



## Academic Senate/ISPC Joint Meeting Minutes

August 31, 2020/1:00-3:50pm

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/94660915996>

Present: Laura Adams, Andy Aldasoro, Greg Aycock, Rex Beck, Kimberly Bell, Quinton Bemiller, Michael Bobo, Sarah Burnett, Angelica Calderon, Michael Collins, Leona Crawford, Monica Esparza, Kevin Fleming, Monica Green, Alexis Gray, Vivian Harris, Dominique Hitchcock, Marie Hicks, Azadeh Iglesias, Samia Irgan, Tenisha James, Ashlee Johnson, Brian Johnson, Kim Kameran, Ruth Leal, Sam Lee, Virgil Lee, Arezoo Marashi, Jethro Midgett, Barbara Moore, Lisa Nelson, David Payan, Suzanne Schepler, Kaneesha Tarrant, Jody Tyler, Dana White, Sigrid Williams, Cameron Young

Meeting commenced at 1:02pm

Monica Green welcomed everyone to the first of two meetings, the second meeting is scheduled for September 30, 2020 from 1:00-3:50pm.

- 1:00-1:50pm: Timeline and Process for the [Strategic Planning and Governance Manual - Draft](#)
  - Previous discussion/status of COTW
    - Kevin shared and reviewed the timeline for adoption on the cover of the Strategic Planning & Governance Manual (SPGM).
    - The college has hosted several open zoom sessions with dialogue relating to the timeline. Two items to note with regard to the timeline, committee appointments for spring and COTW. The adoption date of Feb might be pre-mature. Classified professionals hosted forums over the summer for classified constituent feedback. Similar concerns and others that will be brought forward.
    - COTW was discussed in October 2019, guiding principles were established and further discussion on the purpose and scope of COTW. After that meeting it was not ajenized; therefore it is still a part of the process and should be a part of the approval for the SPGM.
    - Proposed an alternative adoption timeline: Implementation Fall 2021

- Request to recap pros and cons of COTW. The purpose of COTW was for representation for the entire college convened with the intention of meeting multiple times a semester providing an opportunity for discussion on items that affected the entire college. Include a link to the guiding principles.
- 1) college continues to grow larger; it becomes difficult to manage the meeting, not everyone attends. When COTW began the number of employees was less. 2) Large items have already been through an extensive process, questions, or comments from COTW should be brought up early in the process. We have a structure in place for feedback and constituent groups. 3) Concern about attempting to gather meaningful feedback at the tail end of a process.
- Concern about COTW removal and the absence of student voices. The question was raised about ASNC representation on college committees and coordination with Academic Senate (AS) and ASNC, is there a feedback loop from the student representation to the student body at large?
- If we eliminate COTW, we might be moving away from the small college feel.
- COTW also offers members of the public/surrounding community to attend.
- ISPC was looking for ways to make COTW more inclusive.
- We need to determine if COTW is about strategic planning or communication. New structure removes direct reports from AS to ISPC. There may be challenges with information sharing among faculty if representatives are in different departments. COTW could be an opportunity for all faculty to be present and hear important announcements and presentations on issues that affect the entire college.
- This conversation will continue at the next meeting.
- Conversation about the Strategic Planning & Governance Manual's Timeline
  - December meeting, the first COTW possible would be in February, DSPC – Feb/March, BOT March or April. Implementation would then be 21FAL.
  - Classified professionals are asking that each chapter will be discussed and the meeting dates for the discussions be posted for transparency.
  - How are we taking into account that we are virtual and the challenges with connecting? There is something about everyone being in a room and

able to see everyone's faces? Is there consideration for in-person meetings in 21 spring? We wanted to be sure that there was ample time for feedback, there is no hard-external deadline other than what we set for ourselves. We will continue to gather feedback on the timeline, and if we feel that we need additional time this can be accommodated.

- There is also a sense of urgency. We have ambitious goals. As we get into fall, we need to keep this document moving forward. This plan will help us accomplish the work we have detailed out in our educational master plan. Work is already in progress, though, by departments and committees so goal attainment is not contingent solely upon the plan.
- 2:00-2:50pm: EMP assignments
  - SP&GM – Review of Chapters 5
    - Kevin reviewed the document shared in the meeting invitation. The goal of chapter 5 is determining who is responsible for the work in the Educational Master Plan. ISPC previously looked at assigning objectives to committees or councils only. But, learning from the previous process, the SPGM is proposing to assign objectives to council, committee, workgroup, department, or position. Additionally, a strategic body is responsible for assessing and tracking progress and providing strategic oversight of our EMP goals.
    - An excel spreadsheet was also shared with the group, please use the filter, to review the EMP objectives by council/committee. Note this is not a thoroughly completed process, there are some gaps that need to be addressed (they are noted in green font). One example is Objective 6.4, there may be a need for an advisory committee, group, or body to address this objective.
    - Some groups do not have EMP assignments. This does not mean that their work is not needed or important (i.e. Institutional Review Board).
    - We are asking groups to review and rethink the roles and scopes of all our current councils/committee/workgroups to meet the needs of the EMP Goals and Objectives.
    - Individuals responsible for the work would be leadership, Dr. Green and the VPs.
    - The Call to Action and establishment of Anti-Racism taskforces has happened since work started on this document. How do we ensure that this 'new' direction is clearly visible and included in the plan?

- Chapter 5 will be agenized for all college committees and councils to review.
- A charter for the Racial Justice Taskforce has been drafted, the intent is to share with the workgroup leaders today. This is a proposed process done for academic purposes due to it not being approved yet as part of the new SPGM.
- Mechanism for changes to the SPGM as the need arises.
- Note the first draft was written in May, there are items to add. Send feedback/edits to Kevin Fleming, ISPC, or Academic Senate
- Will this be the guiding structure for the next ACCJC Accreditation visiting team? Or, will we make different groups to tackle each of the Standards? Or something else?
- The second half of chapter 5 takes the same EMP goals and objectives and aligns KPI, RCCD Goals, Vision for Success, and ACCJC Standards.
- Should we attempt to add a lead coordinator or point person for each objective?
- SS operational group, titles/positions change. Might it make the document dated if we add names and titles?
  - I see there are titles such as Dean of Student Equity, but that is essentially outdated already given the consolidation in student services.
- We have 15 KPIs
- It will be integral to ensure that this draft is developed with detailed track changes for full transparency and in avoidance of duplicate effort
- Draft 2 and summary of changes will be shared with Nor-all.
- Draft 1 has not had any changes.
- Request to ask for a link back to the old process whenever there is a change in the new plan so that ISPC members and the college community can see the changes for discussion.
- The new plan was built around meeting the goals of the EMP, thus links to the 2013-2018 plan will not be embedded in the 2020-2025 plan.
- Is the hope that this plan is Board approved this semester ready to go in spring? The timeline is now Board approval in the spring with implementation in 21FAL.

- Invited everyone to add chapter 5 to their agendas for discussion and detailed review to be sure that the alignments are as accurate as possible and that any gaps are identified and addressed.
- Review each of the twelve goals to brainstorm which council or committee would be responsible for the work of the goals/objectives.

### **Goal 1 Access: 4 Objectives**

- Objective 1.1 and 1.2 – will these be brought to APC to be disseminated to the departments? This is reported but APC does not have a say in determining how much FTES by department.
- Not sure if there is a process for faculty to grow their programs.
- Be aware that these gaps need to be identified.
- Racial Justice direction is connected to every goal, we need to keep that throughout.
- Outreach to the community in general, are we including the local community who are not interested in a degree? This is addressed in Objective 6.6.

### **Goal 2: Guided Pathways Framework**

- 2.2 Increasing certificates completion. A number of certificates are changing, we have increased the number of small unit certs, many are non-credit. This may result in an increase though our traditional certs declined. We should be tracking these carefully.

### **Goal 3: Equity**

- Add Racial Justice Taskforce
- Distance Ed Committee
- Equity gap is state prescribed metric that looks at the percentage of degree earners compared to the general population. The number should be the same by group.
- If we intend to help, are we steering students to degrees/professions that will be financially stable.
- EMP meets district/state/Accreditation goals.

- Should District committees be added to the chapter 5 committee and council lists for collaboration. The district side is still in production in some areas. Alignment will be added where it is currently known.
- Every year, we will review how we are progressing to our goals, if a revision to the process is needed, we will need to adjust as we go.

#### **Goal 4: Professional Development**

- Where does increasing knowledge in our own fields fit in? Two things that we continue to do and are not called out in this document are increases to our professional scope of work and professional development around the tools the district provides.
- What about LGBTQ trainings, fall under two objectives? There are a number of trainings and areas that are not called out explicitly in the EMP but shall be executed as tactics in order to meet the objectives.
- Classified Professional Development Committee should be added to objectives 4.1 and 4.2

#### **Goal 5: Workforce and Economic Development**

#### **Goal 6: Community Partnerships**

#### **Goal 7: Programs**

- Can faculty working with Strong Workforce be a part of 7.2 (Add AS CTE Liaison)
- 7.3 Identify faculty non-credit lead (or District Non-Credit Liaison) Check with Dr. Mustain.

#### **Goal 8: Effectiveness, Planning and Governance**

#### **Goal 9: Workplace/Employees**

#### **Goal 10: Facilities**

- Modify 10.5 - remove date.

#### **Goal 11: Operations**

#### **Goal 12: Resources**

- 3:00-3:50pm: Proposed Council descriptions/scope

- SP&GM – Review of Chapter 8
- Strategic Planning visuals (boxes and circles)
  - Chapter shows current councils and members and the proposed changes to the councils. Duplicated memberships are called out and total numbers provided.
  - The structure includes two additional councils that do not exist in our current structure.
  - Membership is detailed out for each council in subsequent pages.
  - Membership is recommended based on expertise related to the scope and assigned EMP objectives to each council.
  - For classified professionals it is not a condition of employment to participate in college governance. Classified professionals requested removing job titles from the document.
  - If there are specific roles that require expertise why can't we include those classified professional members on this committees and call it out by title? We have called out by title for administration and faculty. Appointment of classified professionals is done through the CSEA Committee Appointment Process and is outlined in education code as the right of the constituent representative.
  - Proposed a middle ground in the language to help encourage staff to feel empowered to participate. Classified professionals prefer to have a reference to the CSEA Committee Appointment Process.
  - College Council will serve as the accreditation steering committee for future ISER writing and visits.
  - Goals for the leadership councils and standing committees, workgroups, for each council are also detailed.
  - Suggestion to add more student representation to each council or a student alternate. AS will have two student reps this year. ASNC will be reviewing the document this fall and providing their feedback.

#### Academic Council

- Add Counseling rep
- Add Library rep
- Activities related to instructional programs number 4 is a 10+1, in support of but not in place of. Request to add language to clarify.

- How does the flow work in relation to the Academic Senate?
- Institution Planning is the purview of the faculty informed by feedback from classified and students.
- Where does the duplication come from? The 12 co-chairs and the faculty accreditation liaison are where the duplication occurs.

#### College Council

- Is there a provision to have CTE represented on the college council?
- Proposing that the at-large member be CTE faculty. There are not many faculty to serve on the committees, and we want to ensure that the direct CTE voice is included at the college council.
- There are seasoned CTE faculty that are stretched thin and then there are CTE faculty that are newer but do not have
- Revised proposal to add a footnote that at least one faculty representative is CTE.
- Further discussion on faculty representation will continue in Academic Senate.
  - We should start one of these conversations by asking, “Who’s voice is not being represented?” CTE, Library, Counseling, etc ... and make sure they are there.
  - Noted that the councils meet at the same time except for the College Council, to make greater use of our time, expedite approval processes, and prevent having the same employees serve on the councils.
  - Are we expecting 20% of faculty to be in a leadership council? Yes
  - It seems as if we are creating more councils to get more input from a broader constituency, but I would argue that this makes us sluggish as an organization. How do we ensure that decisions for the college is still made thoughtfully but swift?
  - Attempting to alleviate bottlenecks and streamline the process by clearly defining the scope of each council and committee; empowering leadership councils to make decisions.
  - This also gives a chance for ideas to be discussed before reaching the Academic Senate. This will help the senate function better.

- No change proposed for APC, they are still a standing committee of the senate. The terminology will be discussed at the Academic Senate. The APC is affiliated and connected to both the Academic Senate and the Academic Council.
- The senate subcommittees are the purview of the senate. This is noted on the chart and in the Word document.
- Faculty appointment for councils are approved by Academic Senate. Suggestion for how to expedite appointments.
- Noted an inconsistency in classified professionals representation by council.
- Recommended 2-year terms for each council.

Meeting adjourned: 3:50pm