

January 14, 2014

Good evening.

As we begin this new year, I'd like to update the BoT on several items relevant to accreditation and the upcoming Superintendent/President search committee.

For the ACCJC Midterm Report, there are eight recommendations, in addition to a commission recommendation, self-identified elements and other information, that will need to be sent to ACCJC in March 2014. Very much like the completion of the November 2013 ACCJC FU Report, the work for the Midterm has truly been a collaborative effort on the part of faculty, classified and administration demonstrating our recognizing that to improve campus climate (rec 4) and show true participatory leadership and governance (rec 7), this monumental task cannot be completed by just one campus constituency. The AS would like to recognize the support and contributions to this endeavor by Mark Clair, Virginia Moran, GH Javaheripour, Peter Allan, and ALO and VPI/SS Peter Maphumulo.

The Academic Senate would also like to commend the following faculty on the Accreditation Steering Committee, who are devoting the Winter Break to this extensive endeavor: Patty Golder, Jessica Gibbs, David Gibbs, Patrick Malone, Tim Adell, Joe Pendleton, Claude Oliver, Tony Bonato, David Oleson, John Sweet and Mary Lynn Doan. We would also like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Jan Espinoza, without whom we would have many logistical challenges, and truly keeps us all up to date with deliverables and other vital information; Victoria Churgin and Annette McComas, who have

helped recover documentation and pointed us in the right direction to find evidence items; and the members of the DEAC, who are assisting with Recommendation 5. Rolando Regino, Lisa Ellis, Marc Skuster and Michele Laveaux have stepped up and provided narrative, examples and evidence of compliance with ACCJC recommendations on Distance Education.

I'd briefly like to discuss the ACCJC recommendation directly related to what we are doing here tonight: Recommendation 8 deals with the role of the BoT at VVC.

In the 2011 ACCJC report, there were several deficiencies noted by the visiting team, including a lack of recognition by the BoT and the campus community at large on the appropriate role of the BoT as a policy making body.

In compiling evidence to demonstrate resolution in this area, the good news is that recommendation 8 can provide the ACCJC with multiple evidence examples. For example, BP 2200 (BoT duties and responsibilities); BP 2430 (delegation of authority to the S/P); BP 2715 (Code of Ethics); and BP 2745 (Self-evaluation) all contribute to demonstrating to ACCJC that the noted 2011 deficiencies have indeed been resolved and will not be an issue in the next cycle of ACCJC evaluation of our institution.

However, there are also some challenges in preparing recommendation 8; some issues discovered so far in this process include: the BoT needs to establish a Board Policy for reviewing, analyzing and updating current Board Policies on a regular basis – many BPs have not apparently been reviewed and updated for

several years; a BP needs to be created and implemented to establish provisions for orientation and professional development for Board members(IV.B.1.f); the BoT needs to establish a Board Policy for Administrative Evaluations in compliance with Educational Code 87663 (although the BoT has a mechanism to evaluate the Superintendent/President, there is no BP reflecting other College administrators); and finally, if the BoT does NOT presently have bylaws, does this document need to be initiated? Our reading of recommendation 8 appears to separate BPs from bylaws. The recommendation 8 team will be coordinating with ALO PM to assist the BoT in addressing these and future evidence items.

But it's also important to note the BoT is related to many of the recommendations we are busily working on. For example, both rec 4 (Campus Climate) and 7 (Leadership and Governance) also relate to the role of the BoT, as well as other groups, on this campus.

As with rec 8, there is both good news and challenges in these recommendations.

In 2011, campus morale was, quite frankly, very low: 77% of the campus community that responded to the 2010 Campus Climate survey stated that they “perceived campus climate as lacking respect, civility, trust”. In addition, “Respondents disagreed that the views of all constituencies are considered in developing recommendations.” The ACCJC recommended many improvements, including “participatory decision-making” and “advocacy by leaders of the needs of their respective constituent groups.” (p. 50)

There is some demonstrable improvement here. For example, there has been inclusion of participation from all campus groups in many levels of campus decision-making, including College Council and Convocation planning. It will no doubt be imperative to survey the VVC campus community soon to truly see how campus climate and the perception of participatory governance have improved...or not.

In Fall 2013, VVC inaugurated the first formal 'Convocation' to meet ACCJC recommendations in these areas. Information on this was included in the 2013 FUR. For Spring 2014, VVCAS listened to CSEA concerns about the Fall 2013 Convocation regarding bringing more campus groups together, and we have made a conscious effort to include workshops appealing to CSEA and administration as well. The goal of convocation, ultimately, is to acknowledge and celebrate both the diverse roles all campus groups play, as well learn from each other and recognize that we all share the same #1 goal: student success, via institution's continuous quality improvement.

This brings me to my final statement of the evening: item 6.2 on tonight's agenda: the composition of the Superintendent/President Search Committee.

AP 7120 3.a.1 details the composition of administrator search committees:

a. Educational Administrator Positions

1) The superintendent/president or designee is responsible for initiating the process in a timely manner. The selection committee shall be comprised of the following required members:

- One (1) educational administrator appointed by the superintendent/president
- One (1) administrator appointed by the management association
- Two (2) faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate President
- Two (2) classified staff members appointed by the CSEA president
- One (1) student member appointed by the ASB president
- The superintendent/president shall appoint the chair of the committee

2) Additional members (including off-campus consultants) may be added to the selection committee.

3) The superintendent/president shall have final approval of the selection committee.

Agenda item 6.2 proposes:

"It is necessary to approve the composition of the following committee members to serve on the Superintendent/President search committee:

1 Chair (Director of Human Resources)

2 Members of the full time faculty

2 Members of the part-time faculty

2 Community members

1 Foundation representative

1 Student representative

2 Classified employees

2 Managers (one classified and one academic)"

For the VVCAS, the designation of full-time and part-time faculty is problematic, due to the vague wording in this agenda item.

As its established role, the AS appoints faculty to serve on all search committees; if 6.2 is meant to continue this, then the AS will appoint *all* faculty, regardless of employment status to this search committee...this goes against past practice of S/P search committees, where AFT had a place at the table; the AS does not think that it is appropriate take away AFT's place. If 6.2 is meant to include AFT selection for this search committee, as it recognizes classified (which is a bargaining unit)...where's CTA, the other faculty bargaining unit, who has also had a place at previous S/P search committees? As I am sure the BoT is well aware, the interests of the AS, AFT and CTA are NOT the same. This recognition of different interests is given to the management appointees in 6.2, one classified, and one academic...acknowledging that all managers are not the same. It's important to note that not all faculty groups will look for the same qualities in our permanent S/P...for example, the AS will be examining candidates in relation to experience in shared governance, dealing with academic and professional matters,

accreditation, etc., as per the 10+1 of the AS. Bargaining groups have other criteria by which they examine candidates.

Therefore, the AS formally recommends that 6.2 be expanded to include 2 CTA reps, 2 AFT reps, and 2 AS reps, as has been the case with previous s/p search committees. If the AS, AFT AND CTA are recognized constituencies for important decision-making bodies such as College Council, shouldn't all these groups be recognized in such an important decision as to who the next S/P will be? I would encourage the BoT to really look at the 2011 ACCJC report and examine how campus climate and leadership/governance were viewed by campus constituencies...do we want to move forward and validate the contributions of *all* groups, or do we wish to move backwards and find ourselves in more accreditation trouble in these areas?

Thank you.

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites.2. Degree and certificate requirements.3. Grading policies.4. Educational program development.5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles.7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes.8. Policies for faculty professional development activities.9. Processes for program review.10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development.11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.