

President's Report – September 7, 2022

Screening Committees in the summer

By the power given in the By-Laws, Article VIII (Committees), Section 1, the Senate executive officers held short Brown Act meetings every two weeks to “provide consent for the President’s nomination(s) to screening committees.”

- May 25: Electrical Technology Instructor RSP and Agriculture Crop/Soil Science Instructor
 - June 8: Anthropology Instructor RSP
 - June 22: Mathematics Instructor RSP and informational on Equivalency Comm summer work
 - July 6: Biology Instructor
 - July 20: Business Instructor
 - August 3: Program Manager DSPS
- => 6 faculty positions + 1 manager position screening committees

Full-Time Temporary Faculty Hiring Process

Cerro Coso Senate President asked if a FT Temp screening comm at CC should have more than one faculty on it (i.e., *more* than what we do with adjunct hiring via [AP 8802](#)). There is no hiring process distinguished for full-time temporary faculty positions in the KCCCD Board Policy Manual and no consistent application of policy within the colleges and across the district with more departments using the adjunct hiring model instead of the tenure-track hiring process.

[BP 8700 \(Faculty Hiring\)](#) states that it is “Applicable to all personnel with employment contracts based on the Basic Faculty Salary Schedule”. Discussions with the union revealed that FT Temps are placed on the Basic Faculty Salary Schedule, given benefits, go through a Mode A evaluation process, and the temp year can also count toward tenure if they are hired for a tenure-track position. This means that a FT Temp should be hired according to the same process we use for tenure-track positions.

On the other hand, FT Temps are usually hired only in last minute emergency sort of situations and often when a tenure-track search has failed to find someone in time for the start of the semester. BC hired at least 1 FT Temp in the middle of the summer and 16 FT Temp over the weekend before the start of Fall classes. The batch hired right before the start of Fall classes followed the Adjunct hiring process.

The Vice-Chancellor of Educational Services said that he would meet with the Senate presidents to clarify the language in the FT Temporary faculty board policy and admin procedure.

Board Policy/Administrative Procedures Overhaul

The entire Board Policy manual has been converted to the CCLC numbering system and it is posted at <https://www.kccd.edu/board-trustees/board-policy/board-policies-procedures> . It is much easier to navigate than before and it includes the Administrative Procedures as well. Also, at the beginning of each chapter is which policies and procedures are “rely primarily upon the advice and judgement of” or “by mutual agreement with” the Academic Senate plus which ones are accreditation related. For example, BP 6200 and BP 6250 (Budget Preparation and Budget Management) are “Rely Primarily Upon the Advice and Judgement”, so changes to the budget reserve levels will have to go through the full consultative process (local budget committee, senate, and districtwide budget committee and district consultation council).

Board policies and procedures will undergo a regular cycle of review.

Evaluation of High School Faculty Teaching for Bakersfield College

KCCD has the second largest dual enrollment program in the state — we’re about equal to Los Angeles and Fresno CCD’s combined! Early College is an excellent/critical component of the Guided Pathways Pillar 2 (entering the path) and Pillar 3 (staying on the path) and it has a strong equity benefit by focusing on students who would not otherwise even consider college after high school graduation AND it has great student success because of having a “captive audience” of students with less financial and family pressures than our traditional college age students have, as well as, 5 days a week attendance vs. the 2-3 days/week attendance we have at BC.

The weak point to Early College is Pillar 4 (ensuring college-level learning) and being able *prove* the quality of dual enrollment instruction is the same or better than we have at BC. **BC has to be able to document and *prove* the quality is high for accreditation purposes** and let’s say that there has been “less than adequate” transparency and evaluation across all DE classes by our departments, often through no fault of their own. BC faculty have a number of obstacles in being able to evaluate DE instruction in their subject disciplines, particularly the logistics of competing collective bargaining agreements between the high schools and KCCD.

The last slide of the Early College Presentation to the August District Consultation Council listed the five priorities of Early College for 2022-23. The last priority stated “develop a process for evaluating dual enrollment courses at high school locations”. That was the one and only time in the presentation given to District Consultation Council it was mentioned. I asked that the next presentation about DE given to District Consultation focus on that.

The Vice-Chancellor of HR verified that DE instructors are NOT part of the FTE calculation used for faculty department chair release time and extra days. This means chairs are not paid to evaluate DE classes—there is no expectation by the institution to evaluate the DE instructors.

President Dadabhoj gave a presentation at the September 2nd College Council of the College's detailed work plan for the coming year. There are 284 items listed in the work plan. The large majority are focused on the Guided Pathways Pillars 2 and 3. BC does an EXCELLENT job on Pillars 2 and 3! **There are only 4 items in the work plan for Pillar 4.**

There are at least 19 accreditation standards requiring that the institution verify the quality of the courses taught for DE. Five are of particular importance:

1. IC.3: The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public.
2. IIA.2: Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.
3. IIA.3: The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline.
4. IIA.9: The institution awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.
5. IIIA.5: The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Financial Worries of Dual Enrollment

While the evaluation of HS instructors in DE is a clear and present problem that must be solved to retain our accreditation, the following financial worries are possible problems in the next several years but not at the present time. Financially, we're doing fine.

1. Some department/programs are seeing their enrollments drop as potential students get their classes done in high school. At Delano, this could eventually impact the \$2M apportionment we get for having a center if we were to drop below the 1000 FTES threshold. In the near term, there doesn't appear to be any problem with BC meeting the FTES thresholds at Delano or even BC Southwest but we need to be sure that "*college center enrollment impacts*" is a variable in our projected funding calculations.
2. Another variable in the funding projection calculation needs to be the potential impact on our *classroom utilization rates* that the state uses for facility funding. Near term, we're fine but are we as certain for what it'll be 5-10 years from now?

BC's Budget and Proposed Change to Districtwide Reserve Levels

The state and KCCD budget picture for this coming year is very good. Statewide the SCFF will probably go into effect—i.e., "hold harmless" will end—in 2025-26. KCCD continues to be one of the few college districts that has strong FTES, even growth in FTES (with BC responsible for all of the growth). State political leaders are directing A LOT of money toward the community colleges with the expectation that there will be improved student educational outcomes, advances in equity, increased intersegmental collaboration (CCCs, CSUs, UCs), and improved workforce preparedness. The state political leaders are recognizing that community colleges give the most education "bang for the buck" of any educational system in California.

We received more money with the May revise than we expected in January/February when the tentative budget was prepared. Most of that excess money, if not all the excess money, is going into the districtwide unrestricted reserves instead of going directly to the colleges. The concern by the BOT Finance committee is the upcoming recession. "The good times are not going to last forever" so we need to beef up our reserves and codify it permanently in board policy because the bad times *ARE* going to last forever (or that appears to be the logic anyway).

We had a long battle several years ago to get BOT to agree to a budget reserve floor of 15% with a soft ceiling of 20% at a time when budget reserves were regularly well above 30% (closer to 40%) and when colleges had difficulty taking care of instructional and student success needs. The thought with establishing the soft ceiling of 20% is that the excess above the 20% would go back to the colleges to manage as they saw fit—i.e., to the colleges working in the trenches rather than the district office directing everything from their distant location. The projected districtwide budget reserve is expected to be 22% and current cashflow predictions for the 2023 to 2028 timeframe of spending it down to 19.4%. It appears that the actors have changed while the script they're reading from hasn't changed. (You can maybe sense how I personally feel about raising the reserve limits.)