

**I. At the Senate, May 6, 2020**

Last meeting the discussion turned from its intended form, via a resolution from the floor that the process be given more time, by extending the MOU. This had to be amended under the fact that the Senate doesn't produce MOUs, but only consults with AFA for contractual matters within the 10 + 1. Elements of what the senate might ask AFA to negotiate were debated which exposed problems and controversial issues. An amended motion was made and seconded, the upshot of which was that the Senate would ask AFA to negotiate an extension of conditions of the MOU to allow summer work. The question of whether the MOU would be amended to more exactly specify job duties remains controversial, not settled. The motion was tabled.

**II. Investigation**

In the interim, the question of "extending the MOU" was studied and discussed in conversations between ASEC and AFA, and also between ASEC and GP Hubs and Leads. While no one has said it is impossible to extend, the MOU, but its nature, would need more changes than just a change of date, negotiations are very impacted, and there could be no guarantee that the process could be completed in time for summer work to take place. In any case, a new MOU has to be written to cover the next couple of years.

In the meantime, Eric Thompson initiated consultation with President Chong, who in turn consulted with Vice President Jane Saldaña-Talley, about requesting a GP extension from the Chancellor. Being all in agreement, Thompson drafted a letter to the Chancellor to be co-signed by himself and President Chong requesting a two-year extension for SRJC of the deadline to spend GP grant money. The letter is in process. Again, there are no guarantees and it cannot be known to us at this time, when or if the Chancellor will grant our request.

**III. Where that leaves us**

If, as some have expressed, the Senate's action on GP today should be confined to extending the time of inquiry through the summer and into fall, and postponing a detailed discussion of what GP recommendation to design and implement until the fall, the results of that approach will be as follows. We will be, in effect, putting all our eggs in one basket and leaving the basket on the neighbor's porch with a request that the neighbor dye them purple, and walk away.

Leaving it in the hands of negotiations to extend the MOU leaves us with no guarantee or solid footing for anything to take place this summer. It may happen, may not happen, and in any case would be entirely out of the Senate's hands.

**IV. Should the Senate do something NOW with what we have?**

The workgroups are diverse in what they have shown us. Some wish to continue with inquiry, some have concrete recommendations. Some GP items, based on actual words spoken on the Senate floor, seem to be universally acceptable. Others are controversial. Today we could

**A. Survey what has been presented, giving a limited amount of time to each item.**

**B. Take a vote to see where the body is on each item:**

- 1. Yes (we want to see this realized in our college and wish, for the next phase, to specify that this be implemented)**
- 3. Maybe (more inquiry)**
- 4. No (by majority vote, we decide that we are not interested in pursuing this)**

**C. Recommendations with then go to AFA for a new MOU informed by these Senate decisions, the possibility still being open that the new MOU could provide for summer work, if completely in a timely manner. That MOU could then specify which items in the old one are ongoing.**

The latter approach has been the design all along.

So, to simplify . . .

**Decision 1**

