

**President's Response  
Campus Issue 21-22-03**

**Committee or Individual:** Physics Department, Mike Richardson, Chair  
Date Submitted: 09/23/21

**Issue or Concern:** VPRT abuse of shared governance

**Summary of Issue:** Based on concerns about changes made to original plans for Mohr Hall, changes made via the VPRT process, the Physics Department expresses concerns about the VPRT process existing outside the college participatory governance processes and, as a result, facilities decisions being made without awareness and input by constituency groups. The Physics Department recommends investigating the history and operations of the VPRT with a goal of reorganizing so it does exist in the realm of overall college governance.

**Action Taken:**

10/07/21: Issue is presented at Executive Council

02/02/22: Executive Council discusses VPRT with M. Lednicky and C. Hirkala, representatives of the Campus Development Committee. Discussion centers around some similarities between Campus Development and VPRT.

04/07/22: Executive Council discusses how to move forward with issue.

02/22/23: Campus Development Committee revises its charge to include reviewing "short-and-long-range plans for general campus development and modifications, as well as for specific facilities, forwarded via the Facilities Modification or IT Action Process (VPRT)."

**President's Response to Executive Council:**

This campus issue response is considerably late because of a couple factors: transitions in college presidents at the time this issue was being resolved and an incorrect posting on the college website whereby a president's response wasn't actually a response but instead another copy of the submitted campus issue.

When this campus issue was submitted to Executive Council, there was a recognition that the Facilities Modification or IT Action Process, sometimes called VPRT for Vice Presidents Review Team and codified in SCC Operational Memorandum 2.A.1, was an essential process but that, indeed, it did stand outside of the college governance structure. There was agreement that recommendations made by the VPRT via the Facilities Modification or IT Action Process should go first to the Campus Development Committee and then, with their guidance, to the college Executive Staff for a final decision. The Campus Development committee charge was amended

to indicate that process and formally bring the work of VPRT into the college governance structure. Further efforts to integrate the work of VPRT and the Facilities Modification Process into college governance structures will continue, but for now employees can bring forward their ideas for modifying facilities by contacting their dean or direct supervisor. I have heard discussion about this issue from Executive Council and representatives of the Campus Development Committee and agree with changes to the Campus Development Committee charge and overall goal of creating awareness of these processes so the college community understands how facilities decisions are made.

Campus Issue 24-25-03 is closed.

Albert Garcia  
Albert Garcia, President

04/30/25  
Date