

AS President Report to Academic Senate
May 3, 2023
N. Persons

Greetings Senators,

In reviewing all Academic Senate (AS) president's reports for the past 2 years to determine what has been reported out regarding the Strategic Planning process, I realized I have not provided as much information recently on committee and council meetings in which I am involved, so this report is a bit lengthier than usual as I try to bring you all up to speed on what happens between Academic Senate meetings.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Spring 2023 Plenary:

Senator Cavales-Doolan (virtually), Senator/Executive Secretary John Stover and I attended the ASCCC Spring Plenary. This was an arduous process this year, with much "splitting" of resolutions and debate. I have already begun communicating to those potentially affected by these resolutions to alert them to the decisions made at plenary. I will post my notes separately from this document and all will be notified when we post them to the Academic Senate website. The final set of approved resolutions was just posted to the ASCCC website and can be accessed at this address: <https://asccc.org/resolutions-spring-2023>.

Committee Appointment Process:

VP Monica Ohkubo, Secretary John Stover, and Administrative Assistant Natalia Haworth and I met on April 25 to work on committee appointments for the coming academic year. We worked through most of the committees and hope to conclude our work this coming week, at which time a new call will go out for committees still having vacancies. We received 100 responses to the call for interest in serving on shared governance committees. This set of responses includes a couple of duplications and is chiefly composed of contract (full-time) faculty members, but does include responses from some associate (part-time) faculty. We have over 300 contract faculty at SRJC, with some still in stages of tenure review that preclude them from serving, and contract faculty may fulfill their obligation for college and professional service through a wide variety of activities that go beyond serving on shared governance committees and councils. That said, the number of responses indicates that a third or slightly less of contract faculty are opting to serve on shared governance committees and councils. I know there is interest in transparency in the appointment process and support this, which is why I explain here the numbers of faculty stepping forward. Of those who have, there is a great deal of interest in certain committees, and very little in others – this may result in the misinterpretation of how appointments are made. Right now we seek to appoint faculty who bring discipline expertise to the committee that is relevant, and who represent a diverse breadth of lived experience. The ASEC has agreed we need the Academic Senate to discuss a set of values or guiding principles that can be used when making appointments. I recently suggested to ASEC that one way to help foster more awareness and participation in shared governance at SRJC would be to rotate faculty off of a committee following completion of multi-year terms where possible, in order to give others who haven't served the opportunity to do so. This would represent a shift in our culture at SRJC and will need to be discussed by the whole senate as part of a larger discussion about guiding principles.

College Council April 25: The Council held a meeting that was time-shifted to accommodate attendance and was scheduled for a shorter period of time than usual. At this meeting we focused on reviewing a proposal from VP of Finance and Administrative Services, Kate Jolley, on the reorganization of the District Access, District Facilities Planning, District Safety and Health, Parking and Transportation into a single shared governance committee called District Facilities Advisory Committee. The “Parking” portion of Parking and Transportation would go to the new advisory committee, and “Transportation” would move over to the Sustainability Committee. Council members shared some initial feedback, and this proposal will go out to the committees concerned for their input. There was confusion on the part of some faculty, as the District Accessibility Committee was given to understand the proposal would be voted on by College Council this year – this is not the case, as noted earlier the proposal will now go out to these committees for input. Other comments regarding the Facilities-related committees concerned the difference in physical vs. digital accessibility. A council member asked that charges of all committees be diagrammed and show where they’ll go to in new configuration, and questioned whether 1.5 hours month for consolidated committee was enough, also concern that # of students, faculty, and classified rep would be overall lower though admin not, also not sure District Health and Safety, as suggested, is all negotiations-related, as there is more than working conditions involved, it also covers disaster planning and other topics that are outside of negotiated items, and when pandemic began District H&S ceased meeting without members being informed.

Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) April 24: Though not a member of CRC, I attended this meeting because there is a possibility that a matter discussed and voted on may come to the AS later, and I wanted to be well-informed. The CRC heard debate from two departments, Computer Studies and Business Administration, regarding the proposed new course CS 57.12: Applied Social Media. Following open forum debate where concerns over disciplinary overlap took place, the course was reviewed, several changes were made, and the committee voted to approve.

Planning and Budget Council (PBC) April 24: Topics on the agenda for this PBC meeting included an update on our Accreditation response, an update on the Enrollment Management Plan implementation, review of two grants: Title V HSI/CCAMPIS and Rising Scholars Network Juvenile Justice, follow up on the “What we’re not going to do anymore” survey, an update on the “P2 FTES (related to second round of estimated funding for the California Community Colleges following revised FTES numbers), review of [ACCJC Annual Reports](#), and discussion of Leading and Lagging Indicators for Institutional Outcomes. During the meeting questions arose regarding some of the District’s financial information. It may not be clear to all, but information related to our department of Finance and Administrative Services such as [budget updates and fiscal reports](#) or [spending of the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund \(HEERF\)](#) is publicly available from the [department’s homepage](#).

Department Chair Council/Instructional Managers (DCC/IM) April 18: First, revised language for the Professional Growth Increment (PGI) article of the faculty contract was presented by PGI Committee Chair Mark Anderman. This is on our agenda so I won’t spoil the news by giving it here. Mark did emphasize that the committee tried hard to propose revisions that would make the PGI process simpler and fairer. The committee’s faculty members all quit several years ago as an objection to the then state

of the article, and the new members recognized there were PGI applications out there deserving to be addressed. At DCC/IM there was also a presentation on Program Review Planning Process by Dr. Smotherman (Office of Institutional Effectiveness). Senators Avasthi and Schmidt gave a short presentation on Accreditation and progress regarding Student Learning Outcomes. Dean Josh Adams gave an update on enrollment, where we are seeing a slight increase in enrollment this semester. He cautioned that the accurate number won't be attainable until after the semester ends and ADA (average daily attendance) classes (those that don't have regular weekly schedules or have open entry/exit) are calculated. VP of Academic Affairs Robert Holcomb and I presented briefly on the next Educational Master Plan (EMP)— we have drafted a proposed timeline and initial steps for development of SRJC's next EMP. This will be coming to the Academic Senate as we begin development of a proposed new plan.

Reassigned Time Request Referred to All Faculty Association (AFA):

Your Academic Senate Exec Committee (ASEC) has put forward a request for additional reassigned time for the ASEC members. As part of this negotiation effort all members of ASEC were asked for and supplied a work study giving an average of the total hours each of us devote to Academic Senate work. That work study has been submitted and AFA will take the request back to the negotiating table. The ASEC, in an effort to make the work of the AS more equitable and thus attractive to a wider segment of the faculty, seeks to establish compensation that reflects the amount of time and effort required to be diligent and productive. The current reassigned time for ASEC officers is as follows: 80% for the AS President, and an additional 80% to be distributed among the rest of the ASEC. We currently have no president-elect (that position officially begins at the start of the fall semester) nor past-president serving, so the 80% is distributed with 20% to the Vice President, 20% to the Executive Secretary, and 10% each to the at-large, equity, and associate members of exec. The remaining 10% has been assigned to Secretary Stover to compensate for his work as leader of the Guided Pathways initiative this academic year.

Guided Pathways Update:

The Guided Pathways multi-constituent work group you all recommended be formed was brought together by Dr. Chong and completed its assignment. The group created a proposal which you'll hear a brief report about at our meeting May 3rd. The proposal was shared with Dr. Chong and his cabinet. In my regular 1:1 meetings with Dr. Chong, he shared with me that he has decided to hold off on any further Guided Pathways work until our new Superintendent/President Dr. Garcia takes office. I very much look forward to the Academic Senate collaborating with Dr. Garcia to implement Guided Pathways at SRJC. She has vast productive experience in this area which should prove helpful here.

Faculty Hiring Procedure (4.3.2P):

As you all know, we concluded our revision of this procedure at our March 15th meeting. I delivered this document to Vice President of Human Resources, Gene Durand and President Chong on March 30th. At that time I advised them of the Academic Senate's timeline, and asked that if there are any suggestions for substantive revision that the District notify me by the morning of April 14th, so that we can bring the item back to the Academic Senate for consideration and in time to be reviewed again and submitted to you by April 25th for inclusion on your May 9th meeting. I have since heard from Vice President of Human Resources, Gene Durand, that he and his team have reviewed the proposed procedure, and

need to suggest some changes. I requested that he meet with the Academic Senate Executive Team to discuss this, invited him to join us at one of our regular Thursday morning meetings, or to recommend another time that works for him. Once the date for our meeting has been established and we have met we can determine if the requested changes are substantive enough to require the Academic Senate to be consulted again, or if the procedure is ready to move forward to the Board of Trustees.

Faculty Equivalency Committee (FEC) April 14:

The FEC met on April 14th and at this meeting finished working on an outline of the process for Equivalency Cases. The committee and voted to approve the outline. The FEC also discussed offering a Flex workshop in the Fall 2023 semester, after Faculty Staffing decisions are made but before departments begin the hiring process, at which time we can review the process and clarify all things Equivalency for the college community. The committee spent 3 meetings revising this document, with an effort to both make our process more expedient and equitable. We have a couple more related documents to update – this work was begun under the tenure of past President Thompson and will continue this spring and into the fall. I am pleased to see that almost all FEC members have signed up to serve on this committee again next year, which will facilitate quicker progress on the remaining work. I want to thank Sarah Hopkins of HR for her assistance and support in this effort.

Program Review, Evaluation, Revitalization and Discontinuance (aka the 3.6) Committee:

First, let me dispel a misunderstanding I recently learned of: This committee is often referred to as the “3.6 Committee” not only because the name is shorter than the official one (!), but because it refers to Board Policy and Procedure 3.6. Apparently some members of our college community thought this was referring to a section of the Program Review Planning Process (PRPP) – it does not.

The 3.6 committee looked at a wide variety of cases which came through for their regular 6-year review. VP of Finance and Administrative Services Kate Jolley, after consultation with legal counsel, informed me that this committee falls under the Brown Act, as we make recommendations regarding academic programs (to the Vice President of Academic Affairs). The committee thus met in person during the spring semester, and our AA Natalia has set up a web page for the committee. Current chair Mark Anderman and I are working to edit and prepare our meeting notes (programs reviewed and decisions made) and these will be posted to the committee’s new webpage along with information regarding its charge, members, and meetings. There is a large backlog of programs of study needing our attention next academic year. This was not brought to our attention until we were most of the way through the current cycle of programs up for review this year. In addition, SRJC has had a practice of reviewing all programs only once every 6 years, but Career Education (CE) programs are supposed to be reviewed every 2 years. This will need to be discussed in various spaces and our process will probably need to change. Finally, a faculty member expressed concern that CE programs are looked at differently than others (often referred to as “transfer” programs) and that CE programs are not treated well. This was the reason that I recently emailed department chairs to urge faculty involved in CE programs to apply to serve on committees, councils, and the Academic Senate in general. When I was elected president-elect of this body, I immediately reached out to Dean Brad Davis to start improving my understanding and appreciation of CE programs, as it has been my observation that they do not always get the attention deserved.

I encourage you all, no matter your discipline, to consider putting your name forward to serve on committees and councils here at SRJC. Only with a larger, deeper pool of faculty to choose from can we actually make progress in improving inclusion, enhancing awareness, and increasing transparency in our work. Over the past three years we have hired a large number of new faculty here at SRJC, and I look forward to the new ideas and contributions they make as they step into college service.