

# **Laney...-DAS-...Report**

## **October 16<sup>th</sup>—November 5<sup>th</sup>**

---

Hi All,

**October ended for the District Academic Senate without a lot of fanfare compared to the opening of the month as it seems like a lot of the interest/attention/concern engendered by the discussion of a vote of no confidence in and/or censure of the Chancellor and/or Board of Trustees petered out as it became clear nothing would be decided or done before the November 6<sup>th</sup> election.**

### **10/16 DAS Meeting**

The 10/16 DAS meeting was largely uneventful, if ponderous, as DAS was updated with standing reports from the treasurer and staff development officer that took more time than you'd expect (or welcome) and then DAS was updated on the progress of online Program Reviews (since launched). That was 90 minutes...

The last 30 minutes of DAS (2 hours of this!) picked up a little as discussion about the ONEPeralta mess and the Chancellor's failure to adhere to established Administrative Procedure (AP7123) and Board Policy (BP2430) for hiring an interim VC of IT led to DAS passing a motion to challenge the hiring process and selection of an interim VC of IT. (The motion was largely pro forma and ignored by the Chancellor—he selected his choice the following week—but this could/should be presented at the next BoT meeting when the Board will rubberstamp his choice.)

That was 2 hours. Really.

### **10/23 DAS Meeting**

Because of the “deliberate” pace of the 10/16 meeting I called for another “special meeting” for the following Tuesday (10/23) to address the need to make decisions regarding documentation and processes related to the discussion of the vote of no-confidence/censure. Everybody was very excited to have our 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the month...

This meeting did result in the, eventual, decision to distribute a “White Paper” for all faculty regarding why DAS is calling for discussion of a vote of no-confidence and/or censure along with some additional materials. Essentially everything can be summarized as the following: DAS wants faculty to review the Chancellor's and Board of Trustees failures regarding 1) (ineffective) budget management, 2) continual lack of consultation and collaboration (violation of shared governance), 3) questionable hiring practices and to then decide whether the sum total of these issues, and 4) any other issues raised by the Colleges, should result in a vote of no-confidence and/or censure against the Chancellor and/or Board of Trustees.

The exact timeline for this process remains unclear other than a general desire to complete the process before the end of the semester.

# Laney...-DAS-...Report

## October 16<sup>th</sup>—November 5<sup>th</sup>

---

### **Update: State of the District (It's Bad Folks!)**

While DAS continues trying to reckon with questions regarding how relevant it is or wants to be to District shared governance, there are some major issues facing the District getting relatively little public attention that will be becoming increasingly important this year and next and faculty should be aware that, regardless of the outcomes of the Nov. 6 elections for Peralta, Peralta is facing some severe problems that I continue to believe constitute an ongoing crisis that we, collectively, are not addressing. Here are the 2 that are occupying a lot of my time and attention:

1) **Part-Time Faculty:** All faculty, but especially part-time faculty, need to be aware that the District will be reducing FTES targets substantially in 2021-2022 because of a combination of enrollment decline and overspending that means that as the District tries to find about c. \$6 million in cuts a major target of those cuts will be part-time faculty. Please be aware that it is extremely likely there will be a major reduction in PT faculty classes moving forward (and I would imagine this will be coupled with achieving PT pay equity in the next contract as a face-saving gesture).

Note: the above scenario is the “best-case” scenario; the “worst-case” scenario is that Measure B isn’t extended (whether this November or next year before its expiration) which will leave a c. \$14 million+ shortfall that could very well lead to FT faculty layoffs as well...

There should be discussion and planning about this at all levels if we want to find an alternative to what, again, are going to be severe reductions. There currently is not.

2) **Hourly Classified:** Much as PT faculty are positioned to experience the impact of the bulk of the District’s ongoing dysfunction so too are hourly classified. Hourly classified make up a significant portion of College (and District) classified staffing and the District has been relying on hourly classified, much as it relies on PT faculty, to represent a relatively cheap and easily dismissible workforce. This Fall SEIU 1021’s new leadership decided to push the District to abide by an over decade-old agreement it had been ignoring regarding not relying upon hourly classified as a significant portion of the classified workforce; basically 1021 was trying to force the hiring of more contract/permanent classified. The District’s response, this is my interpretation, was to use the supposed necessity of moving to compliance (after not having been worried about this for over a dozen years) as a pretense for not renewing/laying-off dozens of hourly classified. Some of these positions will be transitioned to contract/permanent positions but most will not. The net impact of this will be the Colleges (and District) losing a lot of positions and remaining Classified having to do a lot more. The upside for the District is the potential for savings ahead of our coming budget shortfall as our most vulnerable and exploited employees will be bearing the brunt of our collective budget and planning failures...

And, again, there is no discussion and planning about this via our shared governance processes...