To: Lloyd Holmes, College President
From: Cheryl Jaeger Balm, Academic Senate President and College Council Tri-Chair
CC: Sushini Chand, Classified Senate
Tracy Chung-Tabangcura, Classified Senate
Anahi Ruvalcaba, DASG President
Date: March 28, 2022
Re: **Feedback for President Holmes Regarding the Shared Governance Recommendation from the March 17, 2022, College Council Meeting**

Introduction

This report is organized with two main sections. First is my feedback on the proposal document from the Shared Governance Task Force. Second is my reflection on how this proposal does and does not address the results of the 2020 Shared Governance Survey results. This report was intentionally made in Google Docs so you can use the left hand outline to easily navigate between the sections and topics. This report reflects my personal feedback. While it is informed by conversations I had with many faculty groups over the past six months, it does not represent a unified view from De Anza faculty or the Academic Senate.

Section 1: Feedback on the Proposal

There is much in the proposal that I think is incomplete, but I think it is a good starting point from which to build on. Here are my detailed notes on the document.

Glossary - p. 7

A **Task Force** need not report to the College Council. Any governance group can create a Task Force to report back to them.

I think the phrase **Ex Officio** is being misused (or at least leading to confusion) throughout this proposal. I prefer this be replaced by a **Non-Voting Chair**. e.g. in the College Council, the college president should be a non-voting chair. He is essential in setting the agenda and participating in the meeting, and his administrative assistant is crucial in publishing the agenda and taking minutes, but he should not be the lead facilitator during the meeting, and he should not be voting on recommendations to himself.

Roles and Responsibilities - p. 8

This page is fine, but incomplete. To me, it's not only the roles and responsibilities of the constituent groups that need to be defined, but the roles and responsibilities of the committees, and perhaps of certain individual offices. We need pages, and a website, outlining each governance group, who chairs it, when it meets, and a 1-2 sentence description of its charge, i.e. the **role** of that committee on campus and what decisions or recommendations that committee is **responsible** for. It also makes sense to me to have a separate list of major offices on campus, what committees that office chairs (the **role** of the office), and the **responsibilities** of that office.

Resource Requests - p. 11-13

One of the biggest problems in instruction at De Anza is how ineffective our program review is and how poorly it is utilized in decision-making. One of my top complaints about this proposal is that it seems to do nothing to address that. I am not well-educated on the state of CAS Standards and how they are currently used by SSPBT, but our program review documents need to be completely overhauled and I do not see that addressed anywhere in this proposal.

I acknowledge the rubric on p. 13 as a first attempt by the SGTF at incorporating feedback that such rubrics are necessary, but it needs much more work, and input from equity experts on our campus, to be fully fleshed out. Also, rubrics are not just needed for funding prioritization, including allocation of new positions. **Rubrics are desperately needed for each of our governance groups, to be completed ideally twice a year to assess how well each committee is performing its defined role and responsibilities, how each committee is contributing to De Anza's equity and student success goals, and where each committee has room to grow and improve.** These committee rubrics should be submitted to the College Council and made publicly available.

College Council and the College President - p. 14-15

I'll wait until I get to Proposal 2.0 to address the flow chart here, but I see no reason why the College Council, or any governance group, should need a non-voting facilitator. The tri-chair model has been widely adopted, and we do not need a fourth person to help run meetings. However, I agree that in most committees, including College Council, the Administrative Chair should be non-voting. As I said above, the administrative chair is essential in setting the agenda and being an active participant in the meetings, but the faculty and classified chairs should be empowered to be the facilitators leading the actual meetings, working to make sure everyone feels comfortable speaking up and all voices are heard. This is something I think has been working very well in the College Council in 2021-2022 and should be spread to other governance groups.

I like that it is clearly spelled out on p. 15 that the College President is the final decision-maker on most matters, but I would love a second bullet point on this page stating that the College President is also responsible for reporting back to College Council on the progress/results of their recommendations as well as any recommendations he decided not to execute and why, and it is the responsibility of the College Council members to report these updates back to their constituent groups and to the governance committees which brought forward the recommendation.

It is unclear to me what the fate and membership of the College Council would be under this proposed new governance model. I would guess that it would basically continue as is for the next year, at most, during the transition into the new model, but it may then undergo a significant change in structure based on the needs of the college.

Proposed Shared Governance Model 2.0 - p. 16

I feel that the SGTF became singularly focussed on budgeting and fixing the current PBT model and failed to address redundancies in the broader governance structure at our college. I am disappointed that this document does not anywhere address our current shared governance handbook. I was also hoping that the task force would take the time to research and analyze governance models of a handful of other community colleges around the state, enumerating the pros and cons of each, before launching into the proposal for our own new model.

I will get to the PAC and Budget Committee in a moment, but I would first like to dive briefly into our current Governance Handbook. This handbook lists 19 (!) governance groups.

Unions (3+1)

Three of the listed "governance groups" (ACE, FA, Teamsters) are unions. This is problematic because (1) not all of De Anza's unions are included and (2) I don't think unions are governance groups. As a college, we need to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each union and how they are included in governance, if at all.

The AMA is also listed in the current Governance Handbook. I'm unsure if this is a union or a governance group, but regardless, it appears to be a district-level group. Our new governance model for the college should at least clarify what this group is and how it affects De Anza's governance.

District-Level Governance Groups (1)

One of the listed governance groups (MSA) is actually an FHDA district committee. While this committee does not belong in De Anza's governance flowchart, it is notable that the new governance proposal does not address how, or if, De Anza's governance groups should interact with district-level committees like DDEAC, HRAC, ESAC, DBAC, PCAC and MSA. I am especially concerned about how the budget / planning governance groups at De Anza would interact with DBAC, since there currently seems to be a lack of communication between college and district budgeting decisions.

Required committees (3+1)

Academic Senate, Curriculum (reporting to Academic Senate) and DASG are all required and do not, in my opinion, need to be addressed at all in the new proposal. I would also include the Classified Senate in this group, although it would be worth clarifying who the Classified Senate reports to. I assume it is the FHDA Board of Trustees, just like it is for the Academic Senate and DASG.

Facilities and Technology groups (3)

The current Governance Handbook lists the three related groups, Campus Center Advisory Board, Campus Facilities, and Technology Committee, but omits a fourth group, the Online Advisory Group. The new proposal condenses these down to two committees, but I would like to see them condensed down to a single committee with a clear charge, and subcommittees as necessary.

Equity and Institutional Planning (3)

The current Governance Handbook lists the College Planning Committee, EAC and SLO Steering Committee. The new proposal renames the CPC the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and omits the SLO Steering Committee. I'm not sure if this omission was an oversight of the SGTF, or a recommendation to eliminate this committee. Regardless, I would like to see the EAC and SLO steering committee combined with the new Institutional Effectiveness Committee since equity and learning outcomes should be at the heart of all of our institutional planning. I also would like to see a clear definition of the role and responsibilities of each of our affinity groups, how they are incorporated in our institutional and equity planning, and how they inform and interact with district-level groups like MSA and DDEAC+HRAC.

Budgeting, Planning and Resource Allocation (4)

The remaining four committees listed in the current Handbook are the three PBTs and College Council. I've addressed the College Council already, and I'll say more about the PBTs, plus the Budget Task Force / Advisory Committee, below.

Current Handbook Analysis Summary

In summary, of the 19 groups listed in the current handbook, 5 should be removed because they are unions and/or district-level groups. Of the 14 remaining, I propose:

- 4 remain unchanged: Academic Senate, Curriculum, DASG and Classified Senate
- 3 (or 4)➡️1: Campus Center Advisory Board, Campus Facilities, Technology Committee (and the unlisted Online Advisory Group) are consolidated to a single committee
- 3➡️1: College Planning Committee, SLO Steering Committee and EAC are consolidated to a single Institutional Effectiveness Committee
- 4➡️3: The three PBTs are consolidated to the PAC, which will, for now, work together with the Budget Advisory Committee and College Council. Under the current proposal, the three PBTs become one, the College Council is unchanged, and the Budget Task Force is made permanent, rearranging four groups (3 PBTs + CC) into three (PAC, Budget Advisory and CC). Eventually, if there are still redundancies, two or even all three of these committees might be further consolidated

This condenses 14 governance groups into nine, addressing one of the major complaints that there are too many committees and too much time spent in meetings on this campus.

PAC and Budget Advisory Committee - p. 16-18

I'll start with my thoughts on the descriptions on p. 17-18, then return to the proposed composition of the PAC on p. 16.

I really like the mission statement of the PAC, although I don't know what ICC stands for. In particular, I like that the mission spells out that the PAC would be a centralized place with representatives from all constituent groups that oversees **planning** and **resource needs**. This contrasts with the BAC, whose mission is to oversee and report out on the **budget process**.

Currently our PBTs are way too large and their members are severely undertrained. I served for years on IPBT and routinely felt I was not given enough information to make an informed decision on resource allocation. The PAC is a centralized place where a group approximately the size of IPBT can make well-informed and holistic decisions on the greatest needs around the entire campus. It allows for a comprehensive and integrated viewpoint rather than siloing instruction, student services and facilities and pitting them against one another. I know one concern is if e.g. IPBT takes four weeks to make a single decision, how will PAC ever get anything done, but I think this is an inaccurate comparison. The problems with IPBT and SSPBT (I know almost nothing about how APBT operates, so I will not speak to that committee) is that meetings are poorly run, non-administrative chairs lack real power, members are underprepared because agendas are set at the last minute, and training for new members is nonexistent. Under the proposed new model, the PAC members can be fully educated in the needs across the entire college, while the BAC members can be fully educated in the district and college budget and funding sources. As someone described it, the BAC understands the money available and the PAC understands the additional purchases or changes we need to make in how we spend it.

Regarding the membership of PAC, here's the current proposal, sorted into the four constituent groups. Note that there are 24 total members.

- **Administrators:** 3 VPs + 3 additional administrators = 6
- **Faculty:** 3 + 1 from FA = 4
- **Classified:** 3 + 3 from various unions = 6
- **Students:** 4
- **Unknown:** 4 total from EAC and affinity groups (I'm not counting MSA because that is a district-level committee and I do not think it should be represented on PAC)

I recommend the following changes, noting that equal representation would be six members from each constituent group:

- **Students:** Students are underrepresented on PAC in the current proposal, but I worry about finding more than four students who are interested in and able to serve on the PAC. My suggestions would be to increase to 5-6 student reps, but also allow 1-2 of the "student" member seats to be filled by the DASG Student Advisor(s) and/or employees from the Office of College Life, who would be there to give weight to student voices and lend consistency if students are only about to commit to one-year terms rather than two-year terms. However, this is just my initial thought, and I am keenly interested in learning how DASG feels student voices could be best represented on the PAC

- **Classified:** Keep the number of classified reps at six, but allow them to decide amongst themselves how these seats are filled and what unions are represented, if any.
- **Faculty:** Increase number of seats from four to six, with the recommendation that three of those seats (or more, if needed in future) be reserved for faculty reps from each of the affinity groups, and one seat be reserved for a part-time faculty member. Faculty can decide for themselves if they would also like to designate one seat for FA. Personally, for both classified and faculty, I think it's worth noting that FA, CSEA, ACE and Teamsters are all currently represented on the Budget Task Force, and the BAC seems like the more important place for union representation than the PAC, in my opinion.
- **Administrators (and tri-chair structure):** I think the administration should have equal representation with six seats, but those seats should be assigned to specific roles at the college (or designees of those office holders).
    - The **VPI** and **VPSS** should serve as **non-voting chairs**, as described above, contributing greatly to setting the agenda, etc., but not running the meetings.
    - I think the **VPA** should have a seat, but is there representing the Budget Advisory Committee.
    - Since the VPA will be focussed on the finance side of her job in these meetings, I think the **Director of College Operations** should be the **administrative tri-chair** alongside the **Academic Senate President** and **Classified Senate President** (or their designees).
    - While the remaining two administrative seats could go to deans/managers chosen as the administration sees fit, I think it makes more sense for one to represent the **Institutional Effectiveness Committee** (likely the Dean of Equity or someone from IR) and one the represent the newly-combined **Tech/Facilities Committee**, who hopefully represents online ed among other departments.

Finally, I think there are several vitally important things on p. 17 that are left open-ended and need to be answered now to avoid future misunderstandings.

1. What if members, especially students, can't commit to a two-year term?
2. Are we sure we don't want term-limits; this seems worth discussing?
3. When formal votes are taken, voting processes, voting by proxy, and whether votes are taken as recommendations or binding results must be very clearly spelled out.
4. PAC meetings must be weekly, like IPBT, not monthly.
5. Will Roberts Rules be used? (I hope not!)
6. How are items added to the agenda? When will agendas be posted (I recommend at least 48 hours before the meeting) and when will minutes be posted (I recommend no later than 48 hours after the meeting)? Who or whose office is responsible for posting agendas, sending out meeting invites, taking and posting minutes, etc?

These questions should also be answered for all other shared governance groups before moving forward.

Training and Compensation - p. 19-21

I think a revamped centralized shared governance website is a great idea, and I'm intrigued by the idea of a **"shared governance support committee"** and would like to hear this idea fleshed out further. I think a formal process to inquire/complain about the proceedings of any shared governance meeting, similar to the process set up to protect tenure candidates, would also make people feel empowered and prevent abuse of power by any of the shared governance committee chairs. I think PGA, release time, and stipends for faculty, classified and students (and administrators?) should be seriously considered, and options for compensation and/or other incentives for participation on all committees for all constituent groups should be clearly listed on the centralized shared governance website.

Unfortunately, I think training and mentorship is given lip service in this document, but an actual plan of how this will be executed is absent. I would like to see either the SGTF continue, working solely on this aspect of the proposal, or a new group formed, strongly centering our student voices and campuswide equity practitioners, to put together an executable plan of how new members of all constituent groups can be recruited, trained and mentored in all shared governance groups so that they are not afraid to use their voices and they know how to do so effectively once they have a seat at the table.

Finally, I love the idea in the concluding remarks that, regardless of what new model of shared governance we implement in Fall 2022, that the **Office of Institutional Research** conduct regular campus-wide surveys and focus groups to help us make changes to this first attempt at something better, and that they conduct a full evaluation at the end of the 2022-2023 year so we know what's working and what remains broken in the new model.

Section 2: Regarding the 2020 Shared Governance Survey

Below is the summary of results from the first two pages of the 2020 Shared Governance Survey results, along with my thoughts on which of these results are and are not addressed by this proposal.

Biggest reasons for not participating in shared governance

Survey feedback	Addressed by proposal?	Comments
Lack of time	No	By consolidating several committees, there are fewer meeting hours during the week, but this may only result in people who are participating in shared governance already not having to spend as much time in meetings. This does not necessarily help folks who are too busy with other aspects of their jobs and/or lives to get involved if they weren't involved before. Perhaps clear compensation and/or incentive for involvement would motivate more people to find time to get involved.
Don't feel like they were asked to participate; lack of awareness on what governance entails and how it works	Not really	There is potential for people to become better informed through a revamped central shared governance website, and through better recruitment, training and mentorship, but these concepts are only mentioned and not well fleshed out in the current proposal.

What is working:

Survey feedback	Maintained in proposal?	Comments
• Students are given a voice in the process • Broad-based participation available for every group to be represented	Sort of	There seems to be a lot of thought given to representation and student involvement, but I think it can be much improved.

What does not work:

Survey feedback	**Addressed by proposal?**	**Comments**
Many positions go to the same people; people should serve on only one committee to provide more opportunities	No	
Belief in a lack of transparency; administrators set the agenda	Yes	This is why the proposal is recommending "ex-officio" positions and a centralized PAC
Need for more student voices; students should be at the center of decision making	Sort of	There is a lot in the document about centering students and training/mentoring them, but students are underrepresented in the proposed PAC, and the training piece lacks an actual plan. I would be very interested in hearing from DASG how this could be improved.
Lack of diversity	Yes	Affinity groups ar- well represented in the PAC. However, I think the rubrics that I suggest on p. 2 of this report could help all governance groups know if affinity reps are being heard or being tokenized.
Lack of part-timer incentives to participate; need for compensation for participation including for classified staff	Yes	
Lack of training and onboarding for all groups	Not really	While the lack of training is addressed, there is no clear plan for improvement.

How shared governance would ideally be structured, and how it would work in practice:

Survey feedback	Included in proposal?	Comments
More transparency and communication from the groups	No	Part of the training and onboarding process must include effective two-way communication to and from the groups each committee member represents for all shared governance committees
More faculty representation, responsibility and leadership	Yes?	I'm not exactly sure how to interpret this suggestion from the survey, but I think the ex-officio / non-voting chair model helps increase faculty (and classified) responsibility and leadership.
Clear guidelines on how votes are taken ahead of time	No	This is desperately needed and should be spelled on in the governance handbook and each committee's website
Interest in having one overarching group rather than the separate PBTs	Yes	This is exactly what the PAC is!

How membership should be selected:

Survey feedback	Included in proposal?	Comments
Should be rotated so that everyone participates with term limits	No	This is why I think we should revisit the idea of term limits on PAC (and all other governance bodies) before making a decision
Selected by vote from their constituent groups	Not really	This is why I think faculty and classified should be able to decide for themselves how they will divvy up their six seats each on the PAC
More outreach and recruitment efforts	Not really	Again, this is briefly mentioned near the end of the proposal, but I think much more work needs to be done in fleshing out exactly how shared governance reps will be recruited, trained, mentored and compensated/incentivized
Required training in shared governance	Not really	Training is discussed, but a much more specific plan is needed.

In summary, there is nothing in the proposal that is antithetical to the results of the 2020 survey, but there are many things that are not addressed or that need much more detailed solutions before they can be executed.