Updates on the State of the State

1. My Conversation with Chancellor Oakley

*After an exchange of emails in which I reached out to him, referring to resolutions of no confidence by several colleges, and to his letter to the Board of Governors which I told him mischaracterized faculty discontent, Eloy called me on **Monday, September 10th**. We talked for about half an hour. I described the conversation to several people in the couple hours immediately following, and wrote the following account down the next morning. I am copying my own notes more or less verbatim here.*

I told him about our vote of no confidence re: Frank Chong, breakdown of shared governance, gave him details of summergate, Frank's response as a model (for him to emulate).

I asked him about what I've heard about him cancelling meetings with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). He told me he didn't have regular meetings with Julie [past ASCCC president], but in response to criticism is now having them with John [the current president]. No one from ASCCC, he said, has told him he has a bad relationship with the ASCCC.

Somewhere in here he said that I am the only academic senate president in the state to have reached out to him. He commended me for doing so. I told him that it was a 'cryin' shame' and that I hoped for a lot more honest dialogue between faculty and his office.

He was keen to explain to me the context of his letter to the BOG in May. He pointed out that the Los Rios letter had been from the union, and that most of what the BOG members have seen of faculty criticism is union focused, that he did not mean to imply that is was all union agitation and assured me that he respects faculty perspective and will listen to us.

I then pressed him on the paucity of faculty consultation on his many initiatives and I elaborated on two examples. A) The Vision for Success document lists 69 names of authors, contributors and consultants, only four of which are faculty. Four out of 69. The rest are mainly political, administrative or corporate representatives. I told him that I know well all four faculty listed, and that I talked to each of them personally about their contribution to the Vision. All four told me they had made no meaningful contribution at all. One of them was surprised to learn his name was in it since he had had nothing to do with it. Two others told me they were interviewed on the phone briefly, but that the quotes from them in the document were taken out of context. Then I turned to B), the Fully Online Community College (115, or "FOCC"). I had spent that morning reading the whole website on the FOCC. I observed that there was a long collection of endorsers, quotes from people praising the idea of the FOCC with names and titles, and that only two of the approximately 70 quotes were of faculty members. I noted to him that one of the two faculty quoted was an English instructor who endorsed the project on the basis that it would provide needed courses for students who are seeking to complete degrees online but are hampered because comparatively few

degree-required courses are offered online at many colleges. Then I asked him if that was indeed what the FOCC would provide.

He responded to my observations and questions about the FOCC but never addressed my observations about the Vision. He said of the FOCC that it was difficult to find faculty endorsers because most faculty are against it. He rued that the two biggest faculty organizations in the state have both officially opposed it (I believe he was referring to the ASCCC and FACCC). He went on to explain the purpose and mission of the FOCC which corrected some and confirmed other aspects of my prior understanding. For the first several years all its offerings will be sub-associate's degree, mostly CTE and non-credit courses. Job skill "credentials," rather than degrees and certificates.

I then asked him about faculty staffing, curricula, and pedagogy. He assured me in emphatic terms that the FOCC would go through a process to acquire a robust and thoroughly qualified faculty committed to 75/25 (fulltime-part time ratio). [The FOCC's Board of Trustees will be the Board of Governors, and Chancellor Oakley himself is its interim president until a permanent CEO is found].

He thanked me again for reaching out. I thanked him for talking to me and ended by telling him that, as has been happening at Santa Rosa, that we would see an increase in transparency and collegial consultation, and that I hoped to talk to him again.

He sent me an email after we ended the call thanking me again.

2. The Webinar on the New Funding Formula

The Chancellor himself spoke and answered questions in a webinar held on Thursday, September 13th 10:30-12:00. I was not able to tune in myself because of class obligations, but several of our administrators did, and I received extensive accounts of it from two of them. I will mention here a couple of highlights. I am attaching the new funding formula for convenience of reference. As most know by now, the new funding formula consist of three categories of metrics—FTES ('Base Component'), underprivileged students (i.e. financial need, 'Supplemental Component'), and Completion ('Student Success Component'). The latter will start out in the first year to be about 10 % of our funding from the state, and it will grow to 20 % over three years. As the "student success" component grows, that money will be taken from the base component.

It was reported to me separately from two independent witnesses that Chancellor Oakley said:

1. The point of the New Funding formula is to support the *Vision for Success*

2. The point of Guided Pathways is to implement the *Vision for Success*

3. All Boards of Trustees will be required by January 1, 2019, to show that their districts' Educational Master Plan or Strategic Plan aligns with The *Vision for Success*

The core message: It IS all about the *Vision for Success*.

Note: There will be other webinars in October and November that will explain this further. Questions about the above and other things in the webinar were asked by participants that the Chancellor had no answer to, it was reported to me. Some of those questions include:

- Must we align with the six *goals* of the Vision, or with the 7 *commitments* of the Vision?
- Are we to show how our Strategic Plan already aligns with whichever aspects of the Vision it aligns with, or are we to rewrite our Strategic Plan to match the Vision?
- Can the Chancellor do this? (re: Ed Code and Title 5)

3. A Visit from ASCCC Exec

I have made a request to the ASCCC that a representative who can speak to the Senate-Oakley relationship, collaboration or lack thereof, etc. come to our senate meeting to talk to us. No one was available for the September 19th meeting, but someone is coming on October 3rd.

Her name is Cheryl Aschenbach, and she is the North Representative on the ASCCC Exec.

Other Business

Policy 3.6: Program Review, Evaluation, Revitalization and Discontinuance. At the first meeting of the year of this Academic Senate committee, the suggestion was made that some faculty aren't aware of the process we have to discontinue and/or revitalize programs, and also may not be aware of their rights regarding such action. So I will communicating to y'all all about it for the next couple of meetings.

The Process

As our policy and procedure now stand, this is what happens. Every program is reviewed on a six-year cycle. Two separate bodies are involved independently, but with overlap. The AAC, Academic Affairs Council, which consists of the academic administrators chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs (Jane Saldaña-Talley), meets in the summer (traditionally) to review the programs due for it, and make judgements and/or recommendation as to whether a program is **vital** (keep on keepin' on), is potentially vital but needs some work (**revitalize**), or is a candidate for **discontinuance**.

The AAC recommendations are then forwarded to the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate's 3.6 committee consists of five faculty appointed by the Senate (one of those, the Curriculum co-chair, is on by position); two administrators sit on that body on an ex officio basis. This AS committee reviews the AAC recommendations, and makes their own determination in consultation with department chairs, discipline leads, and deans.

Some faculty members may not realize that no decision is made about a program without first consulting with that program's faculty, and appeals, which are the right of the faculty are always heard by the Senate committee. Final recommendations are forwarded to the VPAA and the President of the College.

See two Attachments: The Program Evaluation Rubric and the New Funding Formula

ET