



# FUSE UPDATE

FEDERATION OF UNITED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 1212, LIUNA  
5000 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677

September 2006

## Business Manager's Update

By: Sue Keller

Welcome back!

We have returned from summer and have returned to the table. The District and FUSE met for a retreat on August 30, 2006 to discuss negotiation processes for the coming year. The meeting was attended by the district negotiators: Kaylene Hallberg; Jon Hamblen, Jeanne Leland, Deb Sutphen and Ron Martinez, Chief Negotiator. Your FUSE negotiators are Eunis Benecke, Jeff Lloyd, Rick McMurtry, Gerri Snell and Sue Keller, Chief Negotiator.

The meeting went well. We will have another planning meeting September 6 and on September 13 both sides will present their sunshine lists. The sunshine list will be distributed as soon as it is agreed upon with combined interest by FUSE and the District. We have compiled our list using the old sunshine list as well as the survey results from last winter.

The teams worked well together and we look forward to a very successful year dedicating our time and energy to updating/rewriting our contract which will expire in June 07.

Now on to the COLA, "buckets", money, compensation, whatever you like to call it... Omniparty has met and it appears that we will be getting a 7ish percent COLA this year (as long as SB361 is signed by the Governor). We are hoping to have everything in place for an implementation date of October 31<sup>st</sup>. The formula has proven to serve us all well.

I hope you all have a good semester and we will keep you posted on our progress at the table and Omniparty.

Have a great semester!

## A Note from the President

By: Rick McMurtry

The week of July 16, I attended Collective Bargaining Training in Maryland. This training was put on by LIUNA's Public Employee Department (PED).

For six days I was in a room with other Laborers' learning how to bargain contracts and how to work with the employer when sitting across the table from them. The training began at 7 or 8 a.m. in the morning and lasted until 9 or 10 p.m. at night. Sometimes we even went later than 10 p.m. During the training you are split into two bargaining groups (two union and two management) and you sit down in your group and try and negotiate the best contract for your members. I was fortunate to participate in a union group and was able to play the actual role as a union negotiator.

This training allowed me to meet other Laborers' and build friendships that will last past my term. I also came back to Sierra ready to join our negotiations team and try and negotiate the best contract for you.

I look forward to sitting at our table and bringing forward your interests and working with our negotiation's team and the District's team to get you, the members, the best contract possible.

Contact Your Union Representative:  
(916) 781-0512

**Rick McMurtry**, President  
X 3036 or rmcumrtry@sierracollege.edu

**Thor Tivol**, Vice President  
X 2835 or ttivol@sierracollege.edu

**Ruth Echavarría**, Recording Secretary  
X 6245 or rechavarría@sierracollege.edu

**Diana Kenton**, Secretary-Treasurer  
X 2914 or dkenton@sierracollege.edu

**Sue Keller**, Business Manager  
X 2988 or skeller@sierracollege.edu

**Joe Malfa**, E-Board Member  
X 6013/5310 or jmalfa@sierracollege.edu

**Elaine Sturgell**, E-Board Member  
X 2818 or esturgell@sierracollege.edu


**Steve Clarkson**, Sergeant-At-Arms  
X 2490 or sclarkson@sierracollege.edu



---

# SB 361 (Scott)/Community Colleges Funding Formula Reform

California Community Colleges System Office  
April 2006




A comprehensive reform to the formulas that allocate general-purpose apportionments to the 72 districts, based on extensive work by a group of chief financial officers from 12 of the districts, and further work by the Systems Office and Consultation with college representatives around the state.


Replaces an overly complex and outdated formula with one that is more transparent and equitable.

Specifically, the bill:

- ◆ Provides a more comprehensive form of equalization that recognized the fixed costs of operating individual colleges and centers, and is fairer to the smaller colleges. Once these fixed costs are met, the formula provides that all districts will be at or above the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of funding per credit full-time equivalent student. (Current law has the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile feature, but lacks the provision for fixed costs.)
  - ◆ Improves the calculation of district-specified enrollment growth caps. Introduces local unemployment rates as a factor, adjusts caps that are persistently below real enrollment demand, and provides for long-range "smoothing" of erratic year-to-year changes in enrollment.
  - ◆ Helps state meet the growing crisis of young people lacking basic academic skills, by funding selected noncredit courses of compelling state need at the state-supported rate for credit courses. These courses, recommended by a task force of chief instructional officers and members of the academic senate, address high-need areas such as basic skills, high school equivalency, short-term occupational training, and English-as-a-second Language (ESL).
  - ◆ Addresses demographic and financial challenges of colleges serving rural areas of the state, by providing a targeted institutional "rural access grant."
  - ◆ Restores prior law that provided a gradual reduction of funding over a three-year period when districts decline enrollment. This use of existing funds in the Community Colleges bas would give those districts the ability to "re-tool" their curriculum to meet changing local needs and "turn around" the enrollment decline.
- Estimated annual costs over 2006-07 Governor's Budget. Most of these costs would occur in 2007-08 or later, and would depend on Legislature's and Governor's decisions in annual budget acts.
- ◆ \$31 million for added costs of a more comprehensive form of equalization. (Current law calls for \$28 million above the Governor's Budget. Thus, cost of Community Colleges proposal above current law is only \$3 million.)
  - ◆ \$120 million for improved per-student funding of selected noncredit programs
  - ◆ \$96 million for restoration of COLA that was not provided in 2003-04. (Under current law, K-12 already is receiving restoration of same foregone COLA.)
  - ◆ \$48 million for annual 1% augmentation for operational and institutional needs.
  - ◆ \$50 million to increase district growth caps to include as factors (1) local unemployment and (2) persistent over-cap enrollment.
  - ◆ \$40 million to assure that funds budgeted for enrollment growth are based on the sum of annual district growth caps.
  - ◆ \$20 million for a "banking mechanism that compensates districts on a going-forward basis for prior-year deficits in appropriated enrollment growth.
  - ◆ \$5 million for annual "rural access grant" of \$50,000 per qualifying college.
- Total estimated cost is roughly \$410 million, with most costs deferred to future. ***The bill itself does not require the appropriation of additional funds. The amount that the Legislature and Governor with appropriate would be determined in the annual state budget process.*** It is the intent of the System to request, through the annual budget process, these additional funds in a phased basis over the next several years. It is expected that natural growth in the Proposition 98 guarantee, combined with a gradually rising percentage share for the community colleges that is justified by higher enrollment growth in the colleges, would accommodate the phase-in of additional funds.
- The passage of SB 361 would mean an additional \$3.7 million dollars for Sierra College.



---






---

## SB 840 California Health Insurance Reliability Act

## For your convenience: *Sierra College Stewards*



Summary: Creates the California Health Insurance System, a single payer health care system, administered by the California Health Insurance Agency, to provide health insurance coverage to all California residents. Specifically this bill:

1. Creates the California Health Insurance System (CHIS), administered by the California Health Insurance Agency (Agency), a new state program to provide health insurance coverage to all California residents.
2. Requires the Agency to be independent, generally not subject to review by any other agency, and under the control of a new Health Insurance Commissioner (Commissioner). Designates the Agency as the single state agency with full power to supervise every phase of the administration of CHIS.
3. Prohibits any health care service plan or health insurance policy, except for CHIS, from being sold in California for services provide by CHIS.

If you have any questions about SB 840 or have any concerns about health care, please contact your classified representatives on the Health Benefits Sub-Committee: Sonni Cooper-ext. 2727 or John Lervold-ext. 2415.

Sandra Anderson Evening Shift	Ext. 2416
Joan Basque A & J Buildings, Winstead and Student Services	Ext. 2775
Chris Benn Division Offices/Instructional Staff	Ext. 2535
Steve Clarkson Plant Ops, Gym, Police Services, Personnel, Theatre	Ext. 2679
Jennifer Dupuis Learning Resource Center	Ext. 2696
Ruth Echavarria Roseville Gateway, Community Ed, SBDC	Ext. 6245
Sue Keller Tahoe Truckee	Ext. 2512/2988
Diana Kenton M & Mt Buildings	Ext. 2914
Joe Malfa Nevada County Campus	Ext. 6013/5310
Rick McMurtry Plant Ops, Gym, Police Services, Personnel, Theatre	Ext. 3036
Melinda Thomas Nevada County Campus	Ext. 5297/6012

---

## Fewer Middle Income Neighborhoods

A new study conducted by the Brookings Institute suggests even further erosion of American's Middle Class. The gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" grows ever wider as the middle-class becomes non-existent.

LIUNE Women's Caucus Newsletter  
2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2006

In new evidence that the once flourishing American middle class is rapidly shrinking, a study by the Brooklyn Institution shows that middle-income neighborhoods across the country are giving way to neighborhoods that are either more rich or more poor.

As reported by the Washington Post, the study found that "as a share of all urban and suburban neighborhoods, middle-income neighborhoods in the nation's 100 largest metro areas have declined from 58 percent in 1970 to 41 percent in 2000."


The findings suggest that income inequality is far outpacing the decline in the percentage of middle-income families living in and around cities. That proportion fell seven points in the same 30-year period.

"We are increasingly being bifurcated on an economic basis," said Paul Ong, a professor at the University of California at Los Angeles, who commented on the report. "It has taken a big chunk out of the middle."

Los Angeles saw a 10 percent increase in the share of poor neighborhoods, a 14 percent increase in the share of rich neighborhoods – and a 24 percent decline in middle-income residential areas.

In the Midwest and Northeast, overbuilding of homes is part of the reason. Those with the financial means are able to move to newer, larger, pricier homes, leaving cities and close-in suburbs behind. In greater Indianapolis, for example, the population grew by only 3,000, but more than 27,000 new homes were constructed from 2000 to 2004.

Ironically, on the West Coast, the opposite phenomenon – undersupply of housing - contributes to the decline in middle-income neighborhoods, said the study. Prices skyrocket due to intense competition among a burgeoning population, and lower-income residents are pushed out, making mixed-income neighborhoods affluent ones.



---