

SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes – February 11, 2009

Board Room 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Academic Senate–Jeffrey Lamb

CCA/CTA/NEA-Melissa Reeve

Minority Coalition-Sal Alcala, Kevin Anderson

CSEA-Cynthia Simon

ASSC-Lillian Nelson, David Brannen

Local 39-Richard Crapuchettes

Management–Shirley Lewis, Esq.,

Erin Vines

Resource Persons–Jay Field

Charles Shatzer, Ph.D., & Judy Anderson

Members Absent: **Resource Persons**–Lisa J. Waits, Ed.D., Robin Steinback, Ph.D.,

Rich Christensen, Ed.D., Don Mourton, Ph.D., Ross Beck, & Nora O’Neill

Guests: Ruth Fuller, Tracy Schneider, Judy Anderson-Recorder

1. (a) Call to Order

Jay Field announced that Dr. Waits was preparing for the Board meeting and asked that he chair the meeting. Jay called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.

(b) Approval of Agenda

It was moved by David Brannen and seconded by Lillian Nelson to approve the Agenda for this meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

(c) Approval of Minutes

It was moved by David Brannen and seconded by Melissa Reeve to approve the Minutes of the January 28, 2009, SGC Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Strategic Proposals Ranking

Jay Field said SGC members were to rank the strategic proposals. Lillian Nelson volunteered to write the rankings on the chalkboard. Jeff Lamb commented that in applying his rankings, he reminded himself that cash was not to be considered in his ranking—it’s not my decision—rather, what will best serve students in the most effective way. What is the most urgent need. Jay concurred that ranking is not based on finances but based on our educational master plan and strategic goals.

Discussion followed on one of the proposals, “Revised Student Services,” which was not on the board or tally sheet. Jay said seven proposals were submitted for consideration. A few SGC members only had six. The tally sheet only has six. David Brannen reviewed and scored “Revised Student Services,” so the final score wouldn’t be skewed.

All members' scores were written on the board, tallied and ranked. The SGC rankings are as follows:

1. Revised Student Services
2. Promoting Student Success in Math
3. Umoja Program
4. Enhancing Pathways for Success: The High School-to-College Connection
5. Certificate Program for Geographic Info Systems (GIS)
6. Study Skills Center Funding for Student Athletes
7. Add Women's Water Polo

Jay said this is the college's integrated planning in action, and we're doing something that we've been challenged to do better and this is excellent. Jay asked if SGC wishes to forward all seven proposals, or a lesser number, to FABPAC?

Melissa Reeve expressed an observation where she noted the point spread amongst the proposals. She said that the top four items clearly show an impact—they're college-wide initiatives, and the bottom three clearly show affecting individual programs—just a comment because discussions previously occurred on what qualifies as a strategic proposal. The top four recognized that it's college-wide and maybe the other three had no other available avenues for consideration. But, she has no problem forwarding all seven to FABPAC. David Brannen cautioned against giving numerical values to quantitative value.

Jeff Lamb made note that not forwarding all is disingenuous on our part because if there was a problem with a proposal, we should have sent it back to its author. And, none of the groups had the SGC rubric for success. He mentioned the K-16 bridge program and how it was justified by the President's Office that it might increase FTES—he said it's a slippery slope. He cautioned on counting on funds coming in to a particular place from a particular program. Jay commented that information about potential FTES is valid info to include even though it's not guaranteed.

Motion by Jeff Lamb, seconded by Sal Alcala, to forward all seven proposals, as ranked, to FABPAC for its potential funding consideration. Motion passed unanimously.

Jay said our process will be refined, we have a rubric and future proposers will know what is the criteria and what is expected. Dr. Lamb suggested that we have a place on the form where SGC can give official feedback to the proposal's author about the process. Rob Simas said to email him suggestions.

Erin Vines noted that May 1 is the deadline for 2010-11 proposals. Shirley Lewis expressed concern that these went through only two review groups: enrollment management and basic skills initiative. We need to ensure that any and all review groups have a ranking process that is clear and consistent. She also said we need a mechanism to return proposals that need clarification—to clean up. And when they get to FABPAC, what if they have further questions about it? Melissa replied that some proposals didn't make it through the review group and were returned to the authors.

Jay Field recommended that we get volunteers to look the forms over and fill in the holes that were discussed, and bring it back to SGC. And maybe we write a set of guidelines for review groups.

Cynthia Simon expressed a concern that this process was a draft and we never came to a final decision if this is the process the District will adopt—she said we never gave Rob any feedback. Jeff answered by saying that we need to adopt this with great expediency. We have to show that we have a process and we are using it. There is a concern, Kevin A said, about timelines and use of categorical funds. Jay said we need advisory groups to meet earlier. Kevin said yes, he'd like to see it moved up—maybe to the fall, but it's up to the deans.

Sal Alcalá recommends that SGC formalize and accept the process and for Jay to forward the concerns expressed to Dr. Waits. Sal commended Rob for a job well done.

Erin Vines indicated he's heard there are seven review groups but who are they? Discussion ensued on who and how the review groups came about. Jay Field understood that a review group is to be dynamic and so if a proposal is created and there's a group that's working in that area, then it would serve as the review group. Rob added that it wasn't to create new groups but ones that already existed. Kevin made an observation that all review group leaders are management, and maybe it needs to be revisited.

3. Flow Chart for SCC Integrated Evaluation, Planning & Budget Development Process

Dr. Lamb distributed a new flow chart that came as a result of attending the Accreditation Institute. He said it strives to make the connection from the classroom to the planning process to the budget.

Jay asked that SGC members print their agendas and attachments so that multiple copies are not produced. In light of conserving resources, everyone should bring their own copy.

Erin Vines emphasized it's not a good time to change the process. Tracy Schneider replied that it's not being changed—we're instituting what we've got. The reason why 3-year plans were “abandoned” is because it wasn't used effectively. Kevin replied another reason the process broke down is because of summer and didn't include all people affected. Jay said the 3-year plan resulted in being a laundry/shopping list of operational-type items, but it should stay internal to the division. Jay said the college needs to recommit itself to the plans. This strategic plan process is the primary means for identifying initiatives and if we followed it through, we'd incorporate staff's concerns and needs.

Rob Simas stated that a major criticism of the plans is that it never gets funded or goes anywhere. A plan is supposed to move us forward and how we're going to get there—not dreams or wish lists. A underlying girder is that operational items are on the plan's list when staff should have it in their budgets.

Lillian said she didn't see the Campus Enrichment Plan from ASSC. Tracy Schneider stated there are two parts: everybody should know what process exists and what it means and it means education for the entire campus. We shouldn't do things just for accreditation. And second, each committee has a mission and outcomes they're trying to reach. We have to find out and define what these groups do, and faculty will buy into because it's actually going somewhere.

Melissa Reeve asked for clarification between both sides of the flow chart. The distinction is the 3-year plan is mainly at the division level and dovetails with Program Review. The strategic plan proposal is campus-wide.

Motion by Lillian Nelson, seconded by David Brannen, to suspend rest of the agenda and adjourn in order for the board room to be set up for the special board meeting at 5 pm. Motion passed unanimously.

4. **Shared Governance Code of Conduct:** tabled to next meeting.
5. **Accreditation:** tabled to next meeting.
6. **Budget Information/New Position Review:** tabled to next meeting.
7. **Review of Governing Board Agenda:** tabled to next meeting.
8. **College Area Reports/Announcements:** tabled to next meeting due to time limitation.

Superintendent/President:
ASSC:
Academic Affairs:
CCA/CTA:
CSEA:
Local 39:
Management:
Minority Coalition:
Student Services:
Human Resources:
Academic Senate:
Technology & Learning Resources:
Workforce & Community Development/Foundation:
Administrative & Business Services/FABPAC:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

JF/ja