Faculty Leadership Positions in Educational Services at District Office

Right before Thanksgiving, VC of HR Dena Rhoades sent a message to all faculty in the district to become part of a group advancing the work of student success through the Office of Educational Services at the District Office. Faculty would provide paid leadership for the areas of Guided Pathways, Early College and Transfer, and Innovation & Development as a test pilot for a restructuring of the Office of Educational Services (OES). The VC of Ed Svcs John Means is retiring this year, so Chancellor Sonya Christian is looking to use this transition time for exploring a restructuring of OES. It is hoped that a restructured OES will foster greater inter-college collaboration, idea-generation and dialogue to move the Guided Pathways, Early College, and Transfer work to the next level. However, we don’t know what that restructured OES looks like yet. That is what the group is going to develop in the Spring 2022 semester. Faculty would be hired to work with Rhoades, Means, and Associate Vice-Chancellor of Economic and Workforce Development Trudy Gerald in restructuring OES. Not only would faculty be acting as paid consultants, they would be providing administrative leadership for those areas while developing the job descriptions/duties of possible permanent positions.

A similar sort of process was used in developing the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at BC several years ago. Before we brought Craig Hayward to BC, biology faculty member Janet Fulks had release time to act as our institutional researcher, train the first data coaches, and develop the job description/duties of the head of the OIE that was being developed. I don’t recall if she transitioned to management during that development process or if she remained as faculty.

Chancellor Christian wants to get faculty plugged into these leadership roles by the start of Spring 2022 semester, so that faculty could use the OES restructure leadership assignment as part of their load. Because these are paid leadership assignments, they would go through the KCCD hiring process instead of being appointed by the Academic Senate. In order to meet the Spring semester start deadline and provide department chairs+deans time to find instructors to fill the classes previously assigned to the faculty member who wants to help with the OES restructure and get applications of intent submitted before the crush of finals and the end of the semester, the application deadline is set to Friday, December 3.

Among the unknowns are the criteria that will be used to hire the faculty consultants, how many faculty will be hired for the OES restructure and who will be on the panel evaluating the applications. The faculty on the panel will probably be the Senate Presidents since the panel would be working after semester’s end but would that exclude them from applying for the OES restructure group? The Senate Presidents will be meeting with VC Means on December 9 to work out more of the details.

**Districtwide Budget Committee December 3+17**

The sub-committees that worked on different parts of the internal budget allocation model have reviewed their pieces of the BAM proposal document. We’ll discuss the feedback at the Dec 3 meeting. Also, we’ll be looking over the District Administrative Unit Review reports. The Districtwide Budget Committee will also be meeting on December 17. (I just love meetings!)

**Enrollments for Spring 2022 Semester**

Enrollments are really down. Take a look at your Spring 2022 classes to see how they’re filling. If you can help encourage students to complete their educational goals by registering for spring semester, that’d be great. Let them know that there is a lot of help available for advising through the Student Information Desk and A LOT of free financial aid available for any BC
student. Many students registering for Spring semester may be running into obstacles that they didn’t have for Fall registration such as filling out the update form, financial aid holds, and needing to be vaccinated. SID and the financial aid virtual lobby could address those concerns/problems.

**Action Items on Senate Agenda**

Some items on the Senate agenda do not have a first read/second read: the minutes and items on the consent agenda such as the standing committee appointments, screening committee appointments, and committee charges. Other items that may not have a first/second read would be time-sensitive items requiring action before the next regularly-scheduled Senate meetings. Recent examples of these have included the nomination of Andrea Thorson to the ASCCC Executive Committee member-at-large, the Education Department’s nomination of its online teaching program for the Exemplary Program Award, and today’s resolution to continue Zoom meetings as required by SB 361.

Proposals for changes in policies+procedures or other 10+1 matters have first/second reads unless the change is considered by the Senate President (with the advice of the Executive Board) to be a minor non-controversial tweak or the language for a very similar item had already been worked out in previous meetings. An example of the first exception is the Budget Decision-Making Criteria approved at the Nov 17 meeting in which one word was inserted in a document that has been reviewed by the Senate annually for the past ten or so years. An example of the second exception is the screening committee membership criteria approved at the Nov 17 meeting which incorporated language approved for the standing committee membership criteria.

However, in the cases where a first read item that is not time-sensitive is listed as an action item, the Senate always has the option to hold off voting. The Senate can choose to postpone action to the next meeting. If the item is listed as a discussion item, then the Senate has no flexibility to vote in the exception cases listed above. In the case of the screening committee membership criteria, the wording for how the Senate would include Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in its decision-making of committee memberships had been worked out with the Standing Committee membership criteria and approved by a nearly unanimous vote at the November 3rd meeting. Other criteria in the screening committee membership were either ones used for years by the Senate or were from Board Policy. For those reasons, the Senate was given the option to approve the screening committee criteria at the first read. I advised the Senate that it could choose to postpone action to the following meeting and I gave the rationale for why the item was listed as an action item even though it was a first read. After an amendment to improve the grammar of one sentence, the screening committee criteria were approved by 92% of the voting members which indicates that the Senate was indeed ready to take action on the item. In the case of the Budget Decision-Making Criteria, I advised the Senate again that it could postpone to December 1 if it wanted. The Senate approved it unanimously with zero debate—the Senate was indeed ready to act on the criteria.

We will have a discussion item about action items on our February 2 agenda.