Academic Senate President's Report
Wednesday, 19 February 2025 / John A Stover III, PhD

Welcome back, everyone. I hope everyone had a wonderful, long weekend away from the daily grind, and that your week in return has been as smooth as we can hope during these late days of winter. I have focused today's report primarily on two topics: our Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) Action Item and the Senate Reapportionment Discussion. First, GenAI which includes a new set of resources today.

Following the last Senate meeting, the Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASEC) and I conducted a detailed analysis of the taskforce's recommendations as cross referenced with the library's suggestions (and intro to). After a week of detailed discussion and analysis (which you can view here), we identified four meta-themes representing the many different recommendations and suggestions contained within the original documents and have been the basis of our previous discussions:

- **Recommendation for policy work to explicitly address Generative Artificial Intelligence in relevant Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs)**
- **Recommendations for work specific to faculty professional development needs**
- **Recommendation for the establishment of a GenAI Committee**
- **Recommendation that the Library is explicitly included anytime key constituents are called to take on GenAI work and committees**

These meta-themes represent actionable recommendations the Academic Senate could initiate on GenAI and in support of the Senate's 10+1 responsibilities when making recommendations on academic and professional matters specific to policy development and implementation matters (*also see 10+1 infographic on p3*). The meta-themes also provide "buckets" or "containers" in which the many ideas and suggestions of **both** the taskforce **and** the library can efficiently and effectively be moved forward.

One thing we noticed in conducting the crosswalk was the complicated nature of integrating the taskforce's original recommendations with the library's follow up suggestions. This was also made clear in our struggle to move forward in an actionable manner at our last meeting (on Feb. 5th). *ASEC, in carrying out our mission "to plan and coordinate the work of the Senate" (see Senate Bylaws Article III, Section 3.C) sees these meta-themes as a tool for organizing our recommendations clearly, effectively, and efficiently.*

With all of that said, we have thirty [30] minutes dedicated to this action step today so that Senators have ample time to discuss and consider these four potential actionable recommendations. I look forward to your contributions and ideas, and as I mentioned at the Board and at PDA, I do hope we decided to take action sooner rather than later.

Second, our discussion today on Senate Reapportionment also deserves some additional context. First, thanks again to the taskforce members for their recommendations as previously discussed and included in our support materials. In their report, they settle on Option Two and the Huntington-Hill Method, which would, in effect, involve rearranging areas into similar fields and then, sequentially by size, assigning Senators proportionately based on population. ***Such a move would create an equity issue amongst contract faculty in that larger departments would have more Senators, and smaller departments would have fewer.*** Also, ARTICLE VII, Section 1 of our Bylaws state, in part *"Each contract faculty area will have two representatives"* *and given the inequity that has already been pointed out in our associate representative areas (more on that below), I suggest Senators think carefully of these implications before proceeding.*

Second, I recently had our Senate AA review our distribution list counts, which are currently sitting at (*note that Areas One thru 11 each have TWO Senators*)…

- Area 01 = 39 faculty or 19.5 faculty members represented per senator
- Area 02 = 49 or 24.5 per senator
- Area 03 = 31 or 15.1 per senator
- Area 04 = 27 or 13.5 per senator
- Area 05 = **55** or 27.5 per senator
- Area 06 = 30 or 15 per senator
- Area 07 = 33 or 16.5 per senator
- Area 08 = **21** or 10.5 per senator
- Area 09 = 26 or 13 per senator
- Area 10 = 50 or 25 per senator
- Area 11 = 30 or 15 per senator
- **Area 12 = 801 with three senators and 267 associates per senator**
- **Area 13 = 419 with three senators and 139.67 associates per senator**

Areas One thru Eleven vary between **21** contract faculty (*at the low end*) and **55** contract faculty (*at the high end*).[1] *There are minor adjustments we could make to bring these closer into alignment, and that work is overdue.*

The clearest problem, as already discussed in previous senate meetings, **is the imbalance in Areas 12 and 13 specific to associate faculty.** *One solution would be to add "Area 14" as a new, third associate area of representation and redistribute accordingly* so associate representative areas each have two senators with around 406 faculty per area and 203 per Senator. *This would require recommending to our Constitution and Bylaws workgroup that they*

---

[1] Also consider the mean [35.5], median [31], and mode [30] of Areas One thru Eleven

update those documents accordingly for formal review by the appropriate parties (*e.g., Senators vote on changes to bylaws, and all eligible faculty vote on constitution changes*). An advantage of this approach, should Senators wish to take it, would align associate representation with contract representation (*in terms of two senators per area*) as well as resolve the current imbalances in Areas 12 and 13. I look forward to our discussion.

I want to end with gratitude for the leadership of the All Faculty Association - particularly President Anne Donegan and Chief Negotiator and Senator K. Frindell Teuscher - our Executive Secretary Laura Aspinall, and Vice President Monica Ohkubo for their collaborative spirit and engaged discussions both within and across the proverbial aisle of our purviews, as well as; all members of ASEC for their heavy lift and critical engagement in preparing this week's agenda and support materials. We have entered a new chapter of Senate and AFA relations, and I'm deeply grateful for the foundation that Past President Nancy Persons provided for the launch of our current slate of activities. I was talking with a colleague this past weekend who mentioned they did not think the Senate was as proactive or productive as the AFA, and I reminded that colleague that change takes time, and that this year we've been more engaged and action-oriented than in previous years and particularly in comparison to the lockdown-days of the pandemic. This weekend I also received an email from a contract faculty member who was wondering if there were any Senator vacancies and expressed a desire to join us! This is an exciting time to be a part of the Academic Senate. I'm so glad you are all here and that we're the topic of conversation amongst our peers who are interested in our actions and eager to join us at the table.

ACADEMIC SENATE
for California Community Colleges

Title 5 §53200 (b): Academic Senate means an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters. In Section 53200 (c), "Academic and professional matters" means the following policy development and implementation matters:

1 Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines

2 Degree and certificate requirements

3 Grading policies

4 Educational program development

5 Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success

6 District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles

7 Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports

8 Policies for faculty professional development activities

9 Processes for program review

10 Processes for institutional planning and budget development

+1 Other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.