three to four positions are available for full-time faculty members to work collaboratively with the Center for Multicultural Learning team to participate in a diversity education training program and to develop diversity curriculum infusion projects. Fellows will work on a project of their choice in their field of expertise. They will have the opportunity to participate in various diversity awareness activities during the 2012-2013 academic year. Furthermore, they will explore ways to integrate multiculturalism and diversity into the content of their courses. The Faculty Fellows, and the Associate Dean of Multicultural Learning will determine time commitment and work schedule based on the project. Each Fellow receives a \$2,000 stipend for the year as well as financial support to attend a diversity curriculum development conference.

**FELLOWSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- 1. Participate in a training retreat on multicultural education and curriculum development.** Dates training retreat for this year to be determined.
  
- 2. Identify a multiculturally oriented research project.** The project must relate to the faculty member's curriculum and focus on ways to infuse an aspect of multiculturalism into the classroom. Project examples include: developing a multicultural teaching resource web site, a course unit or lesson plan and instructional materials that integrate multicultural content, or a new course that incorporates both diversity topics as well as process. Faculty should plan to meet with Laura LaBauve to discuss their project ideas and determine the scope of their project before submitting the application.
  
- 3. Meet on a regular basis with the Associate Dean for Multicultural Learning to discuss project progress.** Projects will be presented to the college-wide community at the end of summer 2013, as part of Faculty Orientation for Fall 2013.
  
- 4. Continuously research the field of multicultural education** and methods for infusing multiculturalism and diversity content and teaching processes into the curriculum.
  
- 5. Participate in a minimum of one student-oriented program offered by the Center for Multicultural Learning,** such as a cultural awareness celebration, "Safe Space Training", a club or organization meeting, or transfer school field trip.
  
- 6. Using the experience gained as a fellow, aide the Center staff in evaluating the program and training for the 2013-2014 Faculty Fellows.**
  
- 7. Attend National Conference on Race and Ethnicity** in May/June 2013 in New Orleans.

**Applications are available from the Center for Multicultural Learning, D142  
For more information, contact  
Laura LaBauve (Associate Dean) Multicultural Learning, ext. 6522.  
Application Deadline – Friday, December 7, 2012**



# Faculty Are Warmly Invited To The Faculty Senate Lunch Friday December 7, 2012

Please return the form below with a check for \$25 payable to Harper College Faculty Senate.  
Mail form and payment to Maria Knuth, AEE, so it arrives before Monday December 3<sup>rd</sup> at noon.

## Westwood Tavern



1385 N. Meacham Rd. \* Schaumburg \* 847-969-9500

 **Buffet Line Scheduled To Open At 12:30 p.m.**   
**Holiday Cheer Will Continue Until 2:30 p.m.**

Lunch Buffet Includes Bruschetta and Spinach & Artichoke Fondue followed by the House Salad.

Entrée Selections Include Black Angus Roast Beef and Herb Roasted Chicken.

Sides Include Oven Roasted Baby Red Potatoes and Grilled Asparagus.

Soft drinks, tea and coffee and dessert are included.

There will be a cash bar on site.

Sadly, there are no refunds.

*of*

-----  
Please send form to Maria Knuth, AEE. Price per person: \$25. Make checks payable to  
Harper College Faculty Senate. Registration and payment must be received  
before Monday, December 3<sup>rd</sup> at noon.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Extension: \_\_\_\_\_ Check # \_\_\_\_\_

