



**SAN MATEO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS**

Advocating for faculty since 1963

**Minutes of
General Membership/Executive Committee Meeting
September 12, 2018-College of San Mateo**

EC Members Present: Paul Bissember, Paul Rueckhaus, Katharine Harer, Steven Lehigh, Anne Stafford, Teeka James, Nathan Jones, Barbara Corzonkoff, Joaquin Rivera, Doniella Maher, David Laderman, Jessica Silver-Sharp, Eric Brenner, Bianca Rowden-Quince

AFT 1493 Members Present: Mike Nagler, Paul Naas, Kate Browne, Michael Stanford, Diana Tedone, Lezlee Ware, Patty Hall, Annie Nicholls, Hyla Lacefield, Denise Erickson, Dick Claire, Elizabeth Terzakis, David Eck

Guests Present: Tom Mohr

Facilitator: Teeka James

Meeting commenced at 2:30

- 1) Welcome and Introductions
- 2) Statements from AFT Members (non EC members)
 - a) On Oct 18, 5-8, at College Vista, we'll hold a party for Dan Kaplan's retirement
- 3) Minutes tabled until next meeting.
- 4) Review of candidate endorsement recommendations
- 5) Board of Trustees Candidate Presentation with Q&A
 - a) Candidate Tom Mohr spoke. See item 13) for summary and selected quotes.
 - b) Nicholls, Erickson and Naas, all of Canada College, explained their views that Mohr had supported Canada faculty, taken time to listen and talk with faculty, and put faculty first while serving as Canada president.
 - c) AFT members present voiced specific questions
 - i) **Maher:** The Chancellor said during his recent address that we couldn't spend 50% on instruction because of all of our other programs to support students. What is your position? **Mohr:** He looks at problem from three frames of reference. What he expects is that administration and faculty

would sit down with union to see how to manage this real issue that needs to be dealt with.

- ii) **Stafford:** You said that after you voted against arbitration. What led you to oppose it? **Mohr:** "It's a bit of a struggle to represent the people and hand off a major decision to a third party; it's a dilemma; if it's set up right, I would be fine with it, all things considered."
- iii) **Rivera:** "Five years ago when you ran you said you would support binding arbitration and then you changed your mind." **Mohr:** He doesn't remember doing that; honestly the way he remembers negotiations last time was that binding arbitration came to the BOT at the last moment; if there had been time to get into it, he "probably would have been fine with it." **Rivera:** "It was there from the beginning." **Mohr:** He doesn't "recall it as a major issue."
- i) **Lehigh:** The current compensation model requires administrators to hire extra faculty. How do you propose to expand faculty compensation? **Mohr:** There is lots of teaching and learning outside the classroom. He thinks people should be paid for it, there should be a system for it. He said he challenges the Chancellor a lot and was clear with him about things that needed to be changed. Faculty trust him with sensitive problems.
- ii) **Harer:** I'm impressed by the faculty here to support you as college president; when we first endorsed you, we were looking forward to having an ally. We felt disappointment and surprise when President Monica Malamud asked to speak with you about most important issues including binding arbitration and you refused to meet with her; you said you couldn't meet with us during negotiations – there isn't a law against that. Instead we went to fact finding and it was grueling. Why did you refuse to speak with her? **Mohr:** The Board agreed we were so far along in negotiations that we would not do that. The thing about affirmative action (I mean binding arbitration) sounds like a "gotcha." Mohr feels like "being a good board member is bigger than that." Tells story about faculty showing him he was wrong on another occasion.
- iii) **Reuckhaus.:** Poses question about programs that generate revenue for the District. "What is your position as a Trustee about the District operating duplicative programs and programs that threaten the legitimacy of existing programs?" **Mohr:** What you hand off to the Academic Senate is the integrity...when there's a conflict they have to strive to work it out. He would come down on the side of the Academic Senate if they had a good rationale to maintain their programs. **Rueckhaus:** it means a lot to have you come here. **Mohr:** To me too. (Mohr departs meeting).

6) Next steps following BoT presentation

- a) Bissember described endorsement process/timeline:
 - i) May 9th we endorsed Richard unanimously.

- ii) Next was COPE vote on July 25th to endorse Richard. There's a vacancy in leadership in COPE, which is why the vote went to 52 committee members, all respondents said yes.
- iii) Only COPE can mobilize funds, these are not from AFT membership dues.
- b) Next, Harer explained:
 - i) In advance of our May EC meeting, we were contacted by Richard Holiber that he was running in District 4
 - ii) At this time EC not aware Mohr now lived in District 4, planned to run.
 - iii) When Monica spoke to Mohr on July 25th he never mentioned he was running. He called her a later date and let her know.
- c) Transcript of major comments by membership follows:

Naas: Apologizes for tone, but "is this body in the habit of endorsing before we know all the candidates?"

James: It's not, it depends on whether we're approached and other factors.

Corzonkoff: She's known Tom; thinks it's odd that AFT didn't check to see who else was running, it seems like it was a rush.

Claire: He has observed that AFT usually invites candidates to an interview session; Mohr announced he was running to 400 people at the Progress Seminar [April 2018].

Maher: We are in a new era as far as Trustees go; we've never had regional distribution. We've not been in this position before. We've never had them running against each other, it's new! This hasn't been a problem before, in fact it's never come up. She takes it seriously, she's here representing her faculty and knows her faculty would have wanted her to endorse Mohr. She would have, had she known he was running. We don't want to be in this situation again. How do we remedy this? We need a process. Proposes change for the future: We wait until the filing date to endorse.

Rueckhaus: Speaking of past practice, only other cycle we've had was when Maurice Goodman ran for Trustee; we did interviews; however, we don't usually do them for incumbents.

Erickson: She counts on AFT to be responsible, careful, watchful and fully cognizant; she's disappointed, process is flawed.

Stafford: Well it's hard to foresee what hasn't happened before; waiting for filing date makes sense. What to do next?

Rueckhaus: COPE has a clear process; our EC doesn't. This would be opportunity to make a change in our by-laws.

James: When EC discussed Richard's endorsement, she didn't do it at the exclusion of Mohr since she didn't know he was running or that he had moved to a new district. Agrees with waiting until filing date to endorse. Inviting everyone is good; we haven't done it with incumbents because we have their records to look back on. As much as she respects Mohr and his record, as a Trustee she's not been as impressed with his record. If we were to do a dual endorsement, she's not sure personally if she would endorse him. If we want to go there, what are our priorities for what we want to see in a Trustee?

Ware: Decide going forward whether to do a dual, look at he records; she feels Mohr would rise to the top.

Corzonkoff: The process was flawed before filing closed. How to make it more equal now? We should endorse them both.

Stafford: Disagrees that *we have to* endorse them both; the endorsement should be on their past track records, their advocacy for faculty, their support for binding arbitration. It's not a "gotcha;" it was at the forefront of negotiations for 15 years; it was a gut punch that he didn't support it after saying he would do so in writing.

Patty: She supports Tom, was embarrassed that we endorsed without knowing who else was running. It was "fatal" for her; to develop a meaningful process would take us past the election; she's "mortified." She thinks there shouldn't be a choice now.

Terzakis: Agrees with Lezlee; Richard Holiber said to faculty, "I owe you nothing" in a letter. Strategically there are people who don't support the union and this is fodder for them. She thinks dual endorsement is necessary at this point, and that the whole process needs to be more democratic. Why not poll the people? She's against binding arbitration and believes faculty are too.

James: The EC endorsed Richard Holiber at open meeting to which all AFT members were invited.

Stanford: His feeling is that Mohr is a friend of the faculty. Does that mean he's been in total agreement with faculty on everything? No. The feeling at Canada is that Holiber is not so supportive of faculty; he did "insidious things;" Monica would have been aware of this as president.

Rivera: Richard Holiber *has* been supportive of faculty. He meets with us whenever we ask; Tom Mohr refused to meet us. The District negotiator said Richard was on our side pretty much all the time and mentioned that Mohr was very strongly against binding arbitration.

Naas: What is the purpose for today; why did we bring Tom in? It's obviously a done deal [that we're not endorsing Tom].

Stafford: I don't get the sense that we're already decided at all. I don't want Patty to be embarrassed. I agree that we need to be strategic.

David Eck: Request for future process, wait for filing date and list out other people who filed. With COPE, there was just one name to vote on. Tom had not asked for our endorsement at time COPE voted.

James: Let's go to next steps. This is a membership meeting.

Maher: Agrees with Elizabeth on the importance of optics, the reality is that Canada is the smaller college and even if we sent out the vote to all of Canada, it's possible he'd lose, but at least it would be more democratic. Agrees to send out to all membership; thinks it probably makes sense to do a dual endorsement; there are complications since our recommendation already went to Labor Council; it wouldn't be equal, but for the benefit of union, dual endorsement seems the right thing to do. It's noteworthy that we don't have many reps from Canada on the union.

Bissember: The idea was to interview Mohr and discuss here what to change. You all are part of this. **Brenner:** Did the Labor Council endorse Mohr?

Bissemer: No, they were silent. **Browne:** This is a new election; if something was done unusually this is a chance to right that. She supports TM as supporter of faculty.

Erickson: She has been in District 46 years. She believe the AFT EC is tight effective group but there are more faculty at CSM & Skyline supportive of Mohr that she's not sure we recognize. She believes AFT is facing a "crisis of trust" as to why this is a happening. Believes we have two really strong candidates, thinks electorate should decide, and supports dual endorsement.

Lehigh: In additional to dual endorsement, what do you want to walk away with today?

Nicholls: Doesn't want our negotiation experience to influence our feelings about TM; the floodgates will break if we don't; thinks TM will win.

Rivera: We've already done this and it didn't pay off.

Lacefield: She supports dual endorsement and going forward, have renewed commitment to create a process that's open and transparent; people felt blindsided; we need more solicitation of responses.

Ware: We need AFT language to say why we endorse both; this could have been a dual from the beginning. Asks, can COPE give money to Mohr, too?

Patty: We should go to labor leaders and ask them to endorse both; AFT should write a press release about our shift in direction.

Rueckhaus: We can propose a motion to endorse Tom Mohr; EC has to vote on this.

James: Moves to endorse as dual endorsement: In favor, 11; against 1, abstentions 1.

Rueckhaus: We need working committee on endorsements and COPE, revise our bylaws etc. – not today. Mohr has not asked for donation to his campaign. Does anyone on EC want to look at endorsement process? Barbara K. & Paul B.

7) Workload committee report. Anne Stafford

- a) Attending yesterday's workload meeting, much time spent addressing question: what is a "reasonable workload?" How much do we work, how to we hold accountable people who don't do enough. Handouts included chart showing most representative average number of hours faculty spend (Q's 6, 7 and explained how calculated. According to workload survey, faculty spend average 8 hours/wk above teaching, not including hiring committees and community work. (Q's 6 & 7).
- b) Discussion points made by EC
 - i) Much of extra work reported by faculty had to do with technology work.
 - ii) Question: will taking the average exclude the few people working very high hours? Answer: There are only 2 outliers, so probably okay.
 - iii) Brenner will look at trends in responses from faculty and stated the importance of getting info. out to faculty and obtaining feedback
 - iv) Next EC meeting rescheduled to October 3 for longer EC workload discussion with goal of getting solid feedback to Stafford; in the meantime workload data to be circulated to EC to examine on our own.
 - v) If needed we will sub out Workload work to smaller EC group.

- 8) Presentation and approval of budget (review of financial statement)
 - a) Discussion of continued expenses
 - i) Voted to continue printing Advocate for one additional year for \$7,200.
 - ii) Continue SURE payroll services \$500
 - iii) Data breach has thus far cost \$27,000 for 200 (of 2,000) who've enrolled in CLC service; we have savings to this. \$3,000 paid this calendar year out of \$30,000 budgeted
 - b) Discussion of savings
 - i) Discontinue US Labor against the Wars subscription, started during Iraq war
 - ii) Savings of \$42,000/year by elimination of Harriet's position
 - iii) Expected reduction in last year's legal expenses (\$45,000), due to Whitlock's departure
 - c) Proposed new line item with amount for donations, to be solicited from and voted on by members
 - d) Dues income predicated on members remaining members
 - e) We've started online banking, greatly streamlined and modernized office operations
 - f) Expenses this year exceeded income due to breach
 - g) Budget approved unanimously with no abstentions.

- 9) Welcoming New Hires
 - a) 24 new in District, mostly at CSM.
 - b) We have membership forms from half.
 - c) Harer requests help from EC reps to get updated literature to new members, get signed membership forms scanned and sent to AFT office via interoffice mail. She has emailed names of new hires to EC reps.

- 10) Division Liaison Report
 - a) Reuckhaus will generate monthly briefing on AFT business to disseminate to division liaisons.
 - b) Will contact chapter chairs to get final commitments from division liaisons proposed in Google Sheet.

- 11) EC and Committee Appointments
 - a) Doniella moves to approve Elizabeth Terzakis to serve on the CAN Evaluation Guidance Committee. Approved unanimously
 - b) Doniella moves to appoint Michael Hoffman to serve on the EC as campus representative for Cañada. Approved unanimously

- 12) AFT EC Steering Committee
 - a) Make sure we agree that there's a standing committee, more discussion required
 - b) In past, email went to everyone to invite them to be involved
 - c) Need rep from each campus: president, VP and others

13) Statement by Tom Mohr:

The Union is very important to the District; you need body to challenge thinking of leadership structure in academia. He spoke of his background growing up in steel town where “thugs murdered three immigrants;” as a child he crossed picket line and was scolded by father. Has background as high school superintendent, worked closely with union in that role. He believes in Albert Shanker’s principles, he was a visionary about professionalizing teaching; Mohr tries to live his beliefs with transparency. “Faculty possesses transformative power of teaching, very fundamental to invest in faculty as much as possible; when we learn from each other our teaching abilities increase.” He stated he’s the only Board member who has been responsible for students’ learning for a long period of time, in his case chemistry and math. He’s great supporter of Academy (mentions Academic Senate); a good trustee is present to people and listens; our students have had varied experiences and for many this is first higher education experience; their classroom experience is critical; therefore faculty need more support in developing their craft. You must guard against administrators taking over professional development agenda as this realm must belong to the faculty. In past there was no strategic vision for Board but he wrote most of it, so now there is; he got on them to have discussions on race, class and privilege; these topics must stay on the table. He feels he’s results oriented, that the District was not doing enough research, for example, on transfer rates, completion etc. but he urged them on. Working together is what works for students. There’s plenty of research that says community college will only change when students taking 15 units/semester; now we’re beginning to honor that. His focus has always been on power of great teaching. He believes it’s Important to have educator on the Board. Noticed previously there was no one on roster! Regarding instructional program planning he felt the three colleges were at sea. He pushed hard that every administrator should be evaluated each year by the entire faculty and staff. He’s the only Board member who has said the BOT needs to be evaluated by the people who go to BOT meetings about how they govern. Strong supporter of fair workloads; faculty should be reimbursed for extra work according to some reasonable plan. Sometimes hiring committees chaired by administrators, which is also wrong. He “made a mistake last time to vote against binding arbitration and regrets it;” he later “sat down with good labor people who explained to him how it solves a lot of problems.” He has scolded the District about lack of vetting before they did major hires; [hiring personnel] should sit down with applicant’s coworkers before hiring. He used to meet with the union leader regularly when he was school superintendent.

14) Closed session reports.

Meeting Adjourned 5:15.