

# CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

November 24, 2015

2:30 – 4:30 PM

## MEMBERS PRESENT

---

President	David Laderman
Vice President	Kathleen Sammut
Treasurer	Rosemary Nurre
Secretary (Interim)	Stephanie Roach
Creative Arts/Social Science	Steven Lehigh (Absent)
Creative Arts / Social Science	Michele Titus
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Santiago Perez
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales
Business/Tech	Vincent Li
Physical Education / Athletics	Larry Owens (Absent)
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

## OTHERS ATTENDING

---

Mike Claire, CSM President

Dan Kaplan, AFT

## **I. ORDER OF BUSINESS**

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm

### **1. Approval of the Agenda (November 24, 2015) and Draft Minutes (November 10, 2015)**

#### **Agenda**

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve, Steve Gonzales seconded. All in favor, no abstentions, the agenda was approved.

#### **Minutes:**

Two changes to the minutes offering clarification regarding events and programs, and one correction of a typo was put forward. In the Associated Student President report on page four, it was recommended that clarification be made regarding the sponsorship of the Dia de los Muertos event, which was organized by the Puente Project, in partnership with Associated Students as well as a number of other groups. A wording revision was shared by Jon Kitamura. In the discussion item on the ACCEL program on page five, it was recommended that ASLT be mentioned as the division in which the program resides, so that those seeking information about the program will better know how to find it. One typo, a cut and paste error reading “(Absent)” from the draft minute template was spotted below the date and time of the meeting and will be removed.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the minutes with changes as noted, Steve Gonzalez seconded the motion. All were in favor, with no abstentions. The minutes were approved.

### **2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)**

Maker Tuesday, offered from 2pm-4pm at CSM Library now is offering expanded 3D printing services and workshops due to a partnership with San Mateo County Public Library. Please spread the word among students and faculty that twelve 3D printers will be available at Maker Tuesday events every week.

## **II. INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **1. President's Report**

#### **a. Committee updates (IPC, DPGC, DAS)**

The Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) meeting featured information on the International Education Program update, the Center for Academic Excellence budget proposal, and the Student Equity Report that have also been presented in Academic Senate.

District Academic Senate (DAS) featured information from Jonathan Bissell, Co-Director of the Community Education Program (CEP). It was emphasized that the CEP wants to partner with us, in part to make sure that credit, non-credit, and not

for credit course offerings are strategic. He will be invited to speak at Academic Senate next Spring. It was pointed out that CSM does not currently have non-credit courses, but that some Community Colleges do, and further, that there is sometimes confusion regarding distinguishing between non-credit and not for credit courses, and that sometimes there is duplication in course planning as a result. Coordination with CEP may help with this issue.

David Laderman has agreed to serve as Vice President for DAS; he is unclear on the term of service.

There was discussion at DAS regarding other items as well, including the coming Distance Education Effective Contact policy; the draft Textbook Adoption policy; the timeline and details of the migration to Canvas; and the draft policy for Curriculum Development across the District. Regarding the Textbook Adoption policy, it was noted that currently, there is no policy in place. Regarding the Canvas contract, it is expected that it should not be a problem to include the requested add-ons, but that the District is waiting to get an agreement about this in writing. Regarding the District Curriculum Development policy, a response from Skyline College is still forthcoming.

## **2. ASCSM Update, Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM**

Associated Students arranged an event this past week for students who take evening classes. Associated Students shared food, snacks, and hot chocolate with this population of students who typically do not have the opportunity to take advantage of student events, which are primarily scheduled during the daytime at CSM. The evening students were appreciative.

It was reported that CSM has a lot of student involvement as a result of participation in student clubs. There are approximately 40 student clubs at CSM.

The recent Homecoming event was a success, and appears to be unique among community colleges. The band, cheerleaders, athletes, and others, including CSM President Mike Claire were on hand for the event. There were many staff and administrator supporters. Faculty are encouraged to attend future events. The goal is to increase school spirit on campus.

Additionally, Student Government participated in the recent World Village event put on by the International Student Program.

## **3. Standing Committee Reports**

a. Committee on Instruction, *Teresa Morris, Chair*

No report.

b. Library Advisory Committee, *Stephanie Roach, Co-Chair*

No report.

c. Learning Support Centers Coordination Committee, *Ron Andrade, Co-Chair*

No report.

d. College Assessment Committee, *Madeleine Murphy, Chair*

No report.

e. Center for Academic Excellence Committee, *Theresa Martin, Chair*

David Laderman filled in for Theresa, since he attended the last meeting. The meeting featured discussion about Flex Day Planning, as well as a Proposal Form draft for initiative funding requests. The form will be refined and put forward to the Academic Senate. Additionally, the CAE has presented their budget to IPC.

### **III. ACTION ITEMS**

a. Community Service Scholarship

There was some discussion regarding the hourly requirement of ten hours. It was agreed that the best approach is to go for a low threshold for the minimum level of service, thus leaving it to the scholarship committee to determine the best candidates based on the quality of the service.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the Scholarship as written and Michele Titus seconded the motion. The scholarship was approved, with all in favor and no abstentions.

Excitement about offering the scholarship was expressed.

It was noted that David Laderman will be talking with Mike Claire about creating a college wide scholarship in honor of George Kramm.

b. Math Hiring Committee

Submitted by Charlene Frontiera, who noted that she considered the recent hiring committee diversity statement by the Academic Senate when putting together the committee.

Harry Nishanian (Math)

Robert Hasson (Math)

Melvin Hom (Math)  
Cheryl Gregory (Math)  
Carlene Tonini-Boutacoff (Biology)  
Charlene Frontiera (Dean)

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the committee, and Jacqueline Gamelin seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the committee is approved, with no abstentions.

Discussion ensued about how we can best approve committees when members of Academic Senate may not know the person or persons listed on the committee. It was pointed out that individuals have the option to abstain from voting at anytime. Concern was expressed that Academic Senate avoid the trap of “rubber stamping.” It was pointed out that in the case of the hiring, tenure, and tenure-track committees, the Academic Senate relies on the expertise of the Dean for putting together a strong committee.

### III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Prior to the discussion, it was noted that Steve Lehigh, who was scheduled to speak about faculty workload, is not able to attend. Additionally, David Laderman updated the Senate regarding the follow-up cap and gown discussion. David has reached out to James Peacock at the bookstore, and more information will be forthcoming.

a. CCSF strike fund (Rosemary Nurre & Dan Kaplan)

Rosemary Nurre proposed a letter of support or some other kind of action to demonstrate our support for the challenges faced by faculty at CCSF.

Dan Kaplan provided specific updates regarding the situation at CCSF and the AFT 2121 negotiations. Events have been unfolding rapidly. The faculty is in the midst of a strike vote, which is scheduled to conclude November 30, 2015. If they vote to strike, the strike will occur December 7, 2015. It is extremely likely that there will be a strike. Students are also very focused on the strike and are demonstrating in support of faculty.

The strike would be an unfair labor practice strike, as a result of bad faith bargaining because the District has not provided information requested by the union negotiating team. It is a serious development that is not being taken lightly.

A letter of support would be appreciated. CCSF faculty have taken pay cuts that put them back at 2008 wage levels, and this greatly impacts the ability of faculty to afford to live in San Francisco.

Additional discussion followed regarding other options such as third party mediation, and work to rule. Neither approach seems appropriate given current circumstances.

The Academic Senate has agreed to put forward a statement of support after our next meeting (at the beginning of Spring semester), which will be after a strike, should it occur.

b. Faculty workload

*Overview*

Steve Lehigh had planned to discuss FTEF (full time equivalent faculty) 10 years ago vs. today, but was unable to attend. Of note, Jonh Sewart will be providing further data about FTEF, as well as the ratio to adjunct faculty. Dan Kaplan will discuss information on current committee work across the district. The particular requirement that four (instead of three) full time faculty members must serve on hiring and tenure committees will also be discussed.

It is anticipated that there will be follow-up on the topic through college and district wide surveys. Additionally, with contract negotiations and renewal pending, AFT will solicit information from faculty via a survey in December. Faculty members are encouraged to share their point of view including concerns about workload and other specific issues.

Dan Kaplan emphasized that the discussion of workload equity for FTEF is also closely related to part time faculty. Compensating adjuncts to participate more on campus to lift the burden, and of course include them more in governance, can help.

*Discussion regarding Evaluation Procedures, including number of faculty serving on hiring and tenure committees*

Regarding the specific requirements for number of faculty required on hiring and tenure committees, it was noted that a diverse committee representing various stakeholders collaborated on the effort to revise *Appendix G: Evaluation Procedures* in the current contract, and that faculty voted overwhelmingly in favor of the revisions.

Discussion followed regarding this process, and resulting issues. It is apparent that many people have not read Appendix G, despite the strong support of the revisions in the vote. Contributing factors likely include that the accreditation timeline put pressure on faculty to approve, and that the committee went over schedule as a result of careful deliberations. It was noted that some feedback from faculty in departments such as counseling, the Library, and others was not reflected in the final document. Formatting of evaluation forms was a specific issue.

It was acknowledged that the committee worked hard on the revision, and that the point now is to improve on their work. Now is the ideal time to make comments regarding Appendix G. The upcoming survey from AFT is a way to do this.

*Discussion regarding district wide levels of faculty engagement on current committees*

Dan Kaplan noted that what has been known as the Workload Reduction Campaign is instead to be called the Faculty Workload Equity Campaign, in order to better reflect the purpose of the campaign.

Currently, information is available from College of San Mateo and Cañada College only. Information from Skyline College is still forthcoming. Data collected and provided by each college is slightly different, and reflects the difference in size of the two colleges. In general, the percentage of faculty members serving on committees is low. Of note, CSM has many more committees than Cañada College, however the smaller size of Cañada may mean there is a campus culture that expects and thus encourages contributions to committees.

Of note, the data provided below does not include hiring and other department level work or committee service. Additional data should be attained. Also of note, search committees and number of required faculty to participate fluctuates year by year.

At College of San Mateo, PRIE data indicates that 47% of full time faculty members participate on committees. However, not all of these committees are regularly active. The data indicates that 15% of faculty members at CSM serve on committees that meet regularly. Thus, at CSM, a significant number of faculty members are not doing committee work at the College-wide level.

At Cañada College, there are 27 standing committees (including some district level committees). Most committees, 95%, are filled by full time faculty. The remaining 5% of committee makeup is from adjunct faculty, who are not compensated for their work on committees. 67% of faculty members serve on at least one committee, while 53% of faculty members serve on two or more committees. At Cañada College, many faculty members do not serve on campus wide committees, though there is a higher level of service than at CSM. The smaller size of the school may help motivate higher rates of participation.

Discussion followed regarding how to motivate faculty who are not already serving on committees, including whether linking committee service to performance evaluations would be appropriate and effective. It was emphasized that the work must be required and enforceable, not optional. It was noted that this would be within a Dean's jurisdiction. Additionally, Deans would have a good perspective regarding balancing the workload through assignment of committee work.

Dan concluded by emphasizing the importance of resolving the workload issue at the negotiating table through inclusion of specific language that is enforceable. Workload language has not often been successfully added to contracts. However, there are exceptions. Examples of contractual language from other California community colleges was shared. At this point, AFT has not proposed or agreed on any specific language. Specific approaches might include contractual language specifying that all faculty are required to contribute a specific number of hours or that additional compensation be guaranteed for specific activities such as SLO development.

One example of an approach that might be taken is wording such as the following:

*Faculty are obligated to participate, in addition to classroom time, approximately five hours per week on average on activities including hiring and other specific committees, internal and external organizations, and SLOs.*

Another example of an approach that might be taken is wording such as the following:

*Faculty who participate in SLO development shall be entitled to additional compensation. If no full time faculty members participate, the unit member gets a flat rate of \$500 per course; where full time faculty members participate, the flat rate is \$300 per course.*

These examples point us in a direction we can go to help workload equity efforts. Some sort of language like this will likely be put forward in the next round of contract negotiations.

Discussion followed about the genesis of the five hour number, which seemed low to many. This number is specific to a particular college and it may or may not be a comparable figure that meets our needs. Additionally, this is the number that was negotiated at that college—the initial proposal was for more than five hours. However, it was noted that if all full time faculty were to add a small number of hours in committee service, it could provide relief for those faculty members who are currently “over-participating.” It was pointed out that if we use this approach, the number of hours proposed should not be arbitrary, the number should be calculated quantitatively to best meet our specific needs.

Concern was expressed about several issues including:

- The challenge of approving language with specific time contributions laid out because it will add more work for a majority of faculty who are not currently participating.
- Self-reporting of time served or other methods for tracking committee participation
- The relationship between participation and the need for full time faculty to work overload schedules;
- The need to weigh personal issues and quality of life against the benefit of compensation for additional committee work;
- The need to have committee members be a good match for the type of work required by the committee;
- The need for members to add value to the committee, and to be willing to contribute quality work;
- Differentiation between requirements for tenured and tenure track faculty who are often discouraged from participating on committees
- All committees are not created equal in terms of time required, some committees have a much larger time commitment

For the time being, we should focus on aspects of the issue that we have control over, and thus can change. Language in the contract should be pursued, and we should continue to discuss it.



Mike Claire emphasized that he appreciates the work that is done by the faculty. He has been there, and knows it can feel like you aren't doing anything well as a result of having a heavy workload. He believes the trick is to see more rotation among committee members. He discussed approaches and issues, including the following:

1. Reviewing the committee structure of core committees such as IPC, Distance Ed, DIAG, and Technology
2. The importance of faculty rotation so that diverse voices are heard and the same individuals aren't overburdened
3. The potential for funding sources to help
4. The total number of full time faculty and the potential for hiring more faculty

Over the long haul Mike Claire emphasized that he is not opposed to hiring more faculty. However, we must bear in mind that the number of students and faculty members has been declining. David Laderman shared some numbers he got from John Sewart. Ratios of faculty to students over time are:

- Fall 2006: 232 FTEF, and 3576 FTES
- Fall 2014: 189 FTEF, and 3277 FTES

Financial realities include the following:

- The shift to basic aid status helps us with fiscal stability
- There is concern that there will not be enough in Fund 1 to meet our operational needs regularly, as funding from property taxes shifts over time
- There is a risk to shifting to a different revenue source, as over the long term, the Student Success and Support Program (3SP) and Student Equity dollars may not be available

The increase of international students and income from rentals were also named as CSM funding sources to consider and balance.

For the time being, it seems likely that the property tax base will continue to increase, but when it does decline, we don't want to be set up to go into the red. Caution is needed because of this worry about the potential non-continuance of 3SP and Student Equity dollars.

At this point, Mike Claire noted that we can hold the line with faculty hiring—matching the number of retirements with the number of new hires, but we can't yet add more faculty members here and there. We aren't at our target load of 525. With 485, the district won't be able to provide additional resources. When it comes to district resources, we also have to bear in mind how we compare to the other colleges.

In conclusion, given that an increase in the total number of full time faculty members isn't expected soon, it was generally agreed that Academic Senate should focus on contract language, adjunct compensation and adjunct participation as ways to address workload equity. Additionally, it was agreed that the flexibility to have a range of 3-5 faculty members for hiring and tenure committees, instead of the

prescribed 4 members, would help. A separate issue to discuss is whether the Dean should be a voting member on these committees.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, December 8, 2015.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman