

## Calendar Committee Questions During Public Comment (at Calendar Committee Mtg of 9/27/12)

Hello, my name is Danny Hamman and I teach and coordinate the LAC at the CEC.

First, I want to thank the calendar committee for listening to input from others. Second, I want to thank all of you for all your hard work, effort and hundreds of hours you have put in over the past year to develop the current calendar which includes a Winter Intersession.

I have a few questions that I hope the committee will consider. I will highlight a few of them here but I will leave the others for you in writing. I also have a few comments to make and a final request.

As for the questions...

- Has the Chancellor's Office been notified of a change in our calendar? If so who communicated with them? What was communicated? When was this communicated?
- What is the significance of October 1? Who decided that Oct. 1 is the Date of Operational Necessity? When was this decided? How was this decided? Why was this date established as the Date of Operational Necessity?

As for the comments...

- At the BOT Meeting 8/29/12 the Board and the Public were told the “Board has the obligation to continue to negotiate in good faith with the collective bargaining representatives the impacts on the terms and conditions of the “work” calendar on employees.”
- If the “tentative student calendar” is truly tentative and the “terms and conditions” of the “Work” Calendar include whether or not there is a Winter Intersession and its dates, why does the [PCC] web site and the literature distributed immediately after the Board vote on 8/29/12 state that classes will begin January 7 and that the negotiations are not about whether there will be a Winter Intersession? Where is the negotiation? Where is the good faith?

On March 7, 2012 the Board voted to follow their previously stated principle of not exceeding state funding for classes by more than 2%. The Board did not vote to cancel classes in Winter Intersession or Cancel Winter Intersession. The administration decided how the state funded 4,777 sections would be allocated creating the false choice of a Winter Intersession without classes (Because they did not allocate any sections to Winter Intersession) or cancelling Winter Intersession.

The FA's position is that the calendar is tentative because it has not been negotiated. From a legal perspective, it has to be signed off on to be an approved calendar. It has not been approved by the FA, so if it goes forward, it will be an imposed calendar, a breach of our contract and an unfair labor practice.

Most importantly the imposition of this proposed "tentative student calendar" constitutes a violation and blatant disregard of shared governance, and all the hard work you put in over the past year to develop our current calendar which includes a Winter Intersession. We respect your long hours of hard work and if at some point, through the shared governance process, you decide that our calendar needs to be changed in the best interest of our students we would be more than happy to listen and consider those changes.

This committee's discussions today or in the future regarding any aspect of the imposition of the proposed "Tentative Student Calendar" does not change any of this.

Therefore, I would strongly suggest that this committee, if it deems appropriate, make and pass a motion stating that it opposes the “tentative student calendar” and sees the imposition of this proposed “tentative student calendar” as blatant disregard of shared governance in general, and this committee’s hard work over the past year specifically. In addition, I would add that any discussion by this committee regarding its imposition does not suggest and should not be considered tacit approval by the Calendar Committee. Thank you again for all your hard work and for taking the time to listen and consider these comments.

The tricky part is that it can appear that the imposed calendar is going through a shared governance process today simply if the committee simply works on it. Rocha has already used that tactic with the Board. There is the implication or perception that we have tacitly accepted or tacitly approved a calendar that is being imposed. By getting us to discuss the tentative calendar, Rocha and Bell can say it went through committee.

So, my concern is to establish very clearly that we do not accept or approve this calendar, even if the district imposes it. Setting dates is a whole different matter.