

AB 1725 Implementation Questionnaire

Final Report Spring Session 1990

Conducted during the Fall, 1989 by Irene Menegas for the Academic Senate Research Committee.

The bulk of responses to the questionnaire were collected in early November at the Academic Senate's Fall Session in Los Angeles. [For a copy of the questionnaire distributed, see Appendix A.] It is evident from the responses that many colleges had just begun the implementation of AB 1725, so the information reported here is somewhat tentative and impressionistic.

1. Survey Population	
Number of questionnaires distributed:	109
Number of questionnaires returned:	80
Percent of return:	73%
Number of responses from small colleges:	12

Please see Appendix B for a complete list of participating colleges.

2. Has your senate received additional reassigned time for AB 1725 implementation duties?

39 Yes 33 No 7 Currently negotiating

If Yes:

How much additional time has been granted?

Reassigned time to college senate (all colleges):

<u>2.4 - 1.8</u>	<u>1.5 - 1.0</u>	<u>.90 - .60</u>	<u>.40 - .20</u>
2	7	12	10

Reassigned time to district senates:

<u>1.6 - 1.0</u>	<u>.4</u>
3	1

Reassigned time to college senate (small colleges):

<u>.20</u>
1

Who will use the additional reassigned time?

Senate Presidents, past presidents, vice presidents, president elect, other senate officers, AB 1725 committee chairs, AB 1725 committee senate representatives, AB 1725 coordinator, AB 1725 steering committee representatives, budget/financial officer.

If No,

How much additional time do you need for college senate (all colleges)?

<u>2.0</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>8.0 - 6.0</u>	<u>.50 - .20</u>
8	14		3	9

How much additional time do you need for district senate?

<u>6.0</u>	<u>.25</u>	<u>.20</u>
1	1	1

How much additional time do you need for college senate (small colleges)?

<u>2.0</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>.50</u>	<u>.20</u>	<u>not sure</u>
1	1	1	5	3

Questions three- eight dealt with various issues of implementing AB 1725: organizational structure and process used to implement the legislation; faculty involvement in allocation of Program Improvement Funds; consultation processes developed between senates and union; and progress made both toward developing mandated policies as well as reaching joint agreement with governing boards on the policies.

Although the responses to questions 3-8 varied considerably and were difficult to quantify, a number of general observations can be made. The majority of colleges that had begun implementation did so by forming some coordinating body. Less than one-half of the respondents commented on the leadership arrangements for the oversight group, but when reference was made, it was clear that faculty either co-chaired or chaired the oversight body. In only a few isolated instances did management have the disputed leadership role. When a campus relied on existing committee structures to handle the task, the leadership issue was unclear.

A significant minority of districts seemed to be moving very slowly in this attempt to organize for AB 1725 implementation. There was also evidence in about 10% of the districts of overt management resistance to the entire idea of AB 1725 and its implementation. This often happened in smaller campuses where administrative leadership was described as "patriarchal" or matriarchal."

It was evident from reviewing the responses that the implementation process of AB 1725 is placing a heavy burden on faculty governance resources. This was particularly a problem with the smaller colleges. It could be a severe problem for "faculty empowerment" and one that the Academic Senate might need to address.

The organizational structures, developed by the various districts and campuses to implement the legislation reflect the characteristic diversity of California's community colleges. For this reason, it is difficult to analyze any patterns of organization that have emerged, yet several observations can be noted:

First, by a two-to-one margin in response to question three, most colleges reported the establishment of a basic Steering Committee or Task Force to organize the institutional approach to the undertaking. Those that used a committee approach not coordinated by a Steering Committee seemed to be either small colleges with limited faculty resources for an elaborate coordinating Task Force or larger colleges that had already developed a solid and respected committee process that could absorb these new tasks.

Secondly, the fact that most of the AB 1725 mandates triggered by Phase I funding are faculty oriented is reflected in the composition of these Steering Committees. A rough analysis reveals that the academic senate and union membership on these coordinating bodies dominated the composition in about 50% of the instances. In most of the other cases faculty and management had about equal representation. In only a few examples did it appear that management was really directing the operation.

Responses to question five revealed few instances of territorial battles between senates and bargaining agents over which group would be dominant in representation of leadership of these bodies. In a significant majority of cases, unions had equal or important representation on these Steering Committees. Thus, the process was viewed as a joint faculty undertaking designed to develop rational and workable policies.

The responses to question four concerning faculty involvement in the use of Program Involvement Funds yielded valuable information. Since managers tend to dominate decisions concerning budget matters, especially new sources of funds such as those for program improvement, the process used for allocating these funds gave useful clues about the reality of "shared governance."

A rough count revealed that at approximately 40 colleges faculty indicated they had no influence in this area. Many said they never heard of the funds. Some senate presidents were quite caustic in their responses: "zero:" "never heard of it;" "what is this"? Often this appeared to be a problem with the small colleges governed "patriarchally," but it also happened in some larger districts. By contrast, some small colleges seemed quite satisfied with their input on these decisions.

Some of the larger districts that have a reputation for significant shared governance seemed to continue this tradition in the process for allocating these funds: Santa Monica, Mt. San Antonio, Foothill-DeAnza, Ventura County, Contra Costa. In several instances this occurred because the district already had a budget or planning group in operation which took over this function. In fact, it appears that the existence of a budget or master planning committee with meaningful faculty input is probably one of the most important criteria of effective faculty governance.

One of the more impressive conclusions one could draw from this preliminary survey is that faculty organizations seem to be cooperating in the implementation efforts. No real territorial conflicts were apparent. Where districts formed a Task Force to direct the implementation process, the bargaining agents had significant or equal representation on the committee. Where separate committees were charged with specific tasks, equal senate and union representation was evident or satisfactory consultation processes between the two organizations were reported. Although senates have the major influence on developing hiring procedures and bargaining

agents for evaluation procedures, respondents frequently indicated that both groups worked jointly on these tasks.

The results of this survey of initial AB 1725 implementation activities seem to indicate significant faculty involvement in mandated policy development in a majority of districts. The same degree of participation by faculty groups was not evident in the critical decisions that were made concerning the use of Program Improvement Funds. The “consultation process” and “shared governance” concepts which appear so often in the legislation were most evident between faculty groups who, in the great majority of colleges, seem to be cooperating in their efforts to empower faculty. It remains to be seen whether these processes will be transferred successfully to future faculty and management interactions.

Appendix A

The Academic Senate

AB 1725 Implementation Questionnaire

The State Academic Senate is interested in collecting data about how local senates are implementing the various mandates of AB 1725. Please submit only one completed questionnaire for each college. Be sure to turn in your responses before you leave the session. We hope to distribute the results of the survey at the Monterey Leadership Conference in mid-January.

1. _____
Your name or person to contact College
2. Has your senate received additional reassigned time for AB 1725 implementation duties?

Yes No

If Yes:
How much additional time has been granted?
_____ reassigned time to college senate
_____ reassigned time to district senate
Who will use this additional reassigned time?
(Senate President, committee chairs, etc.?)

If No:
How much additional time do you need?
_____ reassigned time to college senate
_____ reassigned time to district senate
How might the Senate assist you in getting some?

3. Please describe the process and organization you are using or intend to use to develop the processes and policies mandated by AB 1725. [e.g. do you have a district or college AB 1725 steering committee? If so, what is the composition of the committee? Who is chairing this committee: senate president, another faculty member, co-chair?] If you have not yet begun the process, please describe the impediments you are encountering.
4. To what degree have the faculty been involved in determining the use of Program Improvement Funds at your college and/or district? Briefly describe the process used to set priorities for and/or to use these funds.

5. Have your senate and collective bargaining agent begun consultation on:
- | | | |
|----------------------|----------|---------|
| hiring procedures | _____yes | _____no |
| FSA's and competency | _____yes | _____no |
| Evaluation | _____yes | _____no |

If yes, please describe your consultation process.

If no, how might the Senate assist you in beginning this process?

6. Has your senate begun a process to reach joint agreement with your governing board on the following:
- | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|---------|
| hiring procedures | _____yes | _____no |
| equivalency criteria and process | _____yes | _____no |
| administrator retreat rights | _____yes | _____no |

Lee Hancock Los Angeles City College	Marjorie Richardson Pasadena City College
Pat Blakeslee Los Angeles C. C. Dist.	Sev Garcia Porterville College
Phyllis Keeney Los Angeles Southwest College	Marguerite Albanez Rancho Santiago Canyon College
Bill Troost Los Angeles Trade Tech. College	Steven Durham College of the Redwoods
Lois Yamakoshi Los Medanos College	Jon Breen Rio Hondo
Jerry Burroni College of Marin	Angela Curiale Sacramento City College
Mike Cuchna Merced College	John Allen Saddleback College
Jim Stanton MiraCosta College	Mary Retterer San Bernardino Valley
Ruth Madalena Mission College	Miles Clowers San Diego City College
Larry Miller Moorpark College	Eileen Schmitz San Diego CC Dist., Con't Ed.
Helen Goulet Mt. San Antonio College	Robert Bacon San Diego Miramar College
Kathy Charles Mt. San Jacinto College	Clare Starr San Francisco CC Centers
Helen Ortega Napa Valley College	Maurice Costello San Jose City College
Leslyn Polk North Orange Co. CC Dist., Adult Ed.	Jack Stirton San Joaquin Delta College
Carla Soracco Ohlone College	Kenneth Kennedy College of San Mateo
Linda Slater Orange Coast College	William Selby Santa Monica College
Cheryl Shearer Oxnard College	Everett Traverso Santa Rosa Junior College
Patrick Scwerdtfeger Palomar College	Tom Riddle College of the Sequoias

Marilyn Day/Merrill Hugo
Shasta College

Jo Sumner
Sierra College

Dave Fontius
College of the Siskiyous

Paula Anderson
Skyline College

Bill Thurston
Solano Community College

Charles Rucker
Southwestern College

Janice Rank
Victor Valley Community College

Jackie Fowler
West Hills College

Ed Lodi
West Valley College

Larry Michel
Yuba College