

Good Afternoon President Burns, Trustees, Dr. Chong, and Colleagues,

I would like to begin my report by reading a letter written by the faculty leadership council.

Dear Board of Trustees,

We, the Faculty Leadership Council, are extremely concerned about the reorganization that is taking place as a result of the Early Retirement Incentive program, which itself is a response to an ongoing projected budget deficit. A deficit that is largely due to years' worth of an excessively large administration. If the reorganization is to continue in the manner that it is proceeding, the result will surely be disastrous.

Therefore, we are respectfully asking the College President and Board of Trustees to stop the current reorganization process, put interim solutions in place as needed, and begin the process again, allowing sufficient of time for a holistic and inclusive reimagining of the college that will produce an organizational structure that saves the District money, rebuilds the college's reputation, and returns us to our mission of serving students.

The faculty has identified the following serious problems with the reorganization:

The timeline and process for the reorg is extremely rushed and unclear. We have been told that there will be a study session in advance of next month's board meeting wherein proposals for various parts of the reorg will be presented. To our knowledge, faculty leadership will not be able to see these proposals or give input on them in advance of that session. There is no time or mechanism for us to give meaningful input or have it incorporated into the proposal. To be honest, the entire reorg process thus far has thrown the college community into chaos.

The administration has informed us that the reorg is to be based on a list of principles determined in advance, and to which the faculty was not invited to give input. Furthermore, the faculty largely objects to these principles. The first principle on the list is probably the most egregious -- that the reorg must support the student-centered funding formula. This puts the faculty in the untenable position that in order to have input into the reorg, we must support performance-based funding.

The process for the reorg claims or attempts to be transparent and inclusive, but it is not. Faculty leaders have asked to be at the table from the beginning, but have been kept siloed from administration and from meaningful participation in decision-making. For example, the VPAA is meeting with each individual cluster but it is not clear how that feedback will be combined and incorporated (or shared between clusters), especially in such a short amount of time. It is unclear whether these meetings, called "listening sessions," are intended to give information or receive real input. It also seems that the drafting of the new proposed org charts will not take place with faculty in the room. The result will therefore be a process that on its face may have appeared inclusive, but the result determined behind closed doors and foisted upon the rest of the college community.

There are rumors flying everywhere that make it appear that decisions that have already been made. No attempt has been made to control these rumors. The President's Office has provided minimal, if any, communication about the reorganization to the faculty. The faculty does not trust the process, and once again has found itself facing the "illusion of inclusion."

The faculty leadership requests:

- That necessary interim solutions for immediate vacancies be put in place, but that the reorganization start again with a truly inclusive process. Interim to us means that immediate and critical problems are solved, but that no aspect of the structure be treated as permanent or indefinite. An interim solution should have a certain end date. We object to the idea that a structure could be put in place, only to be "tweaked"

sometime down the road. It is our experience that once a structure has been established, it is exceedingly difficult to unravel it.

- That the faculty leaders be invited to the table where the real conversations about the reorg are taking place. That means meeting with the President's Cabinet, and other key decision-making groups to help draft proposals.
- That none of the 13 upcoming management vacancies be replaced. Our District will still be over the state average for management ratios even if no management vacancy is filled.
- That the number of upper-level administrators, including and especially Vice Presidents be reduced. Overall, we'd like to see a long-term plan to reduce the current total number of administrators by half.
- That the proper care and time be taken to rewrite job descriptions, relieve administrators from performing tasks that are the rightful work of the faculty, and negotiate impacts and effects before a new management structure be put in place. In fact, any change that affects the working conditions of an employee union member must be negotiated in advance.
- That the administration stop repeating the message that it is trying to avoid layoffs. The schedule of classes has been slashed despite the fact that we are receiving funding for more classes than we are offering. Adjunct faculty have been laid off; therefore, layoffs have not been avoided. Yet, we are turning away students from English, Biology, and General Ed requirement classes.

The faculty understands that the purpose of this reorg is to save money and restructure after the Early Retirement Incentive, which itself is an effort to respond to the District's mismanaged budget, which has burdened the College for years. This is the moment to make this college right. If we fail at this, SRJC may never recover. And if we succeed, we will have a College that can meet the needs of our community in a state of ongoing fiscal health. We all want this. Some hard decisions need to be made. Some creative work needs to be done. That takes time. The faculty has ideas and talent that could help with this process. A result without faculty buy-in will erode this institution. Please honor our requests for full participation so that we can do this right.

Sincerely,

The Faculty Leadership Council

Brenda Flyswithawks and Lenny Wagner, DCC Co-chairs

Eric Thompson, Julie Thompson, and Anne-Donagan, Academic Senate

Karen Frindell Teuscher and Sean Martin, AFA

I'm afraid that the rest of my report does not get more cheerful. AFA wants to impress upon you its deep concern about two more issues.

1. The continued diversion of categorical funds meant for student equity and achievement toward paying administrator salaries. The \$6M Student Equity and Achievement grant is funding so many salaries that now it has its own structural deficit. That money is intended for our students, and AFA sees a failure to make radical changes to the grant budget during this reorg as a failure of our institution.

2. President Chong's evaluation. In the summer of 2018, after the vote of no confidence, faculty leaders were invited to give input on the evaluation of our college president. In its vote, the Senate placed the president on a one-year probation. Yet, no faculty members were asked for input on the follow-up evaluation this summer, which took place at an off-site Board Retreat. We ask that you find a way to gather and incorporate our input going forward so that perhaps we can avoid future votes of no confidence.

Part of me wants to apologize for being the one to deliver a message like this. But I won't. Instead, I'll implore you to listen to it and do something about it.

Thank you for your time.