Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

October 4, 2019 (Convened at 9:05 am) in DLC Rm #8 (Weed Campus)

Attendees: 23 full-time faculty members in attendance

(Jayne Turk took notes, and I apologize for any errors!)

A. No Public Comment

B. Action / Discussion Items
   a. Participatory Governance - Maria Fernandez moved, Jenny Heath seconded to
discuss the proposed resolution. With minor changes, the motion was approved
with 22 ayes and 1 abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 am

Resolution:

**College of the Siskiyous Academic Senate Resolution: Participatory Governance**

WHEREAS: Board Policy 2510 states, “The Board is the ultimate decision-maker in those areas assigned to it by state and federal laws and regulations. In executing that responsibility, the Board is committed to its obligation to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended policies for Board action and administrative procedures for action by the Superintendent/President under which the District is governed and administered;”

WHEREAS: BP Policy 2510 further states, “The Board or its designees will consult collegially with the Academic Senate, as duly constituted with respect to academic and professional matters, as defined by law. Procedures to implement
WHEREAS: AP 2510 states, “It is the policy of the Board of Trustees, in the spirit of collegial consultation, to ensure the District provides for timely communication between the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and students. Further, the Board of Trustees, while retaining ultimate authority as defined by federal and state law and local regulation, seeks to give reasonable consideration to the concerns and opinions of constituent groups at the campus level and to share information with these groups;”

WHEREAS: AP 2510 further states, “Standing committees of each unit or area will be consulted as appropriate and an attempt to reach consensus will be made before advancing a recommendation to the Superintendent/President and then to the Board;”

WHEREAS: The charge of the Institutional Planning and Budget (IPB) Committee is to ensure sound fiscal practices and cost control recommendations that align with the college’s data-driven planning and through the creation, review and recommendation of...budgets in an effort to meet the institution’s short and long-term goals;

WHEREAS: The IPB’s charge has been intentionally thwarted by the Board’s designee in a conscious attempt to remove faculty from their designated roles in creating, reviewing, and recommending budgets in the effort to meet the institutions short and long-term goals:

- By providing the final budget to IPB members less than 10 hours before they were required to vote on that budget, which did not allow faculty representatives adequate time to review, discuss, disseminate, and communicate the budget to their constituents before the vote, effectively
rendering the participatory governance process into a rubber-stamping exercise;

- By stating in an email to IPB members that “[o]nce the final budget is approved, budget managers and leadership exercise their judgment and fiscal responsibilities in responsibly expending those budgeted funds,” and further stating that once IPB recommended the budget for 19-20, “it is now up to the appropriate budget managers and campus leaders to effectively and efficiently implement the approved budget.” (See Appendix A)

- By unilaterally implementing new budget processes and approvals that create roadblocks to student learning, increase institutional inefficiencies, and prevent budget managers from “effectively and efficiently” implementing their approved budgets. Furthermore, these processes and approvals were implemented without input from participatory governance groups.

WHEREAS: The Board’s Designee has over the past three years failed to rely on the Academic Senate in matters related to 10+1, has failed to revise and implement the campus participatory governance model, and has failed to communicate the rationale to constituent groups when decisions are made counter to participatory governance group recommendations;

WHEREAS: The consequences of the above include:

- The creation of yet another deficit budget in spite of increased General Fund revenues;
- A campus climate in which faculty feel disenfranchised and that their expertise is dismissed;
- Non-data-driven decision making that lacks transparency.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the COS Academic Senate formally requests that the Board exercise its power, authority, and most importantly, its responsibility in directing its sole employee, the college President, to create, implement, and adhere to participatory governance processes that uphold COS
Board policies, Administrative procedures, and the laws and regulations governing the California Community College system.

Appendix A-Text of Email to IPB Committee

Good afternoon,

As a matter of practice, when positions open that have budgeted funding the hiring authorities do a job/task analysis to ensure the current position is vital, cannot be reassigned or subsumed, and remains an integral part of the College’s vision and mission. There is nothing “automatic” about the filling of vacated positions and/or budgeted positions. As far as position control, that process – when fully implemented – rests in the budget building process to ensure that each position is identified within our District budget and has proper identification of funding sources. Once the final budget is approved (like the one IPB reviewed and recommended for the current fiscal year in August), budget managers and leadership exercise their judgement and fiscal responsibilities in responsibly expending those budgeted funds.

Last year, during a challenging budgetary period, I announced a hiring and travel freeze for the College. It was at that time all open positions – including previously budgeted and funded positions – were taken to IPB for recommendations. I heard many concerns about that process, even though the necessity for it was apparent to those of us responsible for monitoring the District’s finite resources. Many were relieved that the freeze was lifted at the start of this fiscal year, empowering budget managers to performing their appropriate due diligence on fiscal expenditures to achieve programmatic and operational goals that enable the College to maintain a capacity to enroll students and generate valuable FTES that forms the basis of our state apportionment.

There is a long-standing misunderstanding (generously stated, since I believe most do very clearly understand these distinctions) about the various funding available to the District – how in some ways the District is “resource-rich” while in other areas we are “resource-poor” – and the distinctions between positions that are temporary vs. permanent as well as those that are genuinely “new” positions vs. those positions that have either previously existed or have been mandated by categorical funding by the state. The clarification provided by HR on the different hiring pathways contained within our hiring practices has been useful in lessening those misunderstandings.

At this time, the College has implemented safeguards and checks and balances to closely monitor our budget expenditures – including those for personnel. The College leadership appreciates IPB’s role last
spring in hearing the budget proposals and recommending the budget for this year that was approved by the Board earlier this month. It is now up to the appropriate budget managers and campus leaders to effectively and efficiently implement the approved budget.

Best Wishes,

Stephen

Stephen Schoonmaker, Ed.D.

Superintendent - President | President's Office

College of the Siskiyous