

**DAS President's Report to the PCCD Board of Trustees for February 15, 2011**  
**Karolyn van Putten**

Thank you, Mr. President. Good evening trustees, chancellor, all district administrative center staff, college presidents, colleagues and members of the public.

Last week, 12 to 15 faculty along with 10 administrators participated in two days of interest-based bargaining (IBB) training conducted by Annie Song-Hill, the supervising mediator for the state Mediation and Conciliation Board. It was, to put it mildly, most revealing . . . Revealing in terms of new information learned about many of my colleagues who were participating, and in terms of the purpose of the training, primarily with respect to the distinctions between positional approaches to collective bargaining and interest-based bargaining.

My only question at the conclusion of the training was whether or not the district's willingness to use this approach required a board policy. While I haven't seen the actual language, I'm told that the board's commitment to IBB is reflected in our PFT contract. Since we've already had overtures, during a previous board meeting, that the district administrative center and the PFT were then at odds about purported take-aways the district had presented for consideration, some of us are wondering how this board will communicate its support for the interest-based bargaining approach to contract negotiations.

Next, a brief update on the Chancellor's Ad Hoc Committee: As of this morning, the Ad Hoc Committee has finalized its statement of purpose, which will soon be distributed to the entire district community, along with the chancellor's original directive to the committee. To date, we've heard from four of the eight disciplines that have had district-wide discipline meetings, which comprises a subset of disciplines we are reviewing in preparation for developing a set of recommendations to the chancellor and some of the planning and budgeting integration model committees.

In that process, we've already developed some clarity about additional considerations that must be accounted for as our recommendations evolve. We are in accord that any recommendations we make to the chancellor will first be reviewed by appropriate discipline faculty who would be affected by our recommendations. Since it is impossible to conduct an exhaustive review of ALL disciplines in the time available to us, it is probable that our recommendations will include some models that can be applied to the remaining majority. About this, there will be more to come in the weeks ahead.

During today's District Academic Senate meeting, we discussed our need for meaningful information about district administrative center specific budget reductions. One outcome of that discussion was the DAS members' directive to me to express the following [and I apologize, Chancellor, for not having told you about this in advance; there wasn't time between that meeting and this one]:

The District's official position on budget reduction efforts is to make cuts "away from the classroom." Since we are part of an integrated system of roles, responsibilities and

functions, it is extremely difficult to understand how this can occur. Nonetheless, that's what we've been told is the intention. Given that, over the past 2 years, the colleges have been directed to develop budget scenarios that could result from 3%, 5%, and 10% cuts to services and instruction. What we have not seen, despite repeated requests of one kind or another, is what is being reduced at the DAC in terms of positions and their financial impact; what the DAC is doing or proposing that will address reducing its fair share of the 21+ million dollar worst case scenario.

We understand that some of the information necessary to make these proposals is still buried in the misplaced details of our still-evolving enterprise resource system. Nonetheless, we think it's only fair, especially since the district office does not independently generate any significant funds other than, possibly, grants, that the district shows the colleges its 3%, 5%, and 10% budget reduction scenarios. It would help us to have a flow chart of all district office positions currently filled or planned, their costs, how these positions are integrated with one another, as well as an explanation of how these positions support the colleges. Meanwhile, at least twice a month for the past several months, we see positions being advertised and filled at the district office.

Further, if, as we've heard rumors about, the colleges will be reducing administrative positions, is any consideration being given to moving some of the DAC positions to the colleges to take up some of the slack that would result if the college positions are reduced?

What this boils down to is, basically, we want the veils that are currently drawn over the district office budget to be removed so that we can see what is really happening at the district administrative center.

That concludes my report for tonight. Thank you.