



Office of the President

To: Members of College Council
From: Lloyd Holmes, President
Date: April 18, 2022
Subject: Response to College Council Regarding Shared Governance Task Force Recommendation

I begin by thanking members of the Shared Governance Task Force (SGTF) for their year-long work of reviewing our current shared governance model. I know this work was not easy and was not taken lightly. It is evident from the proposal that much thought was taken into advancing the final proposal to College Council.

I also want to express my appreciation for members of College Council for their advancement of the recommendations to me. A part of my responsibility is to take the recommendations from College Council and either accept them wholeheartedly, accept some of the recommendations while not supporting some components of the recommendation, or not accepting the recommendation. If recommendations are not accepted, I certainly should give my rationale for doing so.

In October 2020, a campus-wide survey was distributed which provided questions related to our current structure. These questions related to

1. What is the biggest reason for not participating in shared governance?
2. What works in the current system?
3. What doesn't work in the current system?
4. Ideally, how should shared governance be structured, and how would this "new" structure work in practice? and
5. How should membership be selected?

At the March 2022 College Council meeting, there were several questions that I sought answers to. I also indicated that as I reviewed the proposal, I would be viewing it through the lens of those questions. As I considered the recommendations from College Council, I also wanted to hear from the leaders of our constituency groups. I asked for feedback to the proposal from the faculty senate president, the classified senate co-leaders, and the student government president. This information, in my opinion, was critical as we thoughtfully consider changes that we make moving forward: we should not make change merely for the sake of change. Each of these

leaders provided their thoughts on whether the recommendations addressed the fundamental questions and charge of the task force.

Regarding the recommendation, I wholeheartedly support the establishment of the budget advisory committee. I questioned the lack of such committee at the beginning of my tenure as president. This committee must be responsible for developing a full understanding of the College's budget, with responsibility to sharing the learned information with members of their constituency. Again, it is critical that the four constituency groups along with the unions be represented on this committee.

I support the training, mentoring, attraction, and retention of individuals who participate in shared governance. One must keep in mind mandatory training may require negotiation. Further, more detail regarding the training plan must be developed, which should be determined by College Council or representatives thereof.

One of the questions I asked was: How does the proposed structure streamline our overall governance process while keeping equity at the forefront. I don't see where some of the proposed recommendations address a structure that is suggested to be fractured. Yes, the idea of the Program Allocation Committee (PAC) suggests a more inclusive approach to decision-making. The problems I see, however, are that

- 1) The four areas of membership fail to address equity among the four basic constituency groups at the college: faculty, administrators, classified professionals, and students. Instead, membership is built around senates, unions, administrators, and affinity/equity groups.
- 2) The model clearly relegates senior administrators into ex-officio positions. So, participation in discussions is permissible, yet senior administrators have no vote? This clearly, in the current model, creates inequity.
- 3) Per my understanding of PAC structure, the Instructional Planning and Budget Committee (IPBT), the Student Services Planning and Budget Committee (SSPBT), and the Administrative Planning and Budget Committee (APBT) will be eliminated with the development of the PAC. It's also my understanding that subcommittees will be established to address the issues that have been addressed in the past by IPBT, SSPBT, and APBT. While I most certainly agree that the structure of the PBTs should be reviewed and restructuring should be considered, planning for the specific areas is critical. Instruction must still have a team that focus on program mix; program initiation, expansion, consolidation, and discontinuance; program reviews, etc. Student Services must still have individuals with a focus on program review, annual planning, and program evaluations; development of a comprehensive annual and long-range plan; discussion, establishment, and implementation of consistent decision-making criteria and evaluation priorities concerning budget allocation and resources. Likewise, Administrative Services should/must have individuals that look specifically at issues for the Administrative Services area. As proposed, a purpose of PAC (to eliminate the need for the PBT structure) leads to the development of sub-committees (Program Evaluation Team) that, in essence, do the same work of the PBTs.

- 4) The proposed PAC committee doesn't seem to address issues specific to the current PBT structure, specifically processes for decision-making.
- 5) Monthly meetings of PAC will be insufficient, especially if PAC carries out the outlined duties from the recommendation.

In terms of the current governance handbook, I don't see suggested modifications or a review thereof from the forwarded recommendations, specifically in terms of roles and responsibilities. In my opinion, the recommendations fall short in that there is lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities of all governance groups/committees. How do we prevent overlap in the process? Further, the current recommendations don't address the number of governance groups that currently exist. Should some groups be combined, or even eliminated? The more groups that exist, the more time that's required for decision-making in a participatory fashion. These issues must be addressed by College Council.

In terms of a facilitator for College Council, I don't support this recommendation. Facilitation is a key role of the chair of any committee.

In conclusion, I return to my original questions:

1. What is the biggest reason for not participating in shared governance? This question must still be answered through the work of College Council. Solutions must be sought to provide individuals with the opportunity to participate in our shared governance processes while meeting the demands of job responsibilities.
2. What works in the current system? College Council must work to identify what is currently working and find ways to improve upon that work. Assessment, both qualitative and quantitative, must be used as a tool for continuous improvement of our governance system.
3. What doesn't work in the current system? This question is, to a degree, answered but needs much more investigation. Our current system is not fully broken. Identifying specific areas of opportunity is critical to improvement.
4. Ideally, how should shared governance be structured, and how would this "new" structure work in practice? This is addressed to a degree but must be further developed.
5. How should membership be selected? This question needs to be addressed from the perspective of the four basic constituency groups. A role of the groups themselves should be to determine how they will equitably represent their constituency.

Moving forward, I am asking that College Council have discussions related to my response. I will be discussing actions that we should take immediately at our meeting this week as well as actions that should be taken during the Spring quarter so that we move into the Fall 2022 quarter with new structures in place.

Again, I thank the members of the Shared Governance Task Force for their work, and I look forward to the continued work of College Council in moving a new system of shared or participatory governance forward.