

Additional feedback regarding information given at College Council 10/16:

- Admin feedback on questions regarding DEI: “These are important questions. I am curious to understand what others at the institution think.” Follow-up questions: What steps have been taken to understand what others at the institution think about this? What is Administration planning to do regarding DEI?
- Admin feedback on questions regarding the general process and how IEP isn’t taking the lead: “The Academic Reduction and Elimination process inevitably provokes concern and anxiety. It is critical that this division continue to be seen as a trusted partner for all at the college, and not be associated with a process that is perceived as threatening.” Suggestion: Do not refer to the process with terms that provoke anxiety. If this process will be used in the future, it needs a different name.
- Admin response to questions about the venue for effective feedback. “It seems like a first point of engagement would be to learn from our community about how we all want to participate.” Follow-up question: What has Administration done to find out how employees would like to participate? What exactly is the plan for engaging employees?
- Admin response to a question if support for program improvement is an essential element of an equitable process: “...is it equitable to continue a program for a few, when we could allocate those resources to programs or services that support many, and many who are quite vulnerable?” What does this mean? The question seems to imply that a program which benefits “a few” may not benefit individuals who are vulnerable. Again: Is Administration interested in giving programs time to make improvements? Does Administration view that element as essential to this process in order to make it more equitable? Or is the plan to simply cut without allowing time for improvement?
- Admin response to a question how the ARE Process will inform decisions regarding budgetary issues such as layoffs: “The question presumes that there will be expenses reduced as a result of the process, which we do not know. If there were savings, it is possible that layoffs in other parts of the college would not be necessary.” Please explain this response. First, we have repeatedly heard contradictory information. We have heard that, on the one hand, we don’t know if this process will result in reductions; then we heard that, on the other hand, this process IS about the budget, and we have to make up for a deficit. Does Administration expect to reduce anything as a result of this process? Also, the sentence in the response about layoffs is unclear. If there were savings... where? Savings by reducing a program? So reducing a program may mean that layoffs in another part of the college wouldn’t be necessary? Isn’t that the goal of this process: to decide where the layoffs will occur? It still sounds like layoffs are anticipated, so it would be helpful to get clarification.
- Admin indicated the following about the rubric: “The rubric is a means to apply criteria in order to enable deeper conversations. Those conversations will allow for a number of considerations to be surfaced that apply to particular programs.” Please explain what that means. What exactly is the purpose of the rubric? How will we be prioritizing programs and courses? What is the purpose of the “conversations” that keep being referenced? What exactly will be discussed, and what will be the outcomes of those conversations? How does a conversation determine whether a program is kept in relation to other programs at the College?
- Admin identified that, according to the draft rubrics, a program could earn points for simply being an area that was “specifically designed to respond to systematically

underserved or underrepresented students.” However, the original design of a program does not reflect whether a program actually does what it was designed to do. Therefore, any kind of yes/no question about the original purpose of a program is not an appropriate question, and it should be removed from the rubric.

- Please clarify whether Administration is planning a reorganization of any kind, with or without the ARE Process to inform that decision. For example, do you plan to reorganize any of the college based on the implementation of Guided Pathways?
- At the end of the 10/16 presentation, it was indicated that “many of these questions need to be considered with the input of others.” It would be helpful to better understand how Administration plans to get that input.

Additional feedback regarding information given at College Council 11/06:

- At one of the ARE open forums, this question was asked: “Are you thinking that a program might be able to make improvements, not from getting more money, but time to assess and change?” The response: “Yes, departments and programs can begin now talking about these issues with the Dean of their division, to determine if there are ways to be more efficient. This is true of all programs, those that aren’t earning as much revenue as they cost AND those that are earning more revenue than they cost.” If a program is in the green, what exactly is the expectation of the faculty in that program? When we have heard presentations about this process, it sounded as if programs in the green didn’t need to do anything additional. If there are expectations, those need to be clearly articulated.
- Another question: “If there are any programs that showed in the green that we feel should be considered in this reduction process, can we propose that be done?” The response from Admin: “We decided on this process and criteria last fall. In this instance, we should let the process play out going forward as designed. As much as possible, I want to avoid directing any negative energy at each other.”
 - First, the Admin response seems to imply that someone would be directing negative energy at another group, when that may not be the case. Please assume positive intent.
 - Second, the criteria and process were not decided on last fall; they have evolved over time, which shows a commitment to improvement. We should not refuse to make adjustments that bring equity and integrity to the entire process.
- We seem to be getting contradictory information. It is unclear if Administration plans to make adjustments to the criteria or process. In response to a question about inductive vs. deductive reasoning, Admin indicated, “We are starting with overarching criteria, but as we look at data and hear feedback, we are modifying criteria and the process.” This contradicts previous comments that state we will not make adjustments to the criteria or process.
- We have already been provided the financial analysis report, which means we all know which programs and subject areas will be moved forward. Now that we all know this information about which are in the red, it is unclear how we are going to adjust criteria and the process in a way that doesn’t artificially benefit/harm a program or subject area.

- Another question: Where does quality of instruction come into the costs here? Some classes will simply cost more to give students the experiences they need to be educated in this program/field. The response: “Absolutely. That is why the process has several phases and looks at programs and subject areas through multiple lenses.” Does this mean that the process is going to examine faculty portfolios or other elements of content instruction to determine the quality of instruction?
- In response to a question about leaning the College, the response indicated that “there are numerous open positions across all areas of the college that have not been filled, following last year’s voluntary separation program.” Does Administration equate not filling positions with leaning the College? How does not filling positions relate to the principles of lean?
- Please describe how you are making the process at BAG transparent. How will Admin provide space for multiple means of communication and feedback? What will that look like?
- Beyond having discussions with FTF about what an “optimal number” of FTF would be for our size college, how is Administration examining research or data to become better informed about personnel decisions? Is Administration looking at overall FTF numbers, or the numbers of FTF needed for each program? How is DEI Strategic Priority # 3 connected to the optimal number of FTF? In other words, how does this strategic priority relate to the conversation Administration is having about the optimal number of FTF at the College?
- Are we framing questions based on who we are, or based on who we want to be?