

AHE SENATE MEETING MINUTES

November 12, 2024

In-Person and Online Via Zoom



Attendance:

In Person

Amstadter, Logan
Anselmo, Paula
Bagwell, Geoffrey
Bem, Greg
Carlson, Bobbi
Cartwright, Ben
Clark, Sam
Condon, Jill
Cuisinier, Eddy
Daily, Bev
Dalsanders, Christie
DeBolt, Katella
Deyo, Robert
Dimick, Susan
Dubois, Rick
Edwards, David
Eggerman, Jason
Flock, Barb
Franklin, Jackie
Goffinet, Renee
Guthrie-Martinez, Megan
Hein, Bradley
Jones, Tina
Kier, Laura
Lackey, Ray
Lopez-Schindler, Lenora
Martin, Melinda
Megow, Lyn
Momono, Christina
Moorhead, Ronda
Morrow, Corrine

Nelson, Thomas
Neuville, Mark
Newcomer, Tybre
Pearson, Michelle
Rambo, Bill
Roe, Timothy
Satake, Katie
Satake, Scott
Stack, Brian
Throop, Judith
Trujillo, Cindy
Vogel, Rob
Woods, Laura

Online

Anderson, Amy
Anthony, Jared
Bishop, Adriana
Bjerke, Joy
Browning, Kristen
Campbell, Holly
Cary, Chris
Case, Emma
Christman, Zachary
Coffey, Jeff
Commers, Ken
Compton, Renee
Cusack, Jessica
Eikum, Kim
Evenson, Donna
Fox, Gigi
George, Kathy

Green, Sabina
Grover, Michelle
Hanson, Callie
Henry, Chad
Johnston, Landon
Kovarik, Camille
Mackleit, Christine
Mandler, Ken
McCoy, Jennifer
McKirdie, Rob
McLean, Scott
Michel, John
Moore, Michele
Morgan, Heather
Nemri, Kamilia
Norman, Pat
O'Sullivan, Mikey
Roewe, Liz
Smith, Angela
Steele, KayDee
Street, Rick
Tibbals, Michael
Volkman, Natasha
Vosen, David
Wanke, Colette
Weaver-Forsman, Britni
Whitmire, Kami
Wizner, Angela
Wolfsen, Amy
Wylie, Mark
Yoon, John
Zirotti, Laurent

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:45 p.m. by Bev Daily.

Minutes and Finance

Approval of Minutes

Laura Kier motioned to approve the minutes; Scott Satake seconded. The motion passed.

Treasurer's Report

	Income	Expenses	Total Assets End of Month
September	\$107.86	\$1,062.26	\$222,052.84
October	\$8,675.05	\$727.38	\$230,000.51

Bobbi Carlson motioned to approve the September treasurer's report; Katie Satake seconded. The motion passed.

Katella DeBolt motioned to approve the October treasurer's report; Eddie Cuisiner seconded. The motion passed.

As a reminder, there is absolutely no recording of the meeting in any way.

Old Business

Bargaining

Since the October Senate meeting, we have reached tentative agreement on a new section for Article 3 related to artificial intelligence. The wording mainly recognizes A.I. is new and will be an issue moving forward and that the parties should engage in problem-solving when there are issues. It is not prescriptive about using or not using A.I. in any particular way. We have also added a similar paragraph to Article 3 related to the use and placement of security cameras. We have also reached agreement on a new version of Appendix N, which is the student-facing document detailing the student-concerns process. There have also been minor technical updates to the department chair evaluation form (what is currently Appendix F-1, but will be just Appendix F going forward) and the Professional Development Plan form used by all CTE programs (Appendix J). We are working towards an agreement on language related to PFML.

Both sides have expressed interest in moving adjuncts to a salary schedule. There is still some back and forth being worked out on this on the precise dollar amounts. Administration at one point also expressed interest in having moonlights paid at a lower rate than adjuncts, but we have expressed serious concerns about that, and they are taking back our questions to look again at that proposal for paying moonlights at a lower rate than adjuncts.

Due to administration's perception that there are some issues where we might not have shared interest, they have suggested we consider changing our bargaining approach on some issues to a more positional style rather than an interest-based style. In addition to that request, which we are discussing, they have brought forward a package that we found unacceptable. The biggest challenge right now is going to be bargaining salary. In June, we gave a proposal of adding \$4,000 to each salary step. This was based on bringing our colleges up to the average salary statewide for all 34 CTCs and also aligning Step 1 with other starting salaries for other colleges. We have heard nothing in response to this proposal until last week. They have countered saying that due to things like overpayment by OFM, the budget forecast, etc., they are very hesitant to commit to ongoing costs for faculty salary. They have also said they looked at our recent faculty hiring pools and felt that we are competitive and don't have issues with recruitment or retention. We have requested data on this from HR, because our impression is that there have been failed searches as a result of low salaries, as well as hiring pools that were smaller than anticipated or hoped for.

Rather than increasing each step of the salary scale by any amount, their counteroffer at this point is a one-time payment to all full-time faculty of \$1,000. This would not impact the salary scale as it would be a one-time payment. Their version of the adjunct salary scale (where moonlights are paid at a lower rate than adjuncts), bereavement leave for adjuncts, and the one-time \$1,000 payment are part of their package offer. What they are asking for in return for those three items would be for us to accept their proposal to significantly change the academic calendar, annual contracts, and workload for Counselors. This means that in their proposal, the only way to improve salary for adjuncts and the only way to provide bereavement leave to adjuncts would be for us to agree to what they want with Counseling. This proposal related to Counselors is a modified version of one they brought previously. We vetted that proposal carefully with both Counseling departments, and neither are in support of it. We have also offered alternative solutions, which they have not responded to.

We shared a chart with recent salary increases for administration showing that between 2021 and 2024, the salaries for the Chancellor, the college presidents, the college vice presidents have increased between 28% and 35.5%, while faculty salaries during that same time have increased only 20.7%. An important factor to consider in all of this is that there were recent salary increases approved by the Board of Trustees above and beyond the COLA. These were funded with local dollars, and are ongoing costs each year (not just a one-time cost). For the academic year 2023/24, the total cost in local dollars was around \$550,000 for raises for administrators (i.e. retention increases). This year, for academic year 2024/25, the BOT approved another increase of \$450,000 for administration raises. These are ongoing costs that are paid for with local money, which means that each year going forward, there is a cost of \$1,000,000 added to the budget to cover these raises above and beyond the approved COLA for administrators. AHE's request to add \$4,000 to each step would be a market adjustment similar to, but still less than, what was given to administration. The administration salary increases were put into effect in September, despite the fact that OFM announced the financial mistake in August, but OFM is now being cited as a reason there is no money to address the faculty salary scale.

Faculty need to be aware that administration seems to be undervaluing faculty. Faculty also need to be prepared to make your voices heard related to salary at CCS.

A member suggested that we should have a response clarifying that the CCS salary proposal was disrespectful and we should have a response to administration.

Bev shared that the bargaining team will relay that sentiment at the table. She also said that it was an initial proposal so we may not need to have a strong response yet if administration comes back with a reasonable offer.

A member asked who makes the decision about moving to positional bargaining.

Bev clarified that administration has made that request, but AHE has not agreed to the change. Ultimately the bargainers will have to make that decision at the table. This was the first time that administration had responded to AHE's salary proposal that was presented in June, and so the bargainers will be working on a response and figure out how to proceed.

A member asked with SCC hiring a new VPI will administration come back and adjust their salary?

Bev said that they have already done that so they shouldn't but we don't know for sure.

Bev asked faculty to be prepared, if called upon, to share their voices and opinions about how faculty are valued at CCS.

Historically salary was bargained outside of the general contract bargain. It used to include Carla and the AHE VPs along with Greg Stevens and the finance director for the district. It usually occurred in one or two total meetings and was a straightforward process.

A member asked why salary is not being negotiated separately this time.

Bev explained that it is likely because Greg has retired.

In the past it is likely that Carla spoke for and on behalf of the faculty. The current chancellor seems to have a harder time understanding that AHE speaks for and represents faculty. This goes back to what Bev said, which is that we may need faculty to do more to express their feelings and make it clearer to administration that faculty should be valued.

A member asked what have faculty done in the past to make their voices heard?

Bev explained that in recent years we have not needed to take any actions, but in the 1990's faculty had to stage a walkout, attend Board of Trustees meetings, and other similar actions. Over the past 20 or so years we have had a good relationship with CCS which was especially due to the trust and open dialogue that was created with Greg Stevens.

Bev mentioned that the nursing accreditation was recently approved and we received good comments related to retention and stabilization of the nursing faculty. That happened due to the increase in salary based on the funds that came in specifically for that purpose from the legislature.

In general, the majority of the information that is presented to the board comes through the chancellor. We do all have the opportunity to speak during public comment. Bev explained that her comments will become sharper to the board if administration does not work with us on negotiations.

A member said that the problem seems to be with the chancellor. He showed at SCC and continues to show as the chancellor that he does not really care about faculty.

Bev said we have to give the bargaining team a chance to negotiate this, but she might need faculty across CCS to step up and voice their opinions.

A member said that it was confusing that faculty have not been centered in the Spokane Colleges' new marketing videos. Another member asked why the video presented today focused on the district when the research clearly showed that we should be focusing on the two colleges. These are further examples of faculty not being valued and just being pushed aside.

New Business

Budget

Renee presented the proposed budget for the 2024-2025 year. A few of the account names will be reverted to prior years. Jason Eggerman moved to accept the proposed budget. Scott Satake seconded. The motion passed.

Bylaws Senate Groups

AHE has looked at the senate groups to adjust the groups based upon the bylaws with regard to size.

Currently the bylaws say that senate groups "shall" be between 6 and 12 members. This is ideal, but not always feasible because we try to group faculty based on physical location, discipline, etc.

The proposal is to keep the spirit of the original language, but add that smaller than 6 and larger than 12 may be acceptable if approved to by the executive board.

Bill Rambo moved to accept the proposal as presented. Geoffrey Bagwell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Searches

There is a lot of conversation at SCC related to the VPI executive search. Bev shared that she told President Martin that if you are just going to hire VP Jacot, then people will respect you more if you just hire her permanently and move forwards. President Martin's response was "well what if there is somebody better?" Also, President Martin is requesting six faculty for this screening committee so that there is good representation from across campus. President Martin says that she is walking into this screening process without any preconceived idea for who will be selected for the position.

We do not know how President Martin will proceed, but we can say that she is not the chancellor and may handle things differently. Also, Fred Davis, the HR VP, is now handling executive searches, which is a significant change from the summer executive searches. Due to the last minute change, there was difficulty with the timeline. They have adjusted to make sure there is time for contributions in the listening sessions. At the end of the day, faculty need to be on the screening committee in order to have their voices heard.

At SFCC, we are in the process of going out for the Assistant Dean of Connected Learning that will be over the library along with some other areas. Please respond if you are interested in being on the screening committee for the VPAA area dean.

Security Cameras

They are putting in security cameras on both campuses. The librarians at SCC had a conversation with security about cameras in their area. We learned that cameras are not being monitored in real time. The cameras are on timers so notifications are sent if unusual behavior is occurring outside of normal hours of operation. People only look at the cameras when notifications occur. The camera footage will be kept for approximately 30 days unless there is some sort of incident that is recorded on camera. The cameras will, at some point, utilize some sort of AI to identify potential threats or issues that may need a response. Security will be looking into what happens with the data collected by the vendors on these cameras. Currently the data is not being shared, but we do not know what will happen in the future. Administration does acknowledge that there is an expectation of a right to privacy in certain areas, such as faculty offices. Supposedly the cameras cannot pickup things like the title of a book or what is on a screen. The current cameras do not record audio.

Faculty are welcome to ask your deans about security cameras in your area.

Faculty should know where the cameras are for safety reasons.

A member asked why faculty have been having to wait for their new prox cards since week one. Bev said that she is working with HR to try and get new faculty onboarded earlier so that they have email addresses, Canvas access, keys, etc. to make the process smoother for new faculty. This will help with the backlog of key requests.

RIF

Thank you to everyone who responded to Bev's email about RIF lists. New faculty have not been added yet but will be soon. There were quite a few people who were not on RIF lists who should have been.

For those interested in getting on a secondary RIF list, you can fill out an application for a secondary RIF unit (found on the CCS forms website). In order to be added to a RIF list you need to be qualified to teach the majority of the classes in the area you are looking to join. Secondary RIF's are not automatic; you have to go

through a process of applying for a secondary RIF. You can only ever be in two RIF units (you can't be in three or more).

The purpose of being in a secondary RIF unit is to move a faculty member to a secondary unit if their primary unit goes through a Reduction in Force. The criteria for getting a secondary RIF unit added and maintained can be found in Article 13.

Keep in mind that RIF units are for the district, not individual campuses.

There is a RIF review committee who determines whether someone is eligible to be added to a secondary RIF unit.

The scheduling matrix says that in terms of scheduling, someone on a secondary RIF unit can be scheduled at the same time as adjuncts, but they do not have priority over adjuncts.

President's and Vice Presidents' Reports

AHE President Bev Daily:

Remember to select your vision plan by November 25. There is a default, but you will not be able to make any changes until next year. The plans have differences in terms of benefits, and there are significant differences in terms of what doctors you can see with each of the plans.

If you are interested in what is happening with the lodge, contact Bev for a copy of the PowerPoint. Some of the funds for the renovation is coming from the freeway money. Despite our best efforts they do not seem to want to put benefits and payroll into the same place.

Training is changing due to our Cultural and Development department. The trainings will be in Canvas. It will also include the new trainings. You do not need to receive a score on the quiz for it to count for step movement.

Contact Bev if you need or are interested in the in-person trainings.

SCC VP Jason Eggerman:

Those interested in Professional Leave next year should reach out to that committee, which is chaired by Jeannie Isern. Faculty position requests for next year are in progress. Departments have already given an informal "heads up" that they intend to request, and formal requests with data and rationale are due November 25. At some point there will be a call for volunteers for the VPI search committee. There were listening sessions, and the All College meeting has an agenda item to summarize the results of the listening sessions. My understanding is that the Arts and Sciences Dean will remain as an interim position until after a permanent VPI is hired. So most likely they will be going out for the Arts and Sciences Dean (or Deans) as permanent positions next year. Each Senate group that does not already have an alternate received an email from me asking me for them to discuss as a group who they would like as their alternate. We would really like eventually for each group to have a senator and an alternate, which is the purpose of this request. If there is a need for any kind of ballot, Rob and I can help with that.

SCC Extension VP Rob Deyo:

There are some concerns around uncertainties and around the new administration following the election. Some of the funding for Basic Skills programs comes from the Department of Education and there has been talk of that being shut down. More concerning is how our students may be impacted and in turn our classrooms. For now, we are waiting to hear what happens and will be watching carefully.

SFCC VP Jackie Franklin:

Jackie thanks the faculty for showing up. Keep your adjuncts in mind with regard to joining the union. Please let Jackie know the reasons you are not interested in committees (509-991-2348.) The art building is an ongoing conversation. It has been a challenging and stressful situation. We are supporting them through the process. Please look at and select your vision benefits. Position requests as SFCC are different from SCC please check with your dean as to which positions are being filled. If you do not have an alternate for your senate group, please work with the members of your group to determine who the alternate will be.

Adjunct Representative Lena Lopez Schindler:

If you are an adjunct and have a 40% or more of a load, you must completed your two trainings in order to renew your contracts. Search for emails from Marta Hartman with regard to the instructions on what and how you need to complete the trainings.

Good of the order:

Scott Satake made a motion to adjourn. Laura Woods seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.