

Clark College AHE Senate Minutes

January 11th, 2010

3:30-5:00

Cannell Library, Cannell Room

Members Present: Dave Duback , Anita Fisher, Don Gonser, Dwight Hughes, Izad Khormae, Nathan Lazar (Izad Khormae), Julian Nelson, Nancy Novak, Marcia Roi, Otto Schlumpf, Nancy Sheppard, Kimberly Sullivan, Susan Torres, Judy Van Patten, Steve Walsh, Jim Wilkins-Luton

Members Absent: Rita Carey, Carlos Castro, Gene Johnson, Carson Legree,

Others Present: Nat Hong

Topic	Discussion and Action
Approval of Agenda and Minutes	The CCAHE Senate came to order at 3:38. The January 11 th agenda was approved as presented. The minutes of the December 7 th AHE Senate meeting were approved as presented.
Balloting Procedures	Steve discussed the procedure for distributing and counting ballots for upcoming MOU votes. Ballots will be counted on Thursday, January 21 st at 3:00. Corrected ballots will be emailed to Senators to be distributed to AHE members (Faculty Excellence Committee MOU Article I.K.3: “intern” changed to “intent”).
Executive Committee Recommendation Re: November 2 nd Senate Meeting	After a brief discussion and per the AHE Executive Committee’s recommendation, the AHE Senate opted to take no action in regard to President Knight’s request to amend the minutes of the November 2 nd Senate meeting. Several Senators reiterated that the minutes accurately reflect the tone and content of the conversation with President Knight, citing the unanimous approval of those minutes at the November 16 th AHE Senate meeting.
Nat Hong: Organizing and Legislative Issues	Nat Hong, Higher Education Chair for WEA, introduced himself and discussed the financial situation facing two-year colleges in the State of Washington. He said our current work level is not sustainable and that all other state employees received their increments last year, but the two-year college employees did not. Nat said this year’s legislative goal is to promote equal bargaining rights. Community college teachers are the only teacher group in the state who cannot bargain wages locally—we must have the financial support of the legislature to be promoted on the salary scale. The push will be to bargain locally, on the campuses where we work. The community colleges are becoming more and more privatized with monies coming from local contracts and sources (student fees and private contracts). Faculty members are underpaid: Nat cited a recent SBCTC study saying Washington’s community college faculty members are paid 43 percent below their West Coast peers and 12-13 percent below the national average. Dave said he thinks community colleges should unionize statewide and not be part of K-12 or higher education, suggesting we push to

	<p>rescind the Community College Act of 1967. Nat said he disagreed, saying that administration’s ballooning numbers demonstrate that there is money within the system to support increased faculty wages (faculty numbers have stayed the same while admin numbers have increased 900 percent over recent years). Nat said K-12 has done well bargaining locally and then moved to discuss the idea of guaranteeing increments in promotion schedules. Marcia said Bob Knight testified against increments and equal bargaining rights before the legislature. Nat raised the point of budget cuts with a 40 percent student increase—we can’t sustain this while maintaining instruction quality. Otto raised the question of equal pay for equal work for adjuncts. Nat said the FACE Bill would move to give more job security to adjunct instructors. A discussion of multi-term contracts for adjuncts followed. Marcia emphasized that bargaining locally means being able to bargain tuition dollars, dollars that are here now because we are taking on extra work. Marcia said we are currently running a 10 percent fund balance. Kimberly asked Nat if he had given the legislature a timeline describing the consequences of overworking faculty and overtaxing the system and asked if there is any discussion of this issue within WEA. Nat said it is possible to be accommodating and shoot oneself in the foot and that we are going to have to set limits on what we will do. Kimberly asked when and where that conversation happens, and Nat said it’s happening at the college level right now. He said we can’t take another 14 percent cut, and that the cuts are having a negative impact on the colleges and our ability to serve our students well. It was reported that one of Clark’s deans asked faculty to raise class caps by two students and that President Knight later boasted to the BOT and the legislature about getting faculty to take on 400 extra students without added cost to the college. Dwight said we need to get the word out about stopping cap overloads. One Senator commented that faculty members are being talked into overloading as a student-help issue, not seeing that overloading is a broader instructional-quality issue in the classroom and service-delivery issue on the campus at large. Dave asked if Nat had taken the idea to the legislature about how a 20 percent increase in student numbers has the same impact on the college as a 20 percent budget cut. Izad asked what WEA is doing to promote a compelling case before the legislature, and Marcia asked what we at Clark College should be doing. Nat said the faculty is the only group within the college that truly has the college’s educational mission at heart; thus, we must protect instruction as vigorously as we possibly can. It is not self-interest: it is our mission to advance the things that are best about the college, and, to do this, we must mobilize our members to promote the best interests of our students. This should be our core mission, but that is not always the case. We are sometimes “too nice” and get taken advantage of by our administrators to do things that do not promote what is best for our students. If Administration is undermining the goals of education, then we must fight and must be strong enough to be taken seriously. Marcia thanked Nat for making the drive and taking the time to speak with us.</p>
Tenure-Track	Marcia asked the Senate to look at, make recommendations for, and approve new tenure-track screening

<p>Screening Committee Ratification</p>	<p>committees as presented by the VPI. Kimberly asked why some committees have different numbers of members than others (for example, why are there seven members on the Dental Hygiene committee and only five on Japanese?) Many of the faculty members on the committees had not been asked if they wanted to be on the committees; there also seemed to be a predominance of AHE Senators on the lists. Marcia said we want volunteers, not conscripts. She also said it would be good to know the complete composition of the committees (would staff members be added to the committees later?). It was also suggested that faculty members on the committees be tenured (Catherine Marshal is not). Dave recommended that Senators take the committee lists, contact faculty members in each unit, and make recommendations to the Senate.</p> <p>Anita moved that the AHE Senate meet for a special session on January 25th to complete unfinished business. The vote passed, and the Senate will meet on Monday, January 25th at 3:30.</p>
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>The CCAHE Senate adjourned at 5:08.</p>