

Nick Strobel <nstrobel@bakersfieldcollege.edu>

October 17, 2014 7:17 AM

To: Sandra Serrano <sserrano@kccd.edu>

Cc: Anthony Culpepper <anthony.culpepper@bakersfieldcollege.edu>, Kate Pluta <kpluta@bakersfieldcollege.edu>, Steven Holmes <sholmes@bakersfieldcollege.edu>, Sonya Christian <sonya.christian@bakersfieldcollege.edu>

Re: Recap of October 8, 2014 meeting at BC about accreditation standard IV.D and Board Policy 10A

Sandra:

We're glad that you're following up on reminding the various groups of the district of the "Governance Processes Relative to the District Board Policy Manual and Collegial Consultation with Academic Senates".

Until we can meet face-to-face again, we'll need to use email to keep the dialogue going as we continue to work on the BC MidTerm report. Our responses in the enumerated points below are in a different color and distinguished by "NSAC".

First of all, let's answer your question about our availability for our next meeting:

- * For the week of October 27th, we can meet October 30th from 2:30 to 4 PM.
- * For the week of November 10th, we can meet November 10th from 4 to 5 PM and November 12th from 2:45 to 3:45.

The rest of our responses are embedded in the conversation below.

On Oct 10, 2014, at 4:24 PM, Sandra Serrano <sserrano@kccd.edu> wrote:

Nick,

Thank you for your summary; you beat me to the next item on my list of things to do before I leave the office. I, too, found the meeting to be good examples of collegial consultation and the value of teamwork.

Earlier today Danielle and I met to review the KCCD Board Policy "Governance Processes Relative to the District Board Policy Manual and Collegial Consultation with Academic Senates", as set forth in the Table of Contents in each of the 11 sections of the KCCD Board Policy Manual. The following will be implemented to ensure that the Vice Chancellors,

College Presidents, and constituent leaders are aware of the governance process agreed to by KCCD many years ago. The *Governance Processes Relative to the District Board Policy Manual and Collegial Consultation with Academic Senates* for each of the 11 sections of the KCCD Board Policy will be disseminated and reviewed with the Chancellor's Administrative Council, Chancellor's Cabinet, and Consultation Council. Additionally, the KCCD Board Policy located on our website will have an added link for *Governance Processes Relative to the District Board Policy Manual and Collegial Consultation with Academic Senates* (hereinafter Governance Process). This link will be the first link, followed by each of the 11 sections. Finally, I have asked that policies 10A5B5 and 10A5B16 be restored (strikeout be removed). Next week, a memorandum will be sent to each of the three college's academic senates indicating that the KCCD Board Policy 10A is being reviewed and requesting that each senate consider revisions to the policy specifically related to BP10A5B5 and 10A5B16. The rationale for review and recommended revisions will be include in the memorandum, along with the Governance Process.

I am going to write some notes following the notes you enumerated in an effort to further clarify, following the benefit of reflection.

I look forward to our continuing dialogue.

Sandra

From: Nick Strobel

Sent: Friday, October 10, 2014 1:05 PM

To: Sandra Serrano

Cc: Anthony Culpepper; Kate Pluta; Steven Holmes; Sonya Christian

Subject: Recap of October 8, 2014 meeting at BC about accreditation standard IV.D and Board Policy 10A

Sandra:

We appreciated your taking the time to meet with us on Wednesday,

October 8th, to discuss the proposed changes to section 10A of the Board Policy. It was helpful to share information, to have another set of eyes looking at proposed changes to Board Policy. It was a good example of using "the contributions of leadership throughout the organization" described in the language of accreditation Standard IV.

As a recap of our meeting, we learned the following things:

1) As part of the collegial, consulting process for changing section 10A of Board Policy, you expected that the college presidents would share the proposed changes given to them at the Chancellor's Cabinet with their colleges for whatever communication and appropriate consulting procedures exist at the colleges and use that feedback from their colleges to offer improvements in the proposed board policy language at the following Chancellor's Cabinet.

What I described was based on past practice. Upon reflection, I think the process could be facilitated by also sending a memorandum to the colleges' academic senates when the governance process uses the process of mutual agreement or rely primarily upon the advice and judgment. The written communication could possibly be following Chancellor's Cabinet. SVSerrano

2) The blank space next to "Governance Process" in the strikeout version ("Track Changes" version) of the proposed changes to 10A meant that it was "for information only" and in the context of consulting on board policy changes, "for information only" means that there is no requirement to "rely primarily upon" or "mutually agree upon" the Academic Senate or a collective bargaining unit such as CCA. "For Information Only" was later added to the readable draft of the proposed board policy 10A to make clearer the governance process.

We may be saying the same thing, but let me state my understanding. The reference to "For Information Only" should have never been placed on the document. When I see the Governance Process blank, my belief or conclusion has been that in the context of AB1725, neither "rely primarily" or "mutual agreement" was employed when the Governance

Process was established. Of course this was not the case based on the Governance Process I was provided when we met. Even though I was not aware of that the Governance Process required consultation with the academic senates, my practice is to take all Board Policy revisions to Consultation Council for information and for Q&A. Furthermore, if this communication or interaction leads to a change, it is incorporated.
SVSerrano

NSAC: Yes, we're saying the same thing. As chairs of one part of Accreditation Standard IV, we're viewing KCCD's process of Board Policy revisions, even those policies outside the strict bounds of "rely primarily upon" or "mutual agreement" or union contracts, from the vantage point of the language and spirit in Standard IV to see how the College and District "through established governance structures, processes, and practices," all stakeholders work together for the good of the College and District. There is repeated language throughout Standard IV (A through D) emphasizing the importance (best practice) of meaningfully engaging all constituent groups in the planning and decision-making process.

For example, with this accreditation lens, even when "for information only" items are shared at District Consultation Council, the reps must be given the chance to bring those items back to the college groups for advice and feedback AND bring that advice/feedback to the following District Consultation Council meeting. From our conversation with you, we think that is your intention with all matters brought to the council meetings. However, because there was confusion among the council reps about what was going to happen with the proposed changes in Board Policy 10A, the process for council-to-college-to-council consultation on all matters, including "for information only" items, needs to be laid out clearly in an established process.

[NS: From a more personal perspective, I (Nick) see the accreditation language and spirit in the Leadership Academy of which I was one of the inaugural members. The Leadership Academy made me a better faculty member through the interactions of classified staff, faculty and administration of the colleges and district office to get the "bigger picture".

Although there are defined persons who must make the final decisions, the Leadership Academy taught and showed how the best decisions are made when we take advantage of the talents and insights of our faculty and staff and administration who care deeply about our students and KCCD.]

3) Authors of the proposed changes to section 10A (District legal counsel and Vice-Chancellor of Human Resources) had forgotten to take into consideration the stated governance process of "rely primarily upon" for sections 10A5B5 and 10A5B16. Those sections should not have been deleted from the Board Policy 10A without consultation with the Academic Senate.

Those engaged in the recommending the changes and those involved in the review were not aware of the Governance Process. Changes were made in Chancellor's Cabinet. Until I met with the group this week, I did not think the governance process involved either "rely primarily" or "mutual agreement", because it had not been established. SVSerrano

4) For accreditation purposes, there is a need to have the duties and responsibilities of the chancellor and college presidents clearly delineated in a public and readily available document that has been reviewed and vetted by the Board of Trustees in an open, public procedure. Such a document would provide the publicly available evidence needed for accreditation and is also a best practice to increase transparency in any case.

I have shared with you what some of my colleagues have as policy. The president of Porterville College was on a visit to a multi-college district this week and she was assigned to Standard IV. She and I will debrief on Standard 4D. I will call ACCJC if necessary. SVSerrano

NSAC: We understand from our conversation with you that the desire of District legal counsel and Vice-Chancellor of Human Resources was to remove procedural details from Board Policy, to "tighten up" the Board Policy. However, from the accreditation lens we're using as chairs of

Standard IV.D, a balance must be reached in Board Policy because the Standard does state that "governance roles are defined in policy". Language from the Accreditation Standard IV could be used for or be inspiration for proposed policy-level language in 10A.

In addition to Rosa Carlson, there are individuals across the district each with years of experience of accreditation visits we can use in our discussions (e.g., Jill Board, Sonya Christian, Kate Pluta, Janet Fulks, Anthony Culpepper, and, of course, you). The discussions need to be broad-based and researched and discussed so that this is policy that gets finalized via a systematic participatory process as stated in Standard IV.

We look forward to further work with you and the Board of Trustees clarifying what are the duties delegated to the college presidents as stated in accreditation Standard IV.D.4 and IV.D.1. I (Nick) teach on Mondays + Wednesdays from 8 am to 2:30 PM and I have planetarium shows on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 9 am to 12 noon, so here are some options for continuing our conversation: Thursday, October 16th from 2 to 3 PM or Tuesday, October 21st anytime from 2 to 5 PM. If these times do not work for you, let us know what afternoons would work for your schedule.

I want our time to be productive. Frankly, each of the colleges should be engaged in the discussion. I know that I am booked solid and will not have had an opportunity to speak with Dr. Carlson by Thursday, October 16th, and I am at a "by invitation only" ACCT Summit on October 21st. At this time, I am uncertain of my availability the week of October 27th, because I may be in trial (I hope to know by Thursday of next week). I will get back to you late next about the week of October 27th. Please advise of your availability the week of October 27th and November 10th.
SVSerrano

NSAC: Repeat our available times:

* For the week of October 27th, we can meet October 30th from 2:30 to 4 PM.

* For the week of November 10th, we can meet November 10th from 4 to 5 PM and November 12th from 2:45 to 3:45.

--

Nick Strobel and Anthony Culpepper
co-chairs, Standard IV.D

--

Nick Strobel
nstrobel@bakersfieldcollege.edu
Astronomy Notes website:
<http://www.astronomynotes.com>