

To: San Bernardino Community College District Constituent Groups
Date: April 5, 2016
RE: Summary of Work: Policy and Procedure Review, Noncredit, Academic Calendars
and Election of a New President for 2016-2017
From: John Stanskas, District Assembly President

As the academic year and my term of office as the District Assembly president draws to a close, it seems important to reflect on the significant work we have accomplished and anticipate the future work for the assembly. It is also an important time to consider serving on District Assembly before nominations close; the president of the assembly is selected by the membership at the May meeting.

Policy and Procedure Review

We have made significant, if sometimes painful, progress regarding our review of policies and procedures. While we have tried various mechanisms to process these, and we may continue to improve the system, we at least have managed to review a significant number of policies and procedures. I believe we have also learned a great deal about how our district and colleges work and contributed to a vision of how they should work in our published documents.

Noncredit

As a body, we chose to investigate the utility of noncredit instruction in the service of our communities. Through a deliberative process that began at District Assembly we made a series of recommendations to the colleges and the collective bargaining agents that noncredit instruction is an important modality that is needed to serve our population better. Our adopted memo from March 2015 is attached. To date, my understanding is that the faculty union and district are actively negotiating the compensation and working conditions pieces and the college academic senates are actively exploring curricular and organizational aspects.

Academic Calendar

As a body, we chose to explore the current calendar configuration after a recommendation from the district calendar committee to District Assembly. The original memo from May 2014 is attached. Since that time, the academic senates considered the programmatic and professional matters associated with the calendar during the 2014-2015 academic year. The recommendation of both senates was to not move to a compressed calendar, but explore the maximum usage of the flexible calendar schedule afforded through legislation and the state Chancellor's Office through the Professional Development (FLEX) Calendar program. Since that time, additional information was requested and delivered in October 2015, attached memo, and later regarding instructional class minutes.

The results of the study of instructional minutes are attached (Mock Calendar Test 3.14.16.pdf) and show that with no adjustment to the block schedule (meaning a 3-unit lecture meeting from 9:30-10:45 two days per week), we comply with regulation and may lose approximately 5% of instructional minutes. With the addition of 5 minutes per class meeting, thus shortening the passing period (meaning a 3-unit lecture meeting from 9:30-10:50 two days per week) we range from losing approximately 1% of instructional time to gaining approximately 1% of instructional time.

There was also a request to study other colleges (attached, DistrictCalendarResourcesApril16). The first option was to study the term multipliers listed on the Chancellor's Office DataMart system. Those show that 28 colleges list an 18+ week term and 89 list something less. It is difficult to analyze such data since colleges report their term multiplier differently. For example, Palomar College lists an 18 week term multiplier, but utilizes 12 flex days in a 175 day contract. Their instructional term then has 81-82 instructional days – roughly sixteen weeks. Whereas districts like North Orange and Mount San Antonio list zero flex days because they have opted for a compressed calendar of 16 weeks. It does appear that most of colleges, through compressed calendars, flex calendars, adjusting term multipliers, and professional development days are converging on a shorter calendar like the 16-week calendar the CSU system has adopted.

My understanding is that the actual number of professional development days to incorporate into our calendar, as either locally determined *flex* or *inservice*, is being negotiated by the faculty bargaining unit and the district. As such, the district calendar committee will not meet until direction from the negotiators is provided.

Looking Forward - Career Technical Education

Attached is a memo I sent to constituent leaders at the colleges regarding the recommendations of the Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy and identified in the Governor's budget. There is significant money attached to the bill, \$200M, for CTE programs. There is also a push toward regionalization and really analyzing the colleges' role in credit, noncredit, and not-for-credit instruction to meet the needs of employers and students. This may be an area that District Assembly wishes to coordinate in the upcoming academic year, and should be a topic for all constituencies of the colleges' governance process.

I appreciate the opportunity to serve as the District Assembly president for the past two years.

Best Regards,

John Stanskas