

CSM ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNING COUNCIL MINUTES

April 26, 2016

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
Creative Arts/Social Science	Michele Titus (Absent)
Language Arts	Jon Kitamura (Absent)
Language Arts	Kathleen Steele
Library	Stephanie Roach
Math/Science	Beth LaRochelle (Absent)
Math/Science	Wendy Whyte
Business/Tech	Steve Gonzales
Business/Tech	Vincent Li (Absent)
Kinesiology/Athletics/Dance	Mikel Schmidt
Student Services	Jacqueline Gamelin

OTHERS ATTENDING

Sennai Kaffl, President, Associated Students
Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, DAS president candidate
Laura Demsetz, Dean, Creative Arts/Social Science
Charlene Frontiera, Dean, Math/Science
Dan Kaplan, AFT
Monica Malamud, Cañada College, AFT Negotiating Team
Teeka James, AFT, English

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

David Laderman called the meeting to order at 2:33 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda (April 26, 2016) and Draft Minutes (March 22, 2016 and April 12, 2016)

Agenda:

Add a short, five minute discussion item regarding issues with the recent lockdown drill.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the agenda with changes as noted and Jacqueline Gamelin seconded her motion. All voted in favor and the agenda was approved with changes as noted.

Minutes:

March 22, 2016

The revised minutes from March 22, 2016 were amended to reflect that Theresa Martin was present at the meeting.

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the revised minutes with changes as noted and Jacqueline Gamelin seconded her motion. All voted in favor and the minutes were approved with changes as noted.

April 12, 2016

Rosemary Nurre moved to approve the minutes from April 12, 2016 and Kathleen Steele seconded her motion. All voted in favor and the minutes were approved.

2. Public Comment (2 minutes per)

Several upcoming events and meetings were announced.

- Friday, April 29: Nullifying micro-aggressions via micro-appreciations workshop, 12:30–3:00 pm. Co-sponsored by DIAG, CAE, and BSI.
- Thursday, May 5: SMCCD 25 year service celebration will be at CSM from 3:00-5:00 pm
- Wednesday, May 11: AFT meeting in College Heights, will spend some time focusing on corporate and community education. 2:30-5:00 pm. Academic Senate members are encouraged to attend this meeting.
- Wednesday, May 11: Board of Trustees meeting will feature presentations about workload equity. Faculty members are encouraged to attend in order to support colleagues presenting about the issue. 6:00 pm
- Thursday, May 12: 3:00-6:00 pm, Adjunct faculty appreciation event.
- Saturday, May 14, EPIC Symposium about internationalizing curricula at community colleges will be held at Stanford. The symposium features CSM faculty Stephanie Roach, Tania Beliz, Michele Titus, and John Stover. Registration is free, and is now open.

- Tuesday, May 31-Saturday, June 4: National Conference on Race and Ethnicity (NCORE) will be held in San Francisco. Contact Theresa Martin or Henry Villareal for details.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. President's Report

David Laderman provided a quick update about funding for specific new positions. The new Student Equity Director is *not* Fund 1 supported, it is paid for out of the equity funds that are received from the State. Additionally, a workforce coordinator is being hired for CSM, also with state funds. Finally, a Year One coordinator is being hired for CSM and is also being paid for using state funds. These positions are designated as temporary, because they are grant funded, although ideally funding will become available to continue support of these positions. It is important to bear in mind that funding for State and grant funded positions do have the potential to dry up as conditions change.

A quick note regarding campus security: Quick lock doors will be installed at CSM this summer.

a. Welcome to Erica Reynolds, Instructional Technologist

The Academic Senate extends a warm welcome to Erica Reynolds, CSM's new Instructional Technologist. Her office is located in the Center for Academic Excellence. She will support faculty and staff with Canvas, instructional design, educational technology, and more. Her background is in instructional design in the K-12 environment. She has a Masters degree in Arts & Education with a concentration in Instructional Technologies from San Francisco State University, and is herself a life-long learner with a personal connection to our community colleges. Her hours are Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 8:00 am-4:30 pm; and Tuesday and Thursday from 10:00 am-6:30 pm.

b. Introducing Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, DAS president candidate

Leigh Anne Shaw teaches ESL at Skyline College and is running for District Academic Senate President. She emphasized that she has always wanted the opportunity to visit each college in order to see how each Governing Council approaches best serving the faculty. Leigh Anne served as Senate President at Skyline from 2012-14. She also is involved with Academic Senate at the state level. She wants to connect the work done at the state level to our district. She recently attended the 2016 Spring Plenary Session. Of note, a strong resolution by the ASCCC was made in response to the Board of Governors Taskforce on Workforce, Job Creation, and a

Strong Economy which recommended delivery of funds to an oversight committee rather than directly to college districts receiving funding. ASCCC wishes to avoid the oversight of a committee so that colleges can best serve the needs of their students. Additionally, Z-Degrees were discussed a Plenary. Z-Degrees feature degree paths with zero costs for text books. Zero cost texts can help with issues of student equity.

- c. Hiring Committee for Dean of Counseling position hiring committee, faculty appointments

David was contacted regarding faculty appointments for the Dean of Counseling position Hiring Committee. He gave support for the two faculty appointments: Lorena Gonzalez, and Brett Pollack. Jan Roecks is chairing the committee. There will be two faculty members, two staff members, and two Deans on the committee. Additional committee members include Mike Mitchell, Helia Ying, and Laura Demsetz. If there are questions about the committee, please send them to David.

- d. Proposed amendments: constitution and bylaws

The purpose of the proposed amendments is to align the constitutions and bylaws of the three district colleges so that they match the language found in the constitution and bylaws of the ASCCC. The document would be divided into two primary parts: the first part would be the constitution, and the second part would be the bylaws. Articles in our current documentation would need to be renumbered to accommodate these organizational changes. This type of change will need to go to an all faculty ballot vote.

Of note, the documents at each college are not required to be identical, but it is desirable for their structure to be similar.

A question was raised regarding Article IV and election of terms for council members. The language should allow for some flexibility regarding terms so that members are accommodated.

The question regarding the type of Senate body, Senate of the whole versus a representative Senate body, should be addressed separately. A discussion about this issue can follow in the Fall.

2. ASCSM Update, Sennai Kaffl, President, ASCSM

- The Spring Fling event is now ongoing in an effort to raise campus spirit.
- There will be a district wide student government mixer on May 6, which will allow students representing each of the three campuses to get to know one another.
- The Scholarship awards ceremony is scheduled for May 6.

- The Washington D.C. trip was a success. Participants met with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo of California's 18th Congressional District regarding support for the following specific bills: Climate Change Education Act, Veteran STEM Education Act, and the All Year Access Act. Congresswoman Eshoo has agreed to co-sponsor these bills.
- Dennis Zhang from Skyline was selected as the Student Trustee for the District.

3. Standing Committee Reports

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

No report.

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

The Library Advisory Committee has decided to put out a brief survey about use patterns of Library Services.

A brief discussion about communication of library services followed, in which the suggestion to place links to core Library resources in WebAccess / Canvas and other sites such as WebSmart that are regularly accessed by students, staff, and faculty. Although all Library resources are available via the Library website, it will help to "advertise" core services and resources by putting the links additional locations.

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

Expect a report next meeting.

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

CAE's three year plan was presented to IPC on Friday where it was very well received.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Lockdown drill

A number of issues regarding the recent lockdown drill were discussed. Concern about what would occur in a real emergency situation was expressed.

- Issues related to communication about drills included: Adjunct faculty in particular experience issues regarding advance communication about drills, the Library reported that no library representatives from the Safety Committee were on hand in the Library for the drill itself, which meant there was a last minute scramble to notify students about and prepare for the drill.
- Issues related to the alerts system for the duration of a drill or real emergency included:
 - There were many reports of specific offices, classrooms, and other spaces in which the emergency announcement system was not clearly audible or was not audible.

- Announcement systems don't seem to alert students and others as to the type of emergency, and thus the type of action to take might be unclear. Should we hide or evacuate, for example, in a real emergency?
- Are there different alert signals (a sound or light signal from the emergency system or carillon) that could inform us about the specific nature of the emergency and/or appropriate actions to take? Perhaps a code could be in place where 1, 2, or 3 "alert signal beeps" could indicate the appropriate action to take. A key could be posted in each room. Evacuation routes/maps should be posted.
- There were reports that some faculty members did not participate in the drill, and continued to lecture rather than practice an emergency response.

Solutions should be as low tech as possible to avoid failure in the event of an actual emergency. Overall it is felt that drills do help, as students do participate. The Senate would like to invite the new Public Safety team to one of our early Fall meetings.

- b. Workload equity and contract negotiations (Dan Kaplan, Teeka James)
 [Deans Charlene Frontiera and Laura Demsetz voluntarily left the meeting at this point.]

David Laderman opened the conversation by introducing some specific issues related to workload equity and contract negotiations:

At this point in the process, are points that are in contract negotiation still changeable based on faculty feedback?

Faculty can still weigh in on proposals, but new proposals can't be made at this time.

How many full time faculty need to serve on the tenure committees? There may not be enough of us to do this work without adding an untenable workload for tenure committee members.

Teeka James responded that one of the important issues regarding the number of faculty member serving on tenure committees is tie breaking. The odd number, five is important as part of this function.

It's too late to address this topic for the current round of negotiations.

Virtual work and workload

The District is not interested in allowing virtual work to count as part of regular workload. They want to enforce 4 days a week on physical campus. There has been a request from the negotiating team that faculty members provide feedback on how they feel about this issue.

In order for service to be more equitably distributed across entire faculty, please discuss the suggestion in which faculty must have performed service prior to banking units or teaching overload.

There is a question about limiting the ability to teach overload. Language about overload in the Education Code may be in conflict with this approach. This will be further investigated.

The proposal put forward as part of negotiations is a five point system for contributing service. Once five points have been met, faculty would be compensated for additional service. Specific language is to the effect of “full-time faculty who exceed 5 points will be compensated for the corresponding number of hours at the special rate of the Regular Faculty Overload Schedule.” Some faculty have expressed that they would like release time instead of pay at the special rate. Perhaps load equivalent language can accommodate this.

The tiers for the proposal were initially different. It is recognized that each school and department may have different needs and priorities, but the hope is that this approach will meet the needs of as many as possible. Past AFT survey data was taken into account when putting together the proposal. Accountability for this system would be in the Dean’s evaluation, which could easily be quantified according to the point system.

Discussion about the proposal covered several aspects related to the proposal. Initial discussion featured the following points: the point system should not be attached to overload in order to reduce pressure on Deans; it should ensure equity for adjunct faculty; the salary schedule indicates that the current system allows for individual faculty members who teach overload, but do not perform service, to earn significantly more than some faculty members who do a lot of committee work or other service.

There was particular concern about workload for small departments, including one person departments. There may not be others to pick up points of service that would ease their workload. However, they will get compensated for doing the additional service under this proposal. Accountability is key. If people aren’t penalized for not participating, then the same people will do the same amount of work, which doesn’t really address the workload issue for those individuals who are overburdened already. The issue is more about time than pay in many cases. But, time is money (if a faculty member gets release time, then adjunct are paid).

Clarification about how the is process reported and calculated was requested. It was pointed out that implementation of the proposal is not negotiated as part of the contract. Staffing will be required to get it done, and needs to be considered if the proposal is successfully negotiated. There are mechanisms in place that track some pieces already. These proposals are competitive and may pit faculty against faculty. If it is in the contract, this will help deal with many issues at once. Faculty will not be responsible for keeping other faculty accountable.

Some similar classes are worth different units on different campuses, which might influence decisions on where to accept teaching assignments. This was identified primarily as a curriculum committee issue, rather than a workload issue.

Is it realistic to expect that negotiations will bring us additional funds or release/reassigned time for those who perform service beyond the five points?

There seems to be a fear response about the result of added costs to pay for this program. It is important to bear in mind that it is possible that the fears won't be realized, and that this will work.

It was pointed out that this might be a reality check about what kind of institution we want to run. Quality costs money. However, the money is there. AFT needs to know how much sympathy faculty members have for this kind of proposal. They have started a petition in support of the workload equity campaign, and ask faculty members in support of the campaign to sign. If this support is demonstrated, then the importance of the issue will resonate more with the administration negotiating team. It was pointed out that we do teach people how to treat us.

State wide, AFT 1493 seems to be at the forefront of this issue. The negotiating team has been pleasantly surprised by the reception so far. There is incentive to welcome the proposal on both sides. For example, getting widespread participation from more faculty members is beneficial. There may be a convergence of interests between the negotiating teams. The issue of accountability has been raised. There will be a counterproposal.

There are some other categories of work that aren't clearly represented in the point system categories. It is requested that these are somehow reflected.

Monica Malumud presented specific topics on which faculty feedback is requested for the current negotiations:

- **Evaluation procedures** – radical changes to evaluation procedures have been proposed. Procedures are not seen as adequate by administration, which is why they've raised this issue. However, we just went through a process to change evaluation procedures. Time and money has been spent on this process already, and it is not desirable to do again so soon. AFT feels that this is not the time to revisit evaluation procedures, because the issues raised by the administration negotiating team didn't come up during the prior process. Examples include VP evaluation and increase of student surveys. This is not a value judgment on the proposals presented—they may or may not have merit. This isn't a comment on that. However, AFT believes this discussion should occur at a future time. Does Senate support this position?

Voices responded in support of AFT. However, it was emphasized that the small tweaks that need to be made to the evaluation procedures are still needed, and should be made.

- **Flex**—Flexible flex is up for negotiation. The district wants to make flex mandatory. Current contract language technically doesn't allow flexible flex, and the district can discontinue the current practice of allowing it. For part-timers flexible flex should definitely continue. A hybrid system has been proposed by AFT. Faculty expressed that flexible flex is desirable. Past practice does not become official over time. However, administration would be required to give advance notice of a change in practice.

- **Accounting for virtual work.** District is not interested in allowing virtual work. They want to enforce 4 days a week on physical campus.
- **The practice of banking** up to 15 units, except for 30 units prior to retirement. The administration's negotiating team is asking about the benefit to the district for those banking up to 30 units prior to retirement. They would like to eliminate the 30 unit banking option for the last year prior to retirement. If possible, it was indicated that faculty would like to continue this practice.

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 pm

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday, May 10, 2016.

Minutes prepared by Stephanie Roach, with assistance from David Laderman