



# THE ADVOCATE



Volume 4 Issue 4

Employee Federation of NHMCCD

January-February 2001



## A Time for Celebration

This semester, the union celebrates its twentieth anniversary of operation. Twelve brave souls began preliminary organizational work in 1980, but we really came together as an organization in the spring of 1981. We are a powerful force in the college recognized as an organization with political influence that advocates effectively on educational and personnel issues, a group that gets things done. We meet and confer regularly with administrative leaders, resolve conflicts, represent employees in disputes, and highlight issues important in the college district in our newsletter. The position we now enjoy has been the result of a slow and often difficult process. Below is an article written by Kevin Bailey, the first AFT president here at the college. Kevin is currently a state representative from District 140. The article appeared in the spring of 1981 in our newsletter, which was titled The Reporter at the time.

## THE REPORTER

Published by the NHCC United Faculty/AFT, Local 4033

P. O. Box 38893, Houston, Texas 77088

President, Kevin Bailey; Vice-President, Alan Hall

The Reporter is designed to provide periodic information on Guild activities.

### THE NHCC-UF LAWSUIT

In March, 1981, the NHCC United Faculty filed a federal lawsuit against Bill Thorne and the Trustees of the College. The suit included a claim for damages as well as a permanent injunction to stop actions by the College against the union and its members. The lawsuit is based upon violations of First Amendment rights of the local membership to associate freely, which have been denied by acts of direct and indirect coercion.

The union maintains that the Board and administration have embarked upon a campaign designed to thwart the efforts of the NHCC-UF and to frighten the faculty so they will not join the union. Mr. Thorne and Board member Hoffman traveled to Florida to a "union-busting" school, and imported a notorious "union-buster", all subsidized with

dollars from the district's taxpayers. The main points in our lawsuit are as follows:

(1) In July, 1980, the Board passed an anti-union policy designed to frighten and intimidate the faculty. This action was followed by a letter from Mr. Thorne to each faculty member expressing his desire, as President of the College, that we not join a union. Then in March, 1981, the Board adopted another anti-union policy to be a part of the official policies of the College, which expressed the Board's desire that faculty not join a union. This latter policy was sent to all faculty members along with their new contracts. The union believes that these actions violate our constitutionally protected right to join any organization, free from threats, harassment, intimidation, or coercion.

(2) The NHCC-UF has been denied on-campus meetings, including a forum with state representative Gene Green. These denials violate our right to use public property and result in unequal treatment, as other organizations are allowed the free use of college property.

(3) The NHCC-UF leadership is not allowed professional leave or expenses for organizational meetings and academic workshops. Yet, TJCTA and Faculty Senate leaders are allowed such leave, even to go to anti-union meetings. This unequal treatment violates union members rights and singles out the NHCC-UF as some kind of "outlaw" group.

(4) Membership in TJCTA and the Faculty Senate is officially encouraged and promoted by the administration and Board at division meetings, by solicitation, adverse comparison, and the circulation of anti-union petitions. These actions violate the union's right of free association by discouraging faculty members from joining the union.

(5) The campus newspaper advisor has been told not to print articles on the union and not to accept union sponsored advertising, while accepting advertising from other businesses. This unequal treatment violates the First Amendment, as well as numerous federal court rulings.

(6) Board of Trustee's member L. B. York directly threatened and intimidated union member Carolyn Davis, during the 1981 Board election.

(7) Union representatives have continually been denied an opportunity to speak before the Board. Yet, other non-union individuals are allowed to address that body. There is not another school or college board in Texas denying teacher organization's rights to appear before that public body, because this is a direct violation of numerous federal court rulings.

(8) Union president Kevin Bailey was told that he cannot speak about the union while on campus and cannot talk to faculty members, in their offices, about the union. Nor can he read union material while on the campus. Bailey was threatened with "disciplinary action" if he violated this edict, and had a negative letter to this effect placed in his personnel file. These actions represent a most serious violation of free speech and reminds one of what happens to people in places like Poland, but isn't supposed to happen in the United States.

In June and July of '1981, six days of hearings were held, in federal court, in a preliminary hearing. Judge Woodrow Seals declined to issue a preliminary injunction against the College, hoping that

these problems could be resolved. However, he also concluded that NHCC faculty members had been intimidated and are afraid.

The NHCC-UF has continually attempted to reach a fair and just out-of-court settlement to resolve these issues. We believe that two reasonable parties can solve serious problems if both are willing to compromise. However, College officials have refused any settlement and instead wish to employ scare tactics and waste taxpayer dollars in the process. We are about to go back into court. It appears that a trial will be necessary. We will keep the faculty informed of the events and the outcome.

**The union lost that lawsuit in federal court, a fact which still astounds us. However, a curious development ensued. The administration began conceding on every point we raised. Had they done so originally, that whole ugly business could have been avoided. We have several generation of administration, and the union is still here. When you look at where there those twelve people began in 1981, it is clear that we have, indeed, come a long way.**

## **BY APPOINTMENT, ANOINTMENT OR APPLICATION?**

The college district has not always done the best job of posting, advertising, and interviewing for positions. Instead, individuals have simply been appointed to open positions which were either existing or new. In various previous Advocates, the union has highlighted these irregularities. The failure to post has resulted in denying qualified employees and individuals outside our system an opportunity to apply. I have discussed the problems, which have typically occurred at the colleges, with college presidents, vice presidents, and Dr. Pickelman and have received assurances that the district will be diligent about posting and advertising. Let me be clear that the union has not objected to the individuals appointed to various positions. In fact, some of them are friends of mine who have a good working relationship with the union. Our quarrel is with the process.

The district is currently experiencing a rash of appointments to unposted, unannounced positions. The difference this time is several of the appointments have been made by the chancellor himself. He has

twice appointed Dr. Ray Hawkins as an interim president, a common practice. However, a Houston Chronicle article (September 13, 2000) discussing the appointment of Dr. Diane Troyer as Cy-Fair College president and Hawkins as interim president at Tomball says of the permanent president of Tomball, "...Hawkins... could be handed the job on a permanent basis if he decides to forgo retirement." In the article, Dr. Pickelman explains the reason for appointing Hawkins as interim was necessitated by his naming of Troyer as permanent president of Cy-Fair, no posting, no advertising, no candidate search. The chancellor defends this move as a result of an exceptional situation (the need to move quickly to build Cy-Fair campus) and as being in the best interest of the college district, a cover phrase for numerous unexplained activities. He correctly maintains that board policy allows him to make such appointments under these circumstances. He also correctly maintains that he has a right to assemble his management team. He does not want "hidden agenda searches" where search processes are a sham because the desired person has already been identified. While we recognize the value of not wasting the time of candidates and screening committees, the union's concern is the frequency of

these appointments and the message it sends.

Prior to Hawkins and Troyer's appointments, Dr. Pickelman made three others. One, the appointment of Dr. David Sam as president of NHC, followed an appropriately extensive search. Before that, the chancellor appointed Dr. Steve Head as Executive Vice Chancellor of Education, Student and Community Development and Dr. Linda Stegall as president of Kingwood. Technically, these were transfers; Head and Stegall simply traded jobs, and Dr. Pickelman maintains there were no vacancies to post.

The union acknowledges the chancellor's prerogative to make such decisions. We also applaud the college's policy of promoting from within whenever we believe the best qualified candidate is internal. However, we believe the practice of simply appointing people should be rare. To make an unannounced appointment, even if it is an internal person, denies other qualified employees the opportunity to apply. On January 11, 2001, Dr. Pickelman fulfilled the Houston Chronicle's prophecy by naming Dr. Hawkins permanent president of Tomball. One has to wonder why Tomball was not afforded the same national

search process as that afforded NHC, the chancellor's email about "overwhelming endorsement of the leadership of the faculty and administrative, professional and support staffs" notwithstanding. If one looks at the seven key appointments recently made by the chancellor, only one was advertised and interviewed. These circumstances lack the ring of rarity. They also send a message to others with hiring authority that such behavior is acceptable. We have already begun to see the trickle down effect. Another interim appointment has been made at Cy-Fair, and others, no doubt, will follow. At the beginning of this semester, Dr. Sam announced six appointments at NHC, some interim, some permanent, all unannounced, unpreviewed by the college as a whole, and a surprise to many employees. Dr. Sam defends the appointments on the basis of meeting some specific needs and solving some personnel issues. There well may be other positions that were unannounced and filled by appointment recently in the district.

Reacting to all of these appointments, a concerned associate remarked to me, "The capricious appointments only occur at the senior administrative levels. Those of us at the lower administrative levels NEVER have the option of appointing someone to a position—we're always told to 'follow college policy for filling open positions.' Is that not a double standard? Does that not raise legal issues?"

Leading by example is a good practice. Our administration should be mindful of the example they set. These appointments may all be excellent, but the process leaves lingering concerns. Generally, folks dislike closed processes which raise suspicions of cronyism. Is it legal? Maybe? Is it within policy? Yes. Is it open and fair? Unequivocally, no.

Alan Hall

## Going the Distance

AFT guidelines for good practice in distance education

Distance education—also known as e-learning, to use the terminology of the moment—is big business. The market for distance education is growing by leaps and bounds, with the "traditional" 18- to 22-year-old college student rapidly becoming the minority. Because the majority of today's students are older and more motivated, seeking training but needing flexibility, education has become "the next big killer application on the Internet," as Cisco Systems CEO John Chambers pithily pointed out last year.

Quite a few for-profit education businesses didn't need Chambers' help in discovering this ready market. Venture capitalists are pouring money into e-learning, realizing \$1 billion in revenues last year alone. These profits will skyrocket to \$11 billion in the next three years, according to the research firm International Data Corporation.

The non-profit higher education world is not waiting for an invitation to join the party. Distance education programs in higher ed grew by 72 percent between 1995 and 1998, the National Center for Education Statistics reported in a survey released at the end of last year, noting that growth in the past two years has probably been even more rapid.

The NCES data show that public two-year and four-year colleges are moving into distance education more quickly than private institutions. In 1997, some 79 percent of the four-years and 72 percent of the two-years were offering the courses.

And, while video and interactive television transmissions were the popular vehicle for distance education in the recent past, the Internet is the way to go today. From earlier modest efforts to

design home pages and get their syllabi posted online, faculty have advanced to more sophisticated interactive modes of instructional design and evaluation. In 1995, NCES reported, only 22 percent of institutions that engaged in distance education were offering asynchronous courses (so-called anytime-anywhere learning) online. Just three years later, that percentage had jumped to 60.

U.S. Department of Education assistant secretary of postsecondary education Lee Fritschler has signaled the department's determination to do more to support institutions that provide distance education. Yet, when NCES released its report, officials expressed a continuing concern for quality control issues.

Quality is also of the utmost importance to the AFT, which last year released "What's the Difference: A Review of the Contemporary Research on the Effectiveness of Distance Learning in Higher Education," an analysis conducted for the union by the Institute for Higher Education Policy. The report was the third major study of the effect of technology on faculty, students and higher education (the studies are available at [www.aft.org](http://www.aft.org)). The AFT report, like the others, states its support for tapping the vast potential of technological innovation while at the same time urging faculty, in their role as academic stewards of our institutions, to exercise caution.

This summer, the accrediting agencies finally announced their intention to take a different approach in evaluating distance education courses than the one they have historically used in assessing traditional classroom learning. The six regional associations said they were working on guidelines that would provide clear standards for distance education programs. Their emphasis would be more on outputs than inputs—i.e., more on student learning than on institutional resources.

This fall, the AFT is releasing a report and recommendations on standards for faculty and their unions to use in shaping distance education policies on their campuses. The report is the byproduct of (1) a survey of AFT faculty members who have taught distance education courses and (2) continuing discussion and analysis of the survey results among AFT leaders and members. The standards, which have been drafted and redrafted through the AFT's higher education program and policy council, were at the heart of the resolution on distance education that delegates passed at the AFT convention last summer (see September AFT On Campus).

It is heartening that the guidelines, which are the result of extended faculty union consideration, are based on premises that the accrediting agencies have also identified as being central. Accreditation of distance education programs will occur only when the programs are the responsibility of faculty, technical support is provided to faculty and students, and assessment and evaluation are well-developed components of the program, according to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (www.wascweb.org).

The AFT guidelines, which are summarized below, have been created to assist faculty members who teach or are preparing to teach distance education courses, as well as higher education locals negotiating distance education issues with management. They also will be useful to college administrators and public officials who want to put quality at the center of their technology programs, as well as to other organizations that are attempting, as is the AFT, to shape new media of instruction in constructive ways.

The guidelines focus primarily on distance education in college credit-bearing degree programs: two-year, four-year and graduate. These standards apply equally to public, private, non-profit and for-profit education providers. In the view of the guidelines' framers, for-

profit providers warrant a higher level of scrutiny because the commercial marketplace creates special incentives to cater to a consumer's desire for ease and convenience rather than academic rigor. However, for-profit enterprises that meet the guidelines of good practice deserve their place at the table.

**The guidelines**

**1. Faculty must retain academic control of distance education courses and programs.**

Decisions about particular courses should be made at the departmental or interdepartmental level, including the decision to award credit for distance courses generated by transfer from another institution or provider. Distance education courses for credit should be taught by faculty appointed and evaluated through the traditional hiring and tenure process, which involves the faculty and the department. Teaching and research faculty, not just "curriculum specialists," must be involved in developing the curriculum.

**2. Faculty must be prepared to meet the special requirements of teaching at a distance. Teaching distance education courses should be a matter of faculty choice.**

Faculty who teach distance education courses must become proficient in the communications technology employed in these courses; faculty should be prepared to spend more time planning the course, and being available (electronically) to students on an extended basis. They also must provide feedback and grades promptly.

In order to handle these responsibilities effectively, faculty must be provided with:

- adequate training and technical support—in terms of hardware, software and troubleshooting;

- additional compensation, in the form of credit toward workload assignments, to meet the extensive time commitments of distance education; and
- positive recognition through the institutional rewards process for the creative work of formulating distance programs.

**3. Course design should be shaped to the potentials of the medium.**

Faculty members developing distance education courses should approach course design—curriculum planning, class projects, visual aids, library materials and student interaction—not in terms of replicating the traditional classroom, but in terms of maximizing the potential of the medium that will be employed.

**4. Students must fully understand course requirements and be prepared to succeed.**

Research shows that particular kinds of students perform better in distance education than other students. All first-time distance education students should be given a clear statement of course expectations in advance. This should include: (1) all course requirements, (2) the weekly time commitment and specific computer skills the course requires and (3) a presentation of the practical difficulties of working at a distance and what is needed to manage those challenges successfully.

Training in advance of the course must be provided to students who have the appropriate equipment but do not know how to use it properly; and advice should be offered to students who have trouble communicating in writing or who are undermotivated.

Students require reliable, extended-time technical support throughout the course. In all course materials, institutions

*no forced time any*

*tech. supp for students*

should specify the nature and extent of technical support to be provided. A telephone number to call for technical support is essential; and this support should be available for as many hours a day as possible.

Because distance education isn't suited to every student, states and localities must ensure that no one is offered distance education as his or her only option for obtaining a college education.

#### 5. Faculty and students must maintain close personal interaction.

To maximize communication electronically, distance learning courses should, to the greatest extent possible, incorporate both:

- real-time electronic interchange through devices such as chat rooms and discussion groups and;
- asynchronous forms of communication such as e-mail and computer bulletin boards.

*on campus activity*  
When feasible, opportunities for same-time ~~same-place~~ interchange between the teacher and student, or among students, should be built into credit courses taught at a distance. Exceptions are in order for homebound or truly isolated students, or in cases where students or professors are not within reasonable travel distance of one another.

#### 6. Class size should be set through normal faculty channels.

This process will ensure that educational, rather than bureaucratic or financial considerations, drive the process. Class size should encourage a high degree of interactivity. Given the time commitment involved in teaching through distance education, smaller class size should be considered, particularly at the inception of a new course.

#### 7. Courses should cover all material.

The amount of material covered in a distance education course, and the depth with which it is covered, should equal that of a classroom-based course.

#### 8. Experimentation with a broad variety of subjects should be encouraged.

There is insufficient evidence to conclude that distance education can be ruled out, a priori, for any particular kind of credit course. On the other hand, institutions should not continue to offer courses that have been unsuccessful. If attrition rates are high or test scores are low, or if the teacher reports disappointing results, the faculty should declare a "time out" during which a careful evaluation is conducted, along with an exploration of successful learning techniques employed elsewhere. If the faculty determines that problems have been overcome, the course can be reinstated.

#### 9. Faculty and librarians must provide research opportunities that are equivalent to those in traditional classrooms.

Opportunities for distance education students to conduct independent course-related research must be substantially the same as the opportunities provided to other students. Distance education students should have access to all possible electronic research material. For any course requiring independent research, distance education students should be expected, if feasible, to visit a campus or public library at least once in order to confer with professional librarians and employ the variety of materials and resources available there. If there is no accessible location where a student can obtain needed hard-copy research, and there is no online source, the college should arrange to get books and materials to students through overnight mail, either for sale or loan.

#### 10. Student assessment should be comparable to that done in traditional classrooms.

The level of achievement expected of students, and tested for in a

distance education environment, should be as challenging as that in a classroom-based course. Differences in electronic and classroom educational techniques may dictate various forms of assessment, or different emphases, but the overall standard of student achievement should be equivalent. Prudent steps should also be taken to limit the possibility of fraud and abuse in a distance education environment. *how do we*

#### 11. Institutions must offer equivalent advisement opportunities.

Academic professionals must take care to offer students pursuing college degrees through distance education many opportunities for individual advising. Same-time same-place advisement should be made available, particularly at key junctures in the student's academic career, but telephone contact is an acceptable alternative.

#### 12. Faculty should retain creative control over the use and reuse of distance education materials.

The issue of intellectual property rights is broad, complicated and still unfolding—in state and federal legislatures, the courts and at the bargaining table. As a general standard, however, - faculty member(s) developing a course should maintain creative control over the use and reuse of the course in subsequent years. Absent such control, students have no guarantee that a course will be of the same caliber as in previous years or that it has been updated to reflect changes in the subject area.

#### 13. Full undergraduate degree programs should include same-time, same-place coursework.

Each institution's faculty should assume responsibility for carefully considering how much coursework a student can appropriately obtain through distance education. The faculty should deliberate at the

campus, department and interdepartment levels, allowing for differences among disciplines and an appropriate amount of experimentation. As a general rule, faculty should consider permitting up to 50 percent of a full undergraduate course of study to be offered at a distance.

Procedures should be established to ensure, on a case by case basis, that a full undergraduate distance education program is available to students truly unable to participate in classroom education at any time, after considering all other options.

A full program taught at a distance may be acceptable at the graduate level and for some certificate programs, as determined by the faculty.

**14. Evaluation of distance coursework should be undertaken at all levels—institutionally, regionally through accreditation and nationally.**

All institutions offering distance education courses should become laboratories of program evaluation. Areas for evaluation should include the characteristics of successful and unsuccessful distance education students, variations among academic disciplines, faculty-student interaction, student performance, and the efficacy of offering large parts or all of an academic program by distance learning.

Regional and specialized accreditation agencies should establish high standards for distance education programs and ensure that these programs are always included in the evaluation of the institutions offering them.

Evaluation of distance education should become a priority concern of the federal government, which immediately should take two steps:

- create a national clearinghouse to share information about successful and

unsuccessful practices, and

- initiate a priority program of targeted research in distance education in the areas outlined above.

Copyright 2000. American Federation of Teachers. Reprinted with permission from the October 2000 issue of AFT On Campus.

## HIGHER EDUCATION LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

The Texas Federation of Teachers, our state affiliate, has released their higher education legislative agenda, including the following:

**PROTECT HEALTH INSURANCE:**  
Block erosion of health-insurance benefits and prevent shifting of health-care costs from the state.

- **RAISE FACULTY PAY:**  
Raise pay for all college faculty, including those at community colleges—and guarantee by law that the raise actually reaches them, as the state did for K-12 teachers in 1999.
- **FULFILL STATE COMMITMENT TO FUND COMMUNITY COLLEGES:**  
Increase state funding for community college instructional costs, as promised in law.
- **RAISE PENSIONS FOR TRS AND ORP MEMBERS:**  
Raise pensions for all employees, with a TRS pension multiplier of at least 2.25 plus cost-of-living adjustments, and restore state Optional Retirement Program contributions to at least their 1995 level (7.31 percent).
- **PROVIDE PAY EQUITY FOR PART-TIME FACULTY:**  
Guarantee pay equity for adjunct faculty (i.e., make their pay proportionate to compensation for full-time faculty).

- **GUARANTEE DUE PROCESS FOR ALL:**  
Provide guarantees of due-process rights for all employees, both faculty and staff.

## CE UPDATE

The December issue of *The Advocate* included an article by union president Alan Hall titled "Follow the Money." In that article, he reported that from 1996 to 1999, NHC returned to the district almost \$1.5 million in surplus funds after covering deficits in C.E. The reported C.E. deficit was based on information provided by the administration.

However, further probing has revealed that the figures in the chart we printed did not include state reimbursement for contact hours. When factoring in this reimbursement, C.E. at NHC was actually in the black. Steve Megregian, North Harris College Vice President of Administrative Services responded to a new information request by the union: "In response to your request for clarification regarding the overall value of CE students to the district, please add the following to the information that was previously supplied to you. For the last (current) biennium, each contact hour was funded at approximately \$4.00 per contact hour. This is a very simple overall calculation, done by dividing the total district contact hours into the total appropriation. The actual state process is more complicated, because every contact hour has a weight, therefore it could be more or less than the average, but for these purposes the average is a very fair representation of the overall value. For the 99-00 year, NHC had approximately 327,000 contact hours of fundable CE. At \$4.00 per contact hour, that computes to over \$1.3 million of state reimbursement in addition to the tuition. Without even attempting to factor in a share of the tax revenue, the CE operation actually did not 'lose' money, they 'made' money when state reimbursement is factored in. In a macro sense the situation with CE is no different than with any other teaching department. Every teaching department needs the state reimbursement to help it cover its total costs and help pay the institutional overhead. Unfortunately,

several years ago the district attempted to look at CE in a different light. We attempted to make CE 'profitable' without considering state reimbursement. In my opinion, and based on my experience in the business, that is not practical and is not likely to work. CE, like all teaching departments, must run efficiently, but cannot be expected to be 'self-funded'. Hopefully as a district I believe we have now moved away from that premise and are now operating from the premise that CE must be carefully managed, but its expectations must be reasonable in light of what is possible.

We assume the same scenario existed in the previous two years. This information is significant in two ways. First, it is good news for C.E.'s reputation. However, it also makes one wonder what happened to that money.

#### Staff

### Are you ready for April 15?

As a special benefit for NHMCCD employees, the NHMCCD Employee Federation would like to help you get prepared to file your 2000 tax return and plan your tax-reduction strategies for 2001 by making the 2001 edition of the *Educator's Tax Guide* available to you. The *Educator's Tax Guide* is a quick and easy way to learn about the special tax savings breaks available to professional educators under the new tax laws. For a limited time, the *Educator's Tax Guide* will be available to all employees for the following rates: Non-union members--\$5 per copy; Union members—FREE. The regular price of the guide is \$16.95, so don't pass up the chance to take advantage of this special benefit provided by your union. If you would like to obtain a copy, please contact Allen Vogt by email or at extension 5583.

### Who is the AFT?

Do you sometimes wonder who the Union is? We are your friends and colleagues, teachers and staff delivering on the mission of the

colleges of NHMCCD. We might be the fellow delivering the mail or the woman in the business office, a colleague in your office suite or maybe the computer technician upgrading your software. To introduce you to some of the folks who serve the AFT, we will present short bios of the executive staff of your AFT over the next few months. For our first bio, please meet Julie Alber, Professor of Speech at Montgomery College.

Julie Alber joined the faculty at Montgomery College in 1996. She had previously worked for the University of Houston-Downtown as an adjunct lecturer for 6 years. Julie received her Bachelor of Arts and her Master of Arts, both in speech communication, from the University of Houston. While in graduate school, Julie developed an interest in conflict management. To further her skills in this area, she completed 40 hours of mediation training at the Dispute Resolution Center in Houston.

In addition to her academic career, Julie is a communication consultant. She has taught communication courses for several law enforcement agencies in Texas. For 9 years, Julie has worked with and instructed classes for the in-service training division of the Houston Police Department. She has developed or assisted in the development of a number of communication classes including conflict strategies, nonverbal communication and human relations. She is also one of the communication instructors for the HPD cadet-training program, PSO training program and the Lieutenant's program. Julie was also asked to instruct a "train the trainer" workshop on conflict strategies for the Department of Justice; U.S. Attorney's Office, Southern District of Texas.

Julie believes in community involvement and is active in her civic association. She is a member of the Public Relations committee that facilitates

communication within the community. In her spare time, Julie enjoys quiet time with her family, long walks with her dog, and traveling. She is looking forward to a trip up the coast of New England this summer.

#### Staff



**Plus AFT is wired—**  
**www.aft.org**

Access the latest AFT news and info at the click of your mouse.

- Thousands of pages of searchable information
- Latest Member Benefits news
- Online discount shopping
- AFT Bookstore

VALID THROUGH 7/01



### CALL FOR ARTICLES

We invite you to send us your opinions, your news, your questions and so forth. The Advocate is a forum for information and free interchange of ideas. Send your articles to Dawn Baxley, Editor, NHC, or e-mail: [dawnb@nhmccd.edu](mailto:dawnb@nhmccd.edu), or submit to any of the following officers: Alan Hall, President, ACAD 217, NHC; Velma Trammell, WNSP 174, NHC; Rich Almstedt, KC; Tim Howard, NHC; Julie Alber, MC; Cris Neuman, NHC; Mary Ella Phelps, TC; Bob Locander, NHC; or Allen Vogt, NHC.

## Life Is Unpredictable... Make Sure Your Family Is Protected

You never know what life will bring. Luckily, as an AFT member, you can rest assured AFT PLUS Insurance Plans will be there for you—no matter what happens. Designed specifically for AFT members and their families, each plan provides complete protection.

- Term Life Plan
- Senior Life Plan
- Disability Income Plan
- Catastrophe Major Medical Plan
- Hospital Income Plan
- Critical Illness Plan
- Accident Plan
- Care Plus Plan
- Long-Term Medical Care Plan
- Short-Term Medical Plan



For details, call **1-800-272-4AFT (4238)**  
or visit our Web site at [www.aftplusinsurance.com](http://www.aftplusinsurance.com).



VALID THROUGH 7/01

### CURRENT DUES

FULL-TIME FACULTY - \$24.55 per month  
 FULL-TIME STAFF - \$17.40    FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF - \$21.00  
 ADJUNCT FACULTY and PART-TIME STAFF - \$14.30

### Join the AFT - Call Alan Hall

The Advocate is a publication of the Employee Federation of North Harris Montgomery Community College District.  
 2700 W. W. Thorne Dr. - Suite A 217 - Houston, TX 77073