

## Academic Senate President's Report

December 7, 2016

### *AFA/Senate Dialogue*

The AFA/Senate Meeting took place on November 30, 3:00-5:00 at AFA's New Headquarters at 437 Elliott. The discussion was dominated by the topic of Measure H and the 2030 plan.

#### Highlights of the Conversation:

A great deal of discontent, and disaffection has been expressed about the "2030" Plan, and the spending of the Measure H money. One thing that was suggested was that an all faculty forum be called and that an outcome might be a vote of no confidence in the 2030 Plan process. Further discussion pointed out that not all faculty are equally disaffected. The process and the shape of the priority list suits some departments well, and faculty in those departments are satisfied with their inclusion in the process and the outcome. But the fact remains that some feel very left out and that the inclusion of faculty was more apparent than real. Therefore, it was agreed, we want to have an all faculty forum, but cast it broader than just Measure H. There are many concerns on the horizon that threaten to compromise faculty voices in shared governance. Concerns include local practices of making institutional decisions without a thorough inclusion of the faculty, such as the farming out the Bookstore; statewide themes include the new Chancellor's emphasis on Guided Pathways and the Completion agenda, and nationally President-Elect Trumps nomination for Education Secretary is at least problematic.

#### Planned Action

It was decided to call a meeting, a forum, inviting all faculty. The suggested date was Jan 27, early in the new semester, a Friday, in the morning, 9:00-11:00.

### *The Promise*

A Promise Task Force was convened and produced the basic contours of what our version of The Promise will be. Following that, a panel has formed to write a grant application for the following grant:

#### **"California College Promise Innovation Grant Program**

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is pleased to announce the creation of the *California College Promise Innovation Grant Program*. The 2016-17 Budget appropriated one-time funding in the amount of \$15 million, to support colleges interested in implementing new or expanding existing College Promise programs. Generally speaking, College Promise programs are partnerships which align local K-12 school districts, community colleges, and public university segments to provide clear pathways for students to follow in order to achieve their educational goals. In addition, a successful program should also improve college readiness, access, and the overall success of its participants." --From the Chancellor's Office RFA

The contours of the SRJC Promise are being still being developed. A recent draft blurb reads thus:

“Since 1950 the **Frank P. Doyle and Polly O’Meara Doyle Scholarship Fund** has distributed over \$82 million to assist more than 125,000 SRJC students. As the College nears its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary, the Santa Rosa Junior College Doyle Promise will continue to build on SRJC’s long-standing commitment to make higher education accessible in Sonoma County. All eligible high school and re-entry students will receive financial assistance [and guided pathways]<sup>1</sup> to successful completion of their education at Santa Rosa Junior College and beyond.” Note again, this is a draft.

The proposed name “Doyle Promise” recognizes the beneficence of the Doyle family and the main source of funding for the students coming straight from high school. The glitch is that we are seeking to include “re-entry” students, i.e., students who have attended SRJC, amassed units enough to be near a degree or certificate, that we hope this promise will entice back to complete their degree or certificate.

### *The Brown Act*

Since our last meeting, I have learned a lot about the Brown Act. Some highlights:

- The agenda must be posted in physical form 72 hours prior to the meeting in a place accessible to the public 24/7. This last part we have not been doing but will do hereafter.
- Adding items for discussion or action to the agenda after the 72 hour posting deadline is a violation of the BA except in extreme circumstances. We did this, of course, in our last meeting. Whether our action would survive the criteria for extreme circumstances or not, I’m not sure. I have no regrets, but in this current climate,<sup>2</sup> we must be very careful and play by the book. Local Academic Senates have been sued over BA violations. So in the future, we must be very careful, and generally avoid moving items on to the agenda at the meeting not on the published agenda.
- Voting members of the body (i.e. all senators) and its officers (i.e. the president, past-president or president elect), may not comment on, discuss, or give an opinion on an item given in open forum (!). This also applies to all items covered in reports. Clarifying questions may be asked, and information of a factual nature may be contributed, but no discussion and no opinions expressed by anyone having power within the body.

Eric Thompson

---

<sup>1</sup> Disputed phrase

<sup>2</sup> There are already professor “watch lists”; see, for example, <http://www.commondreams.org/news/2016/11/30/chilling-professor-watchlist-aims-expose-leftist-educators>