



Notes

1. PCC discussed that report-outs will be held at the end of the meeting.
2. The Institutional Effectiveness and Partnership Initiative (IEPI)/Partnership Resource Teams (PRT) Application
 - a. Dr. Chong reviewed the plan to request a second PRT visit with the intention of seeking funds (\$250K) for:
 - i. Enrollment management support and strategic planning.
 - ii. Support for shared governance, possibly through the use of a consultant.
 - iii. Resources for IT.
 - iv. Team building between constituent groups.
 - b. This may be the last year that PRT visits/funds are available.
 - c. Feedback included:
 - i. Support for inviting the PRT visit.
 - ii. Clarification that the visiting team makes recommendations, but the college is not required to implement.
 - iii. Support for ensuring that the college is staffed appropriately in order to support the community need.
 - iv. Encouragement for learning what other colleges do with regard to these areas of interest.
 - v. A request to involve all constituencies, including faculty department chairs, in the process and visit.
 - vi. Support for using any allocated funds for IT infrastructure improvements.
 - vii. A recommendation to include emergency response procedures to the list of areas for focus.
 1. Dr. Chong committed to continued support and improvements for safety on campus, regardless of whether it's included as an area of focus for PRT.
 - viii. A recommendation to include the budget as an area of focus.
 - ix. A recommendation that the cost of any consultants or other activities not exceed the funds made available through the IEPI/PRT program.

3. FON Shortfall

- a. Kate Jolley reviewed the shortfall that occurred for the fall 2019 Faculty Obligation Number (FON). SRJC was only at 286.6, 5 FTEF short of the state's required 291.6. As a result, SRJC was notified by the state that we will be receiving a penalty of \$401,000 this year.
- b. After accounting for the additional costs that would be incurred for hiring the full time faculty, the true cost of the penalty is closer to \$150,000.
- c. This shortfall may have occurred due to a number of factors, outlined below:
 - i. In 2018/19, the college had several failed recruitments, which were unable to be filled in time.
 - ii. SRJC has also seen an increase in the number of full time faculty teaching non-credit, which does not count towards the FON. It is possible that SRJC had been so many over the FON in the past, the non-credit change may not have been realized.
- d. Kate reviewed the plan to prevent such an issue in the future.
 - i. She has padded the planned recruitment number by one, in case there is another failed recruitment.
 - ii. She has also allotted FTEF for the non-credit full time loads.
 - iii. She is also now working alongside HR and Academic Affairs in order to mitigate impacts from failed recruitments more quickly.
 - iv. She assured the group that this will not happen again.
- e. Feedback included:
 - i. Support for padding additional FTEF hires to ensure this does not reoccur.
 - ii. Encouragement to improve hiring timelines to ensure SRJC does not lose candidates.
 - iii. Support for Kate, who has taken over the oversight of this.
 - iv. Support for hiring sufficient full time faculty to allow flexibility to respond to community need.
 - v. Agreement and understanding that the budget does limit faculty hiring.

4. Shared Governance Task Force

- a. PCC requested additional information on the status of this group's work.
- b. A discussion ensued regarding whether or not this shared governance workgroup's efforts overlap with union purview.
 - i. There was general agreement that it is difficult to consider what is "broken" about SRJC's shared governance while working within that very same system. However, ~~there was understanding~~ some asserted that the college must follow the current policy.
- c. The shared governance workgroup will be bringing forward recommendations to College Council, at which time there will be an opportunity to consider these recommendations. Nothing will be implemented without the college community having the opportunity to review and give input.
- d. Additional feedback included:
 - i. Encouragement for any constituent group to seek report-outs from its representatives on the shared governance workgroup.
 - ii. A recommendation that the college determine a safe venue for free flowing ideas and creative discussions.
 - iii. Understanding that the college is working to fix a flawed system and needs to do so from a place of trust.

- iv. Clarification that the shared governance workgroup is not making any recommendations about specific committees. One part of the proposed recommendations is that each committee should consider its charge and how that falls within various constituent group purview. Though some argued that this work must be done first by those with legal purview over mandatory subjects of bargaining.
- v. There was general support for the union and its processes. There is a need to balance the requirement to consider issues within the mandatory scope of bargaining while allowing for open and creative conversation in a manner that does not intrude on the legal rights of the exclusive bargaining agents over mandatory subjects of bargaining.
- vi. A desire to continue to move forward from a place of more trust, in the spirit of collaboration.
- vii. An assertion that the problems raised are not a matter of trust in the motives or character of individuals, but with the processes that systemically threaten to undermine the legal purview of the exclusive bargaining agents over mandatory subjects of bargaining.
- viii. Expressed need for a greater understanding of labor law and the meaning and problems caused by direct dealing.

5. Friendly Reminders – Eric Thompson

- a. Eric Thompson reviewed the practice of classified employees sending reminders to faculty about grading and flex deadlines. This has caused conflict between some faculty and classified employees.
- b. PCC discussed and there was general agreement that:
 - i. Faculty are responsible for managing their own deadlines.
 - ii. Classified should not be expected to track deadlines for faculty.
- c. Faculty members of PCC proposed that classified employees no longer send multiple reminders to faculty for grading or flex deadlines. They said that if faculty do not meet their deadlines, those faculty should face the consequences appropriately.
- d. There were comments that this would work for missing flex deadlines, as there are clear consequences for those issues. However, there were concerns about faculty missing grading deadlines as there are no clearly delineated consequences for that. Missing grade deadlines also impacts students' ability to receive their aid packages and it also delays the required reports that the college must provide to the state.
- e. There were comments that missing such deadlines increases workload for classified staff.
- f. Next steps:
 - i. Faculty leadership and classified leadership will work together on a solution.
 - ii. This will be agendaized for the next PCC meeting.