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Much of the month of March has been spent in District and campus-level meetings regarding all things Return-to-Campus. Here’s a summary of the issues addressed in these consultations.

Masks for Spring Quarter
For at least the start of Spring quarter, the campuses will require indoor masking for public spaces and classrooms. This includes continued use of masks in student services areas such as counseling and libraries. The campus Instruction Offices will provide more detailed guidance on any exceptions to masking requirements, such as allowing removal of masks during class presentations. Faculty should place mask guidelines on their course syllabus to clearly communicate the requirements to students. The Chancellor’s Consultation Task Force will reconvene as needed to review health updates and guidance.

**Class Cancellations (Spring, Summer, Fall 2022)**

While the student demand for online courses is strong, the demand for courses with an in-person component is still unknown. The campuses agree that the transition back to campus will happen gradually, and thus far, those who requested courses with an in-person component are at higher risk for class cancellations. In recognition of this, both campuses have agreed that a lower enrollment threshold is appropriate for class cancellations in the coming quarters. For classes with an on-campus component, any class with 15 or more students will be safe from cancellation unless there is more than one section of the same course below 20, in which case a cancellation may occur. For remote classes (asynchronous or synchronous), the historical threshold of 20 remains. As always, each college has the freedom to allow classes to run with fewer than 15 (or 20 for remote) students. Those decisions are made on a case-by-case basis.

**Planning for Fall**

Fall scheduling is upon us and everyone wants to know what each campus will offer in Fall, both in terms of number of sections and modality. The Academic Senates have a say in the programs we offer as well as modality, and FA has a role to play in terms of the method used to assign courses or duties to faculty.

At De Anza, the deans are working with the department chairs and program faculty to develop a schedule that has 50 to 60 percent of courses with an on-campus component (either all on site or part onsite, part online), and the remainder of courses will be remote. Here, remote means asynchronous online, synchronous zoom, or some combination of the two. The 50 to 60 percent on-site is the overall goal for the college, but this does not mean every department will meet that target. Some departments, like those with in person labs, will have a much higher percentage in person than others.

At Foothill, the goal seems to be to come as close to pre-pandemic levels of onsite offerings as enrollment supports. Recall that just before the pandemic, Foothill was already slightly more than 50 percent online, with the remainder on site. In terms of planning the onsite offerings for Fall, the deans at Foothill, in consultation with department chairs, will use Guided Pathways
program maps to schedule a set of courses together so that students coming to campus can take multiple classes in the same pathway, in a convenient schedule. This approach to scheduling is brand new and in very early stages.

At both campuses, the roughly “50-50” goal (online vs on site) seems to be supported by reports from our neighboring districts. Some of our neighbors had more aggressive goals of 70% on site or more for Spring semester, but after student registration, offerings ended up roughly 50-50.

In student services (counseling, psychological services, library, etc.) at both campuses, the deans report that the faculty and deans are working collegially to determine how to serve both our on-site and online students. Schedules will be based on the hours needed for onsite services vs. online services.

At the table, FA negotiators have been working with the campus Vice Presidents to determine the best way to distribute the various modalities of courses. We have heard from many part-time and full-time faculty that we must avoid a schedule in which all courses of one modality go to full-time faculty (since they are scheduled first), while the other modalities are left for the part-time faculty. In addition, we have heard loud and clear from both full-time and part-time faculty that working remotely is not a convenience, rather it is a necessity when one has extreme expenses due to a long commute ($6/gallon gas) and the cost of housing in the area.

FA is in negotiations with the district to develop a scheduling method in which the courses assigned to full-time faculty include a combination of some remote courses and some on-site courses, and similarly, Article 7 (part-time) assignments include a combination of remote and on-site offerings. Whether this turns out to be a proportional distribution between full-time load and Article 7 assignments or some other method of distribution is still to be determined. This one is a tough nut to crack!

We are also trying to develop a timeline by which full-time faculty can request a 100% remote assignment for the academic year, in accordance with Article 34.8, which states:

Normally, all contract and regular faculty shall teach part of load on campus. Assignment to full annual load online shall be determined on a case-by-case basis. When a request for full annual load online is made, the division dean or appropriate administrator shall forward the request, and make a recommendation, to the Vice President of Instruction who, in consultation with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, shall approve or deny the request.
Prior to the pandemic, we had no need for a timeline for such requests, but we are receiving questions from faculty about this process, so administration has asked that we develop a timeline. We have not reached any agreement on a change to this language so until that occurs, the current contract language applies.

If you have feedback about any of these issues, please email me at fakathy@fafhda.org, or attend the FA open forums during week 2 of Spring quarter.

Negotiations Update
Amy Edwards
Interim Chief Negotiator

Faculty Feedback Supports Negotiations Efforts

My college-aged twins have just finished finals and arrived home for their spring breaks; I am racing to finish my grading, prepping my lab materials lists for Spring Quarter, and catching up on all the FA work that has been displaced by various emergencies, so that I can spend as much time as possible with them. Why the persistent feeling that we are all racing all the time? From what I can gather, there is simply too much to do and too little time in the day, and this has obviously been exacerbated by the pandemic. So, putting out the immediate fires is all many of us can manage each day, and our to-do lists continue to grow. When the work piles up and there is no salary increase in sight, morale understandably plummets—this sentiment came through loud and clear in our recent faculty survey.
We are grateful to the 409 faculty who provided feedback about priorities for both salary negotiations and the upcoming 2022-25 Agreement. While we are still analyzing your insightful written responses, clear themes are emerging.

Who responded?
Almost 60% of the respondents were from De Anza, and just over 40% came from Foothill; two thirds of respondents were full-time and one third part-time faculty. 87% of part-time faculty who responded have re-employment preference (REP) while about 60% of full-time respondents do. Also, a total of 47% of the respondents (close to 40% of the part-time and over 50% of the full-time) have been with the district for 15 years or more. Another 40% have been with the district for between 5-14 years and the remaining faculty have been hired in the last five years.

In the written responses about understanding REP, we received several questions including how REP affects full-timers. The simple answer is that it only impacts them if they teach overloads. I will address all of the REP questions in an article in next month's FA News.

Overarching Themes

Fair Compensation
The most obvious big-picture takeaway from the survey is faculty feel they are not being paid adequately for their work. Period. This message permeated many portions of the survey.

In the questions about the ongoing salary negotiations, the frustration and anger struck me immediately. That we have stagnated in both salary increases and number of steps on the salary schedules is catastrophic to our collective standard of living. One respondent summed it up well, “I’m living at the locally-adjusted poverty limit while full time in this job.” Many faculty have had to move even further from their place of work due to impacts of the pandemic and rising inflation.

It is a frightening reality that many faculty working full time for FHDA, let alone part-time faculty piecing together a living in multiple districts, don’t earn enough to survive from their salary alone. A whopping 43% of full-time respondents reported that taking overloads is essential to their livelihoods, while many more full-timers reported they would absolutely take overloads if they were available to them (some don’t have REP, others work in departments where there are no overload assignments
available); others said they leave those assignments for part-time faculty whenever possible even though they could really use the additional income. Let’s think on that a minute. Many of us who are lucky enough to have full-time work in the district, and who pay less for health benefits than our part-time colleagues, don’t even make enough money to live, let alone thrive, in the Bay Area.

Obviously, all of these concerns are more pronounced for part-time faculty respondents, two-thirds of whom have to work in other districts, take hourly wage work, do private tutoring, or take gig work to make ends meet. And this outcome is reached by looking at responses from part-time faculty who predominantly have REP. It’s hard to even imagine what picture would be painted if we had more responses from newer part-timers in the district, but they likely don’t have time to get through their email, let alone respond to a survey.

**Department Chairs/Program Directors**

Not surprisingly, another area in which faculty feel they are not being paid fairly is as department chairs and program directors. Over a third of respondents have held or currently hold these positions. Only half of them have access to job descriptions for these roles. Many of those who say they have a job description, indicated that the duties are often vague and too broad. Strikingly, 70% report inadequate compensation, either through reassigned time or additional pay, for the duties required of them. Even more inexcusable is the fact that many respondents receive(d) NO compensation for carrying out these duties. Some of the remarks from the written responses tell the story:

- “The compensation for my role as department chair is pathetic and inequitable.”
- The compensation “covers a tiny fraction of my workload.”
- “We all know that the compensation for chair is a joke.”

Chairs and faculty directors report carrying out uncompensated duties that are outside of the job description (if they have one):

- Program Review writing and coordination.
- Foothill’s Guided Pathways implementation.
- Writing Career and Technical Education reports
- Work done over breaks and summer, especially around scheduling.
- Coordination of Student Learning Outcome work
Not only do these positions need to have job descriptions that accurately reflect ALL duties, they need to be compensated appropriately through reassigned time or additional pay. Furthermore, the way in which the compensation is allocated needs to be transparent. It is often unclear why some departments receive the amount of compensation they do compared to others. The issues of transparency and fairness are magnified when new administrators inherit a problematic or complicated situation. Creating a transparent process for job descriptions and appropriate compensation for these roles across the district will be one of FA’s top priorities for the upcoming contract negotiations, and your survey responses helped inform the decision to move forward with this.

**Remote Work Options**

We asked about any professional benefits that emerged from working remotely, and we confirmed that almost two thirds of faculty felt some aspect(s) of their professional lives were improved. Over a third of respondents said they were able to provide better services to some student populations and engage in more professional development opportunities. And, working remotely allowed over a quarter of faculty to get more involved in their campus through shared governance, FA, and department or division meetings. As we move forward, we have to keep in mind that these improvements need to be taken into consideration.

Our contract currently states that FT faculty have to teach part of their annual load on campus unless they apply for an exception to teach 100% remotely for the entire year (Article 34.8). We asked about whether FA should try to negotiate the option of full-timers teaching 100% online without needing to file for this exception. People are passionate on both sides of this argument and responses are split right down the middle. About 40% of respondents indicated they did not think FT faculty should be able to work 100% remotely in an academic year, another 20% were unsure and the remaining 40% said they should be able to do so.

Of the faculty who said they did think some full-timers should have this option, the written responses ranged from those that felt that this should be allowed for medical needs only to all full-timers should have this option all the time. To be clear, if faculty have individual medical reasons for needing to teach remotely, they should contact Human Resources for a medical accommodation independent of Article 34.8. The suggestions offered for how this option might be rotated if we negotiated the change included a range of responses: it should be up to individual departments to decide, seniority should be the driving factor, it should only be allowed if student need dictates it, it should be based on the quality of online classes; finally, some argued that a totally online schedule should be allowed because all faculty are struggling with rising housing and gas prices that make living near campus impossible and commuting astronomically expensive.
One faculty member hit the nail on the head, “Big discussion REQUIRED!”

We also plan to negotiate language about remote work options for student services faculty in the upcoming agreement. This hasn’t been included in our contract in the past because that option didn’t exist. We have heard from counselors and librarians alike that continued flexibility in remote and in-person work is important.

For more information on the current conversations about Fall scheduling see Kathy Perino’s article in this issue.

We need many more hours to review responses about evaluations, the tenure review process, class cancelations, and more. I will report next month about some of these. But while we’re talking about feedback, let me share that we also received some valuable feedback about how to improve future surveys. We have taken note of these suggestions and met with some departments to hear the details; we will continue to do our best to improve.

Lastly, we learned that some people want more “reaching out” from FA, which admittedly has been more difficult for us during the pandemic. We continue to have conversations about how to improve our communication and would love even more suggestions on how to do so. Please know that FA values the input of all of our members and we will be soliciting more of it in both our newsletters (see this issue) and our upcoming town halls (see dates and locations in this issue).

As I check the writing of this article off of my long to-do list, I am hoping each of us can shorten those lists a tad as the quarter comes to a close. Best of luck giving finals, grading, serving our students remotely or in-person, and prepping for Spring. Now I’m going to change out of my pajama bottoms (I got my top half “dressed” for my morning Zoom meetings) and leave my bedroom/home office to go downstairs and hang with my kids.

FA Seeks Executive Council Members

FA has openings for three, one-term replacements in the Spring Quarter, two full-time faculty members from Foothill, and one full-time faculty member from De Anza. Meetings are on the first and third Wednesdays of the month from 3:00 to 5:30 p.m. Spring quarter meetings will be held on Zoom. Council members are assigned to act as liaisons from FA to an academic division on their campus, to which they will forward meeting minutes. While there is no release time for these positions, council members are paid
$100.00 for each executive council meeting attended. FA encourages faculty who are interested in participating in their union to "test-drive" a union position for the quarter. To apply, send a letter of introduction addressed to the Executive Council to office manager Susanne Elwell by April 1, 2022.

Particularly for Part-timers

Ray Brennan
Part-time Association Secretary

Given the District’s abysmal enrollment numbers for spring quarter there are, unfortunately, vagaries in the lives of Part-time faculty that may need attention. Specifically, these are concerns about how faculty who don't receive assignments can retain health benefits and collect unemployment.

Not to worry. FA has your back! Below are informational articles dealing with each of these issues. The explanation about health benefits is courtesy of Dr. Lisa Markus (De Anza Math), FA’s resident expert in all things related to health benefits. The unemployment information explanation is the one given during the Unemployment webinar offered by FA each spring quarter. The dates for this spring’s unemployment webinars will be posted in the next issue of the FA News.

Health Benefits: Article 22A
Eligibility:
Some part-time faculty will be eligible for district-subsidized health benefits under Article 22A. The Foothill-De Anza Community College District contracts with CalPERS for the purposes of providing health benefits. There are a variety of medical plans to choose from. These plans run on the calendar year (January – December), while part-time faculty eligibility is based on the previous academic year’s teaching load.

To be eligible to enroll in the district-subsidized health benefit plan, a part-time faculty member must have load of at least 0.400 and attained/retained reemployment preference during the academic year (fall, winter, spring) prior to the plan year (January – December). (Article 22A.1)

Links to all of the plans and the current year’s costs are available at https://hr.fhda.edu/benefits/_medical-revised.html under “PT Faculty with 40/50/60 subsidy.”

Cost of plans:
Under Article 22A, the district usually pays a percentage of the Kaiser plan for each of the three tiers: single, employee plus one dependent, employee plus family. Although the district subsidy is based on the Kaiser plan, any of the CalPERS health benefit plans may be selected with the faculty member paying the difference in cost. Part-time faculty who taught between 0.400 and 0.499 load in the prior academic year will have a subsidy of 40% of the Kaiser plan, loads between 0.500 and 0.5999 will have a subsidy of 50% of the Kaiser plan, loads of 0.600 or above will have a subsidy of 60% of the Kaiser plan. (Article 22A.4). However, FA was able to negotiate a slightly better subsidy for the 2022 plan year, so the subsidy is a little better than the given percentage of Kaiser.

Paying for health benefits:
The employee’s share of the cost is deducted pre-tax from pay checks. In any month without a regular paycheck, or without a paycheck that covers the employee’s share of cost, the part-time faculty employee needs to pay for benefits through the District Benefits Unit. Specifically, "When off pay and receiving health benefits: Starting January 1, 2022, you are no longer required to go through Direct Pay to continue health coverage with CalPERS. Instead, you must prepay for your monthly employee contributions directly with the District Benefits Unit."
Update: Budgeted vs. Actual Full-time Faculty Positions

Kathy Perino
Interim President

If you read my article last month, you know that I have spent many hours studying the District budget, trying to understand the difference between budgeted positions and actual expenses. For years, we have asked for clarification of this at both the campus and district level, trying to understand the budget implications (overstating expenses). An additional query of mine has been about when the campuses were given more money for part-time instruction due to vacancies, and when they weren’t.

At the March meeting of the District Budget Advisory Committee, we received a report of all vacant positions in the district as of January 31, 2022. We were not given an opportunity to discuss this report, so I will simply report on the vacant budgeted positions. Early in spring quarter, I will follow up with the district and campus budget offices to clarify the implications of this report. (I hope you will too!)

Foothill College

Foothill has 20 vacant faculty positions, 15.5 in the general fund and 4.5 in categorical (Student Equity and Achievement, DSPS, etc.) funds. This is in addition to the nine new full-time positions funded by the state’s full-time faculty hiring money. Combining the budgeted vacant positions with the new full-time positions, Foothill has 29 full-time faculty positions budgeted somewhere. For 2022-23, the college is planning to hire 13 full-time faculty: the nine new full-time faculty positions and four additional positions.

In addition to the vacant faculty positions, Foothill has three vacant administrative positions (two in the general fund) and sixteen vacant classified positions (8.5 in the general fund).

De Anza College
De Anza has 46 vacant faculty positions, 34.5 in the general fund, 7.5 in categorical funds, and 4 in restricted funds. This is in addition to the thirteen new full-time positions funded by the state’s full-time faculty hiring money. Combining these positions, De Anza has 59 full-time faculty positions budgeted somewhere. From these 59 positions, ongoing dollars from 10 positions (from the SRP) have been transferred to cover the positions formerly funded with one-time dollars. From the remaining 49 positions, De Anza plans to hire up to 21 positions: the 13 new positions plus up to 8 additional positions, depending on decisions made in the Instructional Planning and Budget Team (IPBT). Those familiar with the debate, or should I say drama, going on in IPBT are probably shocked to see these numbers (49 remaining positions!!).

In addition to the vacant faculty positions, De Anza has one vacant administrative position (categorically funded) and 31 vacant classified positions (six in the general fund).

Central Services
To complete the report, Central Services has no vacant faculty positions. They do have ten vacant administrative positions, five of which are associated with OEI (categorical funds). They also have 22 classified vacancies (approximately 14 in the general fund).

Do I understand what all this means? No. Do I believe that the district or college administration was aware of the magnitude of the vacancies? Not in all cases. So what's next?

Since we were not able to discuss these vacancies at the District Budget Advisory Council, we must insist that the college and district administration involve employee groups in decision making related to these vacancies. To be told again and again that we have a budget deficit and then find this many vacancies built into the budget sows distrust. Transparent, honest conversations must occur with all employee groups to reduce drama and suspicion.

Part-time faculty may also find this video, which is part of a series of articles, of interest. They are written by Thomas Peele, an investigative reporter with EdSource.
In order to gather more faculty feedback about upcoming negotiations, FA is hosting THREE town halls—one in person at each campus and one remote during the second week of Spring Flex Days:

**Monday, April 4th**: Districtwide Flex Day at Foothill Smithwick Theater
All need to RSVP for morning session

You all should have received an email from Chancellor Miner about this day which included a registration link: [Registration for Districtwide Flex Day, April 4th](#). This is an in-person event for which you must RSVP.

If you have a compelling reason to attend remotely, you MUST first check in with your dean (or appropriate administrator). Secondly,
Quarter. Each of these will include a presentation about the current budget followed by discussions about salary negotiations for both 2021-22 and 2022-23. If you have feedback/questions about the distribution of assignments for Fall 2022, we will make time to discuss that as well.

Save the date for one or more of the town halls!

- In person: Monday, April 11th from noon-1:30pm at Foothill in the Toyon Room
- In person: Tuesday, April 12th from 1-2:30pm at De Anza in Admin 109
- ZOOM: Friday, April 15th from noon-1:30pm

We will send an email reminder the week before the town halls that includes the Zoom link for Friday’s event. Please feel free to attend the in-person event at your sister campus if it is more convenient.

Spring PAA Workshop

Check your PAA eligibility in MyPortal>Faculty Online Services>AAA/PAA look up; if the year listed is 2022-23 or earlier, be sure to attend this workshop as you need to apply before 7/1!

We are sorry for the issue with the link at the March workshop and have fixed the issue. The next PAA Workshop will be held in Zoom on April 22, from 11am-noon.

you MUST use the RSVP form to indicate that you have coordinated your plans with your dean and are attending remotely. A Zoom link will be sent to you.

Part-time faculty participation is optional, but if you do attend, be sure to sign in to ensure you are paid. Part-time faculty will be compensated at the rate of $150 per day. If attending in person, you will need to register at the table located in front of the Smithwick Theatre the day of the event. Part-time faculty who are attending remotely need to both use the RSVP system and register through the Zoom registration link you will receive once you indicate remote attendance.

After the speakers in the morning, lunch will be provided by the FHDA Foundation in the Foothill Library Quad. The afternoon will consist of campus activities, so look for information about these from your campus.

Tuesday, April 5th: Division/Department Day on each campus.
Stay tuned for communication from your campus’ administration and/or your department chair/program director about activities for this day. If you plan to attend remotely, please communicate with your dean about your alternative plan.

Part-time faculty should check in with their dean (or appropriate administrator) to receive payment for attendance.
And lo, the heavens opened, from which a brilliant light did emanate, and lush gardens unfolded around us, enveloping all in the honeyed aromas of succulent fruits and flowers. And soft breezes did play upon us while birds and other fair creatures did pipe luxuriant music for our ears...

Okay, so maybe that is a tad hyperbolic, and faculty are definitely focused more on the District's "now" than its hereafter, but the promise of good—or at least better—times is in the air, despite the many intervening challenges, pratfalls, and seeming failures that await us—if only we can seize this moment and capitalize upon it. Call me a cheerful fatalist if you must call me anything, but the confluence of both colleges independently emerging with new shared governance models at almost the same moment, even as we struggle with the most foreboding obstacles, as an institution and a society, seems a propitious moment to me. At any rate, the opportunity for change lies before us, one which, for better or worse, will shape the culture of our District for years to come.

I'm admonished on occasion for using the moniker of "shared" as opposed to "participatory" governance, to which I wholeheartedly commit. Maybe it's my sabbatical reading getting the best of me, but putting aside the legalese of AB 1725 and just giving a cursory "listen" to the words themselves says everything about which we should embrace. "Participatory" sounds so...persnickety, the six precisely enunciated and overly alliterated syllables compelling such bended knee, Raleigh's coat thrown over the mud, walk-on-me-please abjection, that I can hardly bring myself to say it, much less enact it. "Shared," on the other hand, now there's a word that both offers and demands respect, a single elided syllable, long vowelled and ending with a solid finality (Note: in certain parts of the US the vowel may be extended such that the word appears to be pronounced with two or even three syllables). Ah, if only governance were as clearly delineated as phonetics!
At any rate, shared governance is not about fealty, of subjects to masters, employees to employers, or any other inequitable balance of power. It is about a shared respect, an acknowledgement that all have something valuable to bring to the table and should have the opportunity to do so. In this sense, it is linked to democracy, and regardless of what particular governance procedures might be embraced by a given body, a shared understanding that the body will honor those procedures in its decision making processes. This is where responsibility enters the picture, because, shared governance also involves a recognition that we are not just working to enact our personal interests, or even those of the constituencies we represent, but that we are considering the import of the body's collective decisions for the institution as a whole. And this is where things have gotten sticky for both of our colleges.

The impetuses giving rise to the need for new Shared Governance models at our Colleges are starkly different. The Foothill situation is probably better known to more faculty of both colleges due to the steady, extended decline of shared governance under its former president and the resulting meltdown reached with her departure this past Fall. Most of this I know secondhand, but that is a summation of how my Foothill colleagues have described their experience. De Anza has been at more of a long, constant simmer which, at points, has risen to a full boil threatening to burst the vessel, but which thus far remains contained (though definitely not at a simmer at present). The moves that each of the college administrations make regarding the principles of the shared governance plans coming forward will be defining in terms of both how they are viewed by the college citizenries and the Colleges by external viewers (e.g. by the voters of the District service area and in Accreditation assessments).

Like the catalysts leading them to this point, the ways in which the colleges are being "recast" are also distinct. In the matter of only a few months, Foothill has resurrected its governance system under the central "MISSION (I'M) POSSIBLE COUNCIL." Some of the same governance structures exist as previously (e.g. the Academic Senate's "Committee On Online Learning"), and really, it wasn't the previous governance structure that was the problem per se, but how it was run (into the ground, as one colleague put it). But there are new formulations as well (such as the Integrated Planning Committee) and newly envisioned functions. In fact, the various committees seem focused around specific institutional functions, like the soon to be formed "Enrollment Management and Scheduling Committee." It's a promising model, has enthusiastic support from the various constituencies, and while it's still making its way through the approval process, I understand it also has the blessings of the Acting College President.

De Anza has been "talking about" reconfiguring its governance model for the past several administrations. In fact, the April 1995 issue of Local Talk, the De Anza College newsletter from days of yore, features an article on the "Decision Making Taskforce"
which was "Rivataliz[ing] the College's Decision Making Process." While substantive changes since then have been minimal, the past couple of years, particularly since the onset of the pandemic, have again raised matters to a head. The ensuing uproar from employees finally led the new College President, last April, to create a "Shared Governance Task Force" (of which I am a member) from broad constituencies charged with developing a more equitable shared governance model. The resulting plan, which has evolved in response to feedback collected from presentations to the many campus interest groups, diverges significantly from the existing governance model. It creates a more horizontal structure based around a central "Program Allocations Committee" (PAC), which replaces the existing siloed "Planning and Budget Teams" for Instruction, Student Services and Administration, respectively. The committees are also helmed by a "tri-chair" leadership, so that the creation of agendas and the running of meetings is less likely to be dominated by any one individual. The plan nonetheless retains some of the existing governance structures, including the College Council (the current last stop in the shared governance process) which may be modified as the implementation proceeds. While the plan was approved by the College Council just this past week by a 2-1 margin, the College President is ultimately responsible for implementing it.

Despite the different structures, the Colleges' plans appear to share many principles about the role and function of shared governance. At Foothill, one of the Central operating principles is to "Develop and operationalize college-wide guiding principles for strategic and tactical decision-making with respect to allocation of human, physical, and financial resources and measures of success or effectiveness." Wow. I can envision my colleagues on the De Anza SGTF thinking, "I wish we had put it like that." But the same principle is grounded in our PAC, which brings all constituencies in on the ground floor for more holistic decision making around the allocation of resources. Like De Anza, Foothill has an objective to "minimize or eliminate power dynamics that can contribute to an inequitable process." And we both, I believe, aim for greater transparency, so that decisions do not arrive already "made" in the upper echelons before they've even been vetted through the governance process.

Both colleges also seem to be on largely the same page with insisting on committee membership from broad constituencies and striving for basic parity among the various groups. I wasn't involved in the Foothill process, so can't speak to the rationales behind how they will "populate" their committees, but like De Anza, in addition to including students, faculty, classified professionals and administrators, the plan draws its members from affinity groups and bargaining units as well as the Academic and Classified Senates. This "cross referencing" of members insures that many of the committee members wear multiple hats (e.g. a faculty member who works for FA and also belongs to an Affinity group), which, given that they would also be interacting with a much wider array of constituencies in their committee work, hopefully will lead to more empathetic decision making and less jockeying for position.
With membership comes training, a crucial element in getting any new governing system off the ground. This is invaluable not only for those new to College Governance, but in reframing the way those with more experience conceive of the process(es). A basic understanding of parliamentary procedure is absolutely essential, regardless of how "consensus" is construed. Clear and timely posting of materials, particularly agendas and documents pertaining to action items, is also essential to keeping members apprised of developments and their role in the process. And despite the prevalence of "acronymity" in our academic culture, pains must be taken to more clearly identify the various groups and define the various processes that committee members encounter in their governance work. Finally, committee members themselves need to be trained in, and given the resources and models by which to communicate with their constituencies, so that shared governance is not a closed circle, but a conduit for the entire campus to be more cognizant of campus plans as well as developments.

The proposed governance plans for both campuses are well thought out and well supported by large cross-sections of the college communities. But ultimately a plan is exactly that, a "blueprint" as it were, not scripture that must be statically obeyed. It is in the operation of shared governance, particularly in a changing academic landscape, that we will discover the need for additional changes and refinements. And every governance body should have the capacity and flexibility to entertain such modifications. The consequence otherwise is entropy, and haven't we had enough of that by this point?

Upcoming Deadlines

Cybersecurity
• Apr. 1: Full-time faculty submit written request to return to full-time employment status from Article 18 pre-retirement reduction in contract (18.4).
• Apr. 1: Part-time faculty submit required documentation for column change starting in Spring Quarter to campus Personnel Office (Appendix B.1,C, E, G).
• Apr. 15: Full-time faculty submit application for Training/Re-Training (Appendix R) to District Office of Human Resources (35.6).
• June 1: Full-time faculty submit Professional Growth Activities to campus Personnel Office for salary step advancement (Appendix A, B) and/or Professional Achievement Award application (38.3).
• June 30: Full-time faculty file intent to change salary column for (the next) academic year with campus Personnel Office (Appendix A, B).
• July 1: Full-time faculty submit Professional Achievement Award application to division dean (38.2.1, 38.3).

FHDA has seen an uptick in the number of fraudulent emails and attempted security breaches to our network systems. Cyber criminals are trying to gain access to your personal financial information. While not required, faculty are strongly encouraged to complete the cyber security training to keep your personal information safe. You can find the tile for the training in MyPortal.

If you receive an email that you suspect is fraudulent, click on the blue "p" within your outlook email to report it as suspected phishing.
Part of FA monthly dues goes to the FACCC Education Institute, and 100% of this amount is a charitable deduction.

For full-time faculty who worked all three quarters of 2021 and are FA members, the tax deductible amount is $189.00 ( $63 per quarter). For part-time faculty who worked all three quarters of 2021, the deduction is $63.00 ($21 for each quarter).

Click here to share your thoughts and ideas!

What Do You Think?
We welcome and value your feedback. Use the form linked above to share your thoughts:

- Content Suggestions
- Formatting Suggestion
- Private response to writer or editor (will not be published)
- Letter to editor in response to content. This may be published in a future issue of the FHDA Newsletter
- Request to have your relevant article or information published in the FA News. Please include a detailed description of your planned article.
- Any other constructive feedback you would like to provide
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