TRANSFORMATION: AN ANALYSIS BY THE FACULTY SENATE

Produced by the Houston Community College Faculty Senate
August 2023

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Transformation began in 2015, with Phase I largely implemented by 2016. Phases II and III were scheduled to begin after Phase I was completed, but those plans ran into obstacles and were never fully realized. The Faculty Senate performed its own analysis of the entire situation. Several Phase I initiatives worked fairly well, such as the revision of faculty teaching assignments and the professional development funding system. Other initiatives in Phase I worked well but required review and revision, such as allocation of chairs. A few Phase I changes were not successful; master scheduling stands out as a looming problem amongst those. Additional larger aspects of Transformation failed to deliver as well, particularly the lack of visible changes in Student Services, the continued issues with Procurement and with internal communications, and the failure to "right-size" the upper levels of Administration.

Introduction

When Chancellor Cesar Maldonado started his tenure as HCC's Chancellor, he announced a reorganization of the college called, "Transformation." The centerpiece of Transformation Phase I was the unification of administrative overhead and "shared services" at the district level and the creation of "Centers of Excellence" at the regional colleges, where workforce programs would be focused on career and preparation and industry relations. Phase II, to be initiated after Phase I, was to center on the reorganization of Student Services to a more centralized model. Finally, Phase III was to involve the overhaul of units housed directly at 3100 Main, such as Procurement, Finance, and Human Relations (since renamed Talent Engagement).

When the Board of Trustees announced that it would not renew Chancellor Maldonado's contract going forward, President David White convened an all-day workshop for Faculty Senators to reflect on the impacts of Transformation and to suggest recommendations for the future. He and members of the Senate's Executive Committee (particularly President-elect DaeJan Grigsby and Vice-President Nichole Boutte-Heiniluoma) drafted a list of topics to consider. Those topics were divided into groups and Senators were randomly assigned groups to consider topics. They, in turn, presented their findings to all assembled Senators and their conclusions were discussed.

The following document provides an edited and uniform presentation of those reflections. It attempts to summarize and assess the key impacts of Transformation, particularly as it relates to instruction. Faculty have a vested interest in understanding the impacts of Transformation because that process has impacted faculty directly.

It should be noted that this paper reflects the views of faculty in the main. There will be other perspectives, as would be expected. Yet faculty are the group with whom students have the greatest interaction, and instruction is the primary purpose of the College. Future Administrations would do well to consider the conclusions drawn here.

Centralization of Instructional Services

- Regional/campus-based departments replaced by college-wide <u>departments</u>
- Chair election cycles unified
- Chairs report to Deans, who report to an Associate Vice Chancellor at 3100 Main
  - Workforce Deans report to their local Presidents as well as an AVC/Workforce

<u>What went well:</u>

- Adjunct hiring handled district-wide; no more competition between local departments
- Less territoriality about instructors
- Consistency in hiring standard for both full-time and adjunct faculty
- Some faculty able to teach more subjects within their field
- Increased rationalization of scheduling (prior to centralization of scheduling)
- Deans as subject-matter experts better able to provide leadership than local deans
- Unified elections allowed for increased efficiency
- Enhanced sense of district-wide community among departments
- Enhanced authority for program coordinators (qv.)

<u>What did not go well:</u>

- Loss of administrative assistants
- Concentration of responsibilities for chairs in large departments
- Not enough support for certain newly enlarged departments
- Chair duties in medium-large departments are now onerous yet cannot be delegated at this time
- Less direct observation of instructors in large departments
- Tensions increased as Presidents attempted to retain/exert control over scheduling
- Loss of local sense of community

Analysis

Arguably this was the single biggest change of Transformation Phase I and represented a complete shift from the previously local-based governance model. Many instructional leaders saw this as positive, freeing them from the perceived whims of local management. At the same time, certain issues arose from lack of foresight, particularly with the medium- and large-sized departments. The cross-pollination in large departments of faculty from across the district has had good results, yet at the same time have struggled to fully rebuild the sense of community that existed in the local communities.

Conclusion

While much has been accomplished by centralizing instruction, opportunities for improvement still exist. The bottom line is that the consolidation of instruction not only yields financial benefits for the district compared to the dispersion of multiple departments across various sites, but it also fosters an elevated standard of academic excellence and congruence with strategic goals. This positive shift was notably absent in the previous structure, where department chairs solely reported to local Presidents primarily focused on enrollment matters.

Centers of Excellence

- Workforce programs reorganized to operate under units akin to academic divisions
- Entry-level courses distributed district-wide, but capstone and equipment-dependent courses would be headquartered at a single specific campus.
- Directors (later made Deans) reported directly to Presidents
- Later phase of Transformation created the Vice Chancellor for Workforce and rerouted the AVC/Workforce away from the Vice Chancellor for Instructional Services

What went well:	**What did not go well:**
• Gave Presidents a realm	• Location-specific requirements hindered student opportunities and success
• Allowed for community-based specializations	• Some of the location-bases make no logical sense
• Centralized marketing and advertising	• Reporting lines go against the centralization concept (IS)
• Allowed for non-redundant purchase and use of expensive technologies and large spaces	• Hindered move to one college on account of location-specific reporting structures and non-standardization

Analysis

The creation of Centers of Excellence (hereafter "Centers") was an attempt to address the issue of workforce programs not growing in optimal manners. Programs were grouped loosely along similar lines, and headquartered at various campuses where it was thought they could attract the greatest enrollment, also saving money by not having duplication across the district. The Directors (later Deans) reported directly to the local President, who was seen as a facilitator in building bridges to the local communities. The results have been mixed. Some programs have been forced to close while others are struggling to expand given their current locations/facilities. Additionally, the role of Presidents in running the programs has created issues with scheduling as well as creating separate lines of reporting. Centers containing both workforce and academic programs have been negatively impacted by this dichotomy. The creation of a Vice Chancellor for Workforce has further confused the reporting lines. Particularly with Centers that contain both academic and workforce disciplines, there is a sense of "having to serve two bosses." As a result, certain issues like staffing face challenges that make it more difficult to expand those programs. At the same time, Centers are given higher levels of administrative and financial support per student compared to other campuses within the same college, resulting in academic disciplines within those Centers feeling as if they are being given short shrift.

Conclusion

Some Centers have thrived and expanded, owing to good planning and management. The base concept itself is not a bad one. However, the groupings of certain programs deserve renewed attention, with an eye towards more efficient/logical clusters as well as possible separation of academic programs. Some technology should be location-specific, while other technology could be licensed district-wide to create entry pathways throughout many locations.

It is important to note that the roles of the Presidents do bear closer scrutiny. Questions have also been raised about the need for a separate Vice Chancellor for Workforce, but that is beyond the scope of this paper to address.

Reconceptualization of Faculty Teaching Assignments

- Faculty no longer assigned to specific colleges (locations) for teaching assignments
- District-wide availability of assignments
- Faculty able to move from location to location

What went well:

- Faculty in large programs more able to teach at preferred locations
- Chairs better able to move faculty around as needed for coverage
- Adjuncts able to move around more freely without risk of alienating local chairs
- Reduction in competition for hiring

What did not go well:

- Smaller programs forced to move faculty around to provide district-wide coverage where none had existed before
- Some locations lost faculty (e.g., Southeast)
- Movement of faculty complicated by the office space issue
- Loss of campus-based communities

Analysis

Along with centralization of instruction, this change was one of the most prominent features of Transformation Phase I and was widely lauded at the time. Full-time faculty no longer had to re-apply to change locations and chairs were no longer fighting each other for adjuncts. One of the biggest complaints over time, however, was the loss of a sense of camaraderie amongst local campus communities. As well, the smaller departments found themselves challenged to provide coverage at locations where previously they had none, raising tensions with the Presidents.

Conclusion

Most faculty, particularly younger faculty, now take a large degree of locational flexibility to be a given. Chairs can now seek candidates without worrying about the attractiveness of any given campus. These are very good reasons to preserve the current arrangement. However, some equitable solution should be implemented regarding staffing at certain locations that traditionally have issues attracting full-time faculty. As well, master scheduling (qv.) should be adjusted to try to account for the desire for "geographic/temporal consistency," e.g., having all Monday/Wednesday classes at one location and not two.

Faculty Professional Development Funding

- Full-time faculty received funding straight from VCIS, not local Presidents
- Two thousand dollars per faculty member made available
- Funding could be used to a variety of professional development activities
- Travel could be booked using the Concur system, and prepaid on the Travel card.

What went well:

- Many faculty received funding for the first time in their employment
- Money was dedicated to the purpose, i.e. could not be "raided" by admins for other uses
- Fair and equitable system of approvals and distributions

What did not go well:

- Initial approval process did not work well
- Concur system has major issues
- Inadequate training for faculty
- Rules regarding use of funding are not widely understood
- Some of the rules appear arbitrary
- Funding has not increased in several years
- No funding for part-time faculty

Analysis

Prior to 2015, most faculty were at the mercy of their local Presidents –many received almost zero funding whatsoever. Every full-time faculty member now has up to two thousand dollars to use for travel, journal subscriptions, organizational memberships, and similar uses. Disbursed as it is, the funding provides a savings to faculty both short-term (not having to pay out-of-pocket) and long-term (non-taxable benefit). Those faculty who do use the funding often exhaust their budget lines. However, numerous teething issues were problematic, and the use of the Concur system (compounded by the lack of formal training[*]) has caused many faculty to shun using their funds. The Eagle Travel Office, designed to assist faculty, has done very little to improve its performance since its inception. The rules are not widely known in their entirety, and discussions about appropriate usage of funding are a continuing source of frustration for many (as there appears to be resistance to change from within the organization itself). Part-time faculty, who are currently also expected to engage in professional development, are left to their own devices and the use of the Faculty Senate's Bedichek-Orman Fund.

Conclusion

Contrary to some senior Administration suggestions that the money could better be spent elsewhere, the funding (particularly for travel) is vital not only for discipline-specific training, but to increase HCC's

---

[*] It should be noted that informal training exists and is quite effective.

visibility through networking and highlighting the work of HCC scholars. Other institutions have expressed jealousy that HCC supports professional development to the extent that it does. In short, though there is a need to revise the procedures and rules, this is an aspect of Transformation that must be preserved. It should be mentioned that the two thousand dollars cited previously has not increased since 2015; the figure may need upward revision soon.

Reallocation and Assignment of Chairs and Associate Chairs

- 210,000 contact hours for a discipline or combination to have a regular chair
- 400,000 additional contact hours for each associate chair
- Chairs and associates distributed across the district by divisions (deans)
- Academic chairs were no longer tied to local Presidents
- Term limits put in place for elected instructional leaders

What went well:

- Lower-level leadership distributed more evenly
- Students able to find an instructional leader in-person (within that division)
- Detachment of departments from certain locations promised to offer more opportunities for faculty to advance into leadership

What did not go well:

- Associate chair needs of medium- and large-sized departments not fully anticipated
- Students at times unable to quickly identify and utilize the newly-localized divisional leadership

Analysis

This part of Transformation was akin to a matrix vision of organization (qv.) in that leadership would be de-linearized at the lowest levels. The benefit here was that even if a student could not find a department chair at a given location, there would be an associate chair or a chair from within that division to provide assistance. As well, by giving deans the power to assign faculty leaders to locations, better coverage could be provided while somewhat democratizing the leadership by not tying positions permanently to locations. The then-VCIS had promised a review of the system (including the allocation formula) after a few years but left the position before the review could take place; this review has yet to occur. Meanwhile, larger departments have struggled with the demand for coverage as well as the workload on their chairs and associates. As well, many deans felt constrained from moving long-time chairs (sometimes under pressure coming from the Presidents), resulting in lopsided assignments and poor coverage. Students at times have been at a loss to identify whom to seek, though many now simply use email to contact chairs directly. Finally, the perceived lack of local leadership has been identified as a factor in the loss of local communities, which may be depressing morale; not all departments have successfully replaced these with district-wide communities.

Conclusion

A review of the allocational model for chairs and associate chairs is urgently needed. While centralization of instruction has been seen largely as a positive, this is one of the areas where it could stand

improvement by more direct oversight, not less. The tension between bringing centralization and building communities remains a complex issue, to which there may be no one-size-fits-all solution.

Program Coordinators and Program Directors

- Compliance and data collection position was retained from pre-Transformation structure
- Responsibilities were delineated and expanded
- Coordinators were moved to a four-year election cycle.

What went well:

- Standardization of compensation (stipend versus releases, how many, contract terms)
- Standardization of job responsibilities and expectations
- AVC of Assessment and associated roles to standardize reports
- Division of responsibilities between chairs/coordinators set and established

What did not go well:

- Unified elections took programs off assessment cycles
- Some Program Directors need to be 12-month contract due to their accreditation cycles and reporting
- PC/PD reports to Dean, instead of the AVC who is more aware of PC/PD roles and responsibilities for accountability
- Accreditation issues unresolved
- Some academic departments have workforce components, resulting in blurred boundaries

Analysis

Initially there was discussion about transferring coordinator responsibilities to the chairs; the idea was discarded as putting too much responsibility upon the latter. Prior to Transformation, coordinators had to deal with sometimes-uncooperative chairs who answered to Presidents (and were thus largely shielded). However, chairs must now report to deans while coordinators report to both deans and to an associate vice chancellor, creating tensions and blurred lines. Of immediate concern is that coordinators were placed on a four-year election cycle, which often put them out of step with reporting requirements, e.g., having to complete program assessments in their first year in the position. There is lack of uniformity in terms of contracts in that some coordinators need to be twelve-month employees owing to accreditation/reporting requirements. Finally, there is some confusion as to which programs get coordinators and which get directors (who combine the roles of coordinator and chair).

Conclusion

 The election cycle/term of office for coordinators needs attention to reduce problems with reporting and timing of term of office. While program coordinators and program directors now have more authority, there

are still issues relating to the chain of command. Larger programs are sometimes overwhelmed with the volume of work, and revised compensation for those roles should be considered.

Master Scheduling

- Scheduling control was taken away from chairs and given over to 3100 Main
- Ad Astra software was purchased to render analytics-based decisions on scheduling

What went well:

- Had the potential to improve student outcomes by providing stronger and consistent pathways viz. timing and locations

What did not go well:

- Ignored input from chairs with extensive scheduling experience
- Ad Astra not being properly used
- Lack of flexibility regarding schedule changes (e.g., all changes run through 3100 first)
- Schedules created too far in advance

Analysis

Of all the changes brought by Transformation, this was one of the most controversial, and arguably the least effective. Some chairs attribute the steady drop in enrollment in part to the impact of centralized scheduling, as students could no longer rely upon dependable schedules set by rollover from previous semesters (based on long experience by the chairs as to which courses would do well and which would be inefficient/would not make). Ad Astra continues to provide problems in terms of room assignments and has yet to live up to its reputation for analytic insight; part of the issue is that it uses data that is often seen as not being reflective of real experience; the running of small classes at certain locations is very problematic on that account.

There is also a continued disconnect between scheduling and advising, which negatively impacts the student experience (e.g., degree programs). The process of changing the schedule generated by a central scheduling group was (and is) onerous, save when Presidents request to add additional sections, which often has the negative effect of drawing resources away from students in other parts of the district. Finally, the demands for advance scheduling create tremendous amounts of stress on faculty and chairs and reduce flexibility based on new developments. Hovering over all these issues is the paradox that the Board insists on monetary savings, yet constantly pushes the Administration to run money-losing classes at certain locations.

Conclusion

Scheduling needs to be overhauled, on a "lean to fat" basis, e.g., there will be some campuses that have to run with "lean" enrollment, and that may mean small classes or reduced sections. The department chairs and divisional deans are the best ones suited to performing this task, and their authority should be

restored. Presidents should have to make their cases to the chairs for additional classes, and not vice-versa (i.e., chairs needing to explain why sections cannot be offered).

Matrix Organization

- Linear hierarchies of command to be replaced by a more decentralized network

What went well:

- Promise of increased collaboration
- Creation of new lines of communication

What did not go well:

- Slower decision making
- Conflicts between differing authorities

Analysis

Matrix organization theory posits that less linearity will leverage existing strengths to create new synergies. The reality has been somewhat different. Many mid-level leaders attempted to expand their own authority by creating new layers of reporting, ignoring the argument that a matrix organization should be about reducing rigidity. Others simply ignored the matrix concept entirely. It should be noted that there is much less emphasis now on becoming a matrix organization than several years ago. Indeed, the proposed "collaborative governance" model[*] seems to do away with the concept entirely, relying instead on a traditional hierarchical arrangement of groups.

Conclusion

Matrix organization theory cannot be evaluated properly as part of Transformation because it was never fully implemented.

---

[*] The Faculty Senate rejects the use of the term "collaborative governance" as one artificed to mean more centralized decision-making with a façade of input from stakeholders. Shared governance, as defined many times by the AAUP, remains the preferred concept.

Transparency

- Transformation promised increased transparency in communications and decision-making
- Information would be made easier to locate
- Decision-making would not take place in vacuums

What went well:	**What did not go well:**
• There has been some increase in communications from leadership	• Many communications poorly worded and constructed, giving a non-professional appearance • Key decisions came across as diktats, with little or no indication of faculty (or staff) input

Analysis

If we were to identify KPIs to associate with this particular issue, salary information would be the first one. However, like many bits of information, salary information remains largely hidden from public view by the intranet (MyHCC) and generally difficult to locate. Many key policies remain similarly difficult to locate and reproduce, while older outdated policies remain posted, leading to a culture where individuals make up rules on the fly, sometimes violating stated promises. Decision-making in a form recognizable as shared governance remains problematic, as Administration leaders take on more responsibility while ignoring faculty recommendations. This has produced poor results, e.g., master scheduling. Finally, the communications themselves, while attempting to shed light on key decisions, often have had the reverse effect of raising more questions than they answer.

Conclusion

Centralization of instructional services has been widely cited as a positive good, but it would be even better if transparency were truly implemented. It would go a long way toward keeping HCC as a college of choice for employees. As well, the recent proposal to move to "collaborative governance" seems at first glance to represent an increase in transparency; however, strategic decisions will remain in the hands of a small group which, while unavoidable, still does not explicitly promise to raise awareness as to how decisions are rendered. The quality and tone of communications must be improved, with better explanations and the ability to provide feedback.

Communications

- Improved reporting lines would lead to better internal communications
- Promise of more direct communications from senior Administration
- Creation of a Vice Chancellor for Communications
- Improved coordination of activities via better planning
- Better HCC website

What went well:

- Number of direct messages from leadership increased

What did not go well:

- Calendars still not centralized
- The "game of telephone" doesn't work coming down from VCIS to deans to dept chair, etc.
- Difficult to find most current versions of many documents
- Website is suboptimal despite redesign
- Mixed messaging from leadership still a problem

Analysis

HCC has long had a problem with its internal communications. Improvement was offered as part of Transformation. There is more direct communication from senior leadership, particularly from the Chancellor's office. Additionally, communications has been deemed sufficiently important to warrant the creation of a Vice Chancellorship. It should be noted, in fairness, that the position primarily deals with external communications and relations, at which it excels. Nevertheless, many issues do remain. The communications from the highest level are often passed along less formally than they deserve (e.g., "game of telephone"), resulting in misunderstandings and occasional outright distortions. The HCC website, despite an extensive (and expensive) redesign several years ago, does not serve internal stakeholders well. Many important documents remain difficult to locate –it is well-known that the best way to locate something on our website is to use Google and not the internal search engine. Ownership of many out-of-date pages remains murky, and effecting edits remains an onerous and time-consuming process. The Events calendar is severely limited in that the local campuses still maintain their own Calendars and do not share information, making planning far more problematic than need be. Finally, centralization has produced the unintended consequence of lessening the communications between campus operations and faculty, e.g., no one knows whom to contact.

Conclusion

The HCC website is already in the process of being redesigned, and this is a positive. Internal communications in general remain an issue deserving of closer attention and care.

Reorganization of Office Administration Support

- Reallocation of staff based on perceived needs
- Different templates for Instructional Services, Student Services, and other divisions

What went well:

- Dedicated administrative support directed to most departments

What did not go well:

- Not enough support for certain departments
- Non-standard skill sets for office personnel
- Training requirements /skills required for current job/promotion not specified

Analysis

While many departments did get their own dedicated office staff, some were left sharing personnel with other departments. Additionally, budget woes along the way meant that there was often a shortage of qualified office staff, and replacements were slow in coming. Other limitations included office staff demanding to remain at certain locations; when coupled with the shortage previously mentioned, it had the effect of limiting how departments and divisions could distribute leadership. Finally, there remains confusion as to specific job duties in many roles.

Conclusion

While largely positive, this facet of Transformation has been hindered by lack of funding for additional personnel.

Sizing of Mid- and Upper-Level Management

- Promised reduction in the numbers of mid-level and upper-level administrators
- Revision of reporting lines to promote efficiency and transparency
- Standardization of job requirements

What went well:

- Communications chain became clearer, resulting in some improvements
- Reorganized organizational chart made better sense for academic programs

What did not go well:

- Wide perception that we are still incredibly top-heavy
- Many positions remain vaguely defined and duplicate other positions
- Qualifications for jobs still not completely transparent and are sometimes overly mutable
- Administrative support has been reduced for many departments
- No clear path of advancement for faculty and lower-level staff
- Many admins are "locked in" with no way to return to previous positions, i.e. "move up or move out."
- "Peter Principle" of moving up without moving down comes into play

Analysis

HCC has been repeatedly criticized in decades past for being too top-heavy with too many administrators, most recently by the Huron Group. At the start of Transformation, it was promised that over time, a "right-sizing" of leadership would occur. It has not. HCC has more senior and upper-mid-level administrators than ever before. For example, the organization has gone from having five Vice Chancellors to seven and added an additional President for Online College. This does not even consider the number of mid-level positions that have been created, sometimes under opaque hiring circumstances. Nor does it consider the number of positions whose original title and pay have been elevated and increased for reasons unclear to most. There are serious questions raised as to the inefficiency and costs associated with having so many such employees. Compounding the issue is the well-known "Peter Principle" of individuals rising to their level of suboptimal performance; without a clear exit path other that leaving or dismissal (and HCC's track record viz. the latter is a topic well beyond the scope of this paper), the

organization is left with a surfeit of administrators who may be better positioned below their current level, yet meantime act as an effective barrier-in-place to those below them who might do the job better.

Conclusion

A serious examination of job responsibilities and reporting lines should be a top priority, as the Huron Group itself recommended, with an eye towards significant reductions in force at those levels. The hiring processes should be respected and completely transparent. Consideration should be given to allowing mid- and upper-mid-level managers a path "back down the ladder" instead of forcing them upwards and/or outwards. It has been suggested that term limits for certain levels of management may work well in that capacity.

Transformation of Student Services

- Presidents would continue to hold authority over local personnel in the short term (Phase I).
- A centralization of Student Services would eventually take place (Phase II and beyond).

What went well:

- Improved registration for classes
- More and better tutoring options than before
    - In-Person
    - Virtual
    - Upswing
- Expanded Counseling Services
    - Basic needs
    - Direct student aid
    - Mental health

What did not go well:

Enrollment & Registration require improvement
- Need more advisors
- Advisor turnover rate is a problem
- Advisors providing inconsistent and/or out-of-date information
- Early Alert not fixed
- Student Services website is confusing
- Website for registration is very difficult
- Student Services structure still opaque

Analysis

Student Services was meant to be Phase II of the Transformation process. However, it suffered many setbacks along the way, not least of which was inconsistent leadership in the early days. Much of the issue is that many in Student Services still view themselves as answerable more to their local campus than to the College as a whole. There is still a wide disconnect between what Instructional Services (faculty) need students to know, and what Student Services tells students. In general, there seems to be a lack of accountability in this area.

Conclusion

The Transformation of Student Services remains incomplete. It should be an immediate critical area of concern for the next Chancellor.

Additional Facets of Transformation: Questions Without Answers

Strategic Planning Unit

This entity, under the aegis of the Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives remains very opaque to many within HCC.

- What is its exact role?
- Does it have the authority to overrule other entities, e.g., Instructional Services?
- How does it fit in the larger scheme of shared governance?

Procurement

This unit has long been, and remains, a source of complaints with the HCC community. Chancellor Maldonado initially indicated that Phase III of Transformation would be 3100 Main itself, meaning the units housed there. This never truly occurred. The problems with Procurement persist and grow. Some have suggested the possibility of outsourcing this work.

Talent Engagement (formerly known as Human Resources)

Part of what was envisioned as Phase III was rolled out early on, with the rebranding of Human Resources. However, it is difficult to ascertain what other changes have occurred.

- The actual structure of the unit remains opaque to outsiders.
- Confusion remains as to which individuals hold what responsibilities (e.g., "Whom do I ask about….?")
- Complaints persist that some refuse responsibilities that fall under their job descriptions (employee records, etc.)
- Some within the unit remain difficult to contact

Dual Mandates

One concerning trend observed during Transformation was the rise of leaders holding more than one position. A notable example of this was when Vice Chancellor Beatty simultaneously held portfolio over Instructional Services and Student Services. It begs the question of whether one person can do both jobs well. At the same time, it also begs the question as to why certain positions persist and are backfilled when one person demonstrates that they can do both.

Office Space

HCC has long had issues with many full-time faculty not having true offices. Inconsistency persists as to how existing office space is allocated, such as some faculty having private offices while others are forced

to share space within cubicle farms. The flexibility in locational assignments has sometimes produced negative results, with faculty ejected from office space owing to a single semester's absence. Adjuncts continue to lack anything resembling adequate space to meet with students and conduct their required office hours. Moreover, the issue is not confined to faculty alone; several administrative branches also have severe shortages of space to locate their personnel.

Credits

The 2022-2023 Faculty Senate Executive Committee

- President: David White
- President-elect: DaeJan Grigsby
- Vice President: Nichole Boutte-Heiniluoma
- Secretary: Stacey Higdon
- Treasurer: Nathan Smith
- Immediate Past President: Antrece Baggétt

Transformation Analysis Document Editing Team

- David White
- DaeJan Grigsby
- Nathan Smith
- Kathy Najafi
- Karen Saenz
- Laurel Lacroix
- Evelyn Vargas
- Melissa Miller-Waters

This document is a product of the HCC Faculty Senate.