

Guided Pathways

Moving Forward

Workshop March 1-2, Oakland. Two full days. Overnight. Need 6-8 Faculty

Work Plan due March 30

Money Received in April After Work Plan is approved

Expenses for the Workshop to be paid by borrowing against money received in April

The Money we're talking about: SRJC total: \$1,522,705.00

Year 1: \$ 380,676

Year 2: 456,811

Year 3: 380,676

Year 4: 152,270

Year 5: 152,270

Reminder: we can opt out in any year.

Additional money for Guided Pathways as it applies to CTE will be available through ongoing Strong Workforce grants.

Some Promises and Constraints:

- The Guided Pathways Grant Program, which we voted to sign for the first installment, requires “cross-functional” collaboration including faculty, administration, classified colleagues, and students
- We have been assured by the administration that the process for deciding how the money will be spent will be driven primarily by the Academic Senate (in a letter signed by Dr. Mary Kay Rudolph, Dec. 20, 2017), or “collaboratively with the Academic Senate” in a letter signed by Dr. Chong and Board President Fishman (Jan 31, 2018):

“We are committed to working collaboratively with the Academic Senate and other constituent groups to ensure that this much-needed funding will be accepted and directed to benefit faculty and students.”

- There is a tension between the collaboration called for, the faculty participation required, and the timeline.
- There are issues to be solved about purview and jurisdiction. The Academic Senate's purview is academic matters. Of the 10 + 1, Guided Pathways falls clearly within 8 of the 10 (not to mention the plus 1): 1. Curriculum; 2. Degree/Certificate requirements; 3. Grading policies; 4. Educational program development; 5. Standards/policies regarding student preparation and success; 6. District governance structures as related to faculty roles; 8. Faculty professional development; 9. Program review. AFA's purview includes negotiating faculty compensation, and so has a stake in the processes for how re RAT (reassigned time) is allocated

Role of the Previous Guided Pathways Task Force

We should honor the work already done by the Guided Pathways Task Force. But the matter is more complicated than just handing it over. The previous Task Force was not initiated, not overseen by the Academic Senate; this is a new thing. *A new work group should be much larger, have direct Senate oversight, and carefully include a broad range of cross-functional groups and diversity of disciplines and opinions.*

Principles and Procedures

- The Academic Senate Executive Committee has begun the process of devising an application to be on the work group.
- Suggestion: An MOU between AFA and the Senate be drawn and signed that clarifies respective purviews

Please Suggest: questions and screening criteria for the application process that are aimed at realizing the above attributes.

We need a team to go to Oakland three weeks from tomorrow. We do not have time to follow an application and screening process with full integrity in time. We have numerous volunteers already.

Question: Should the Senate Executive Committee select the 6-8 faculty for that team (to include the Academic Senate president), understanding that the application process will still go on and that the team who writes the Work Plan will be larger than, and not necessarily include, all those who go to the Workshop?

What other interests, principles, or concerns should be kept in front of us as we move forward? Please offer them at the table today, or email them to the Executive Committee.

Thanks,

ET