# MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 23, 2021

Time: 1:30-3:30 p.m.

Loc: via Zoom

## NOTES BY TOPIC

| **ITEM** | **TOPIC** | **DISCUSSION** | **OUTCOME** | **NEXT STEPS** | **\*RESP** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Land Acknowledgement Statement | We will put on next agenda to discuss, if there is time, new language of Ohlone people. |  | Put on agenda to discuss new language of acknowledgement statement | Martha, Tri-Chairs |
| 2 | Roll Call & Approval of Minutes | Minutes from March meeting not approved. Will approve at next meeting  Laura: Can we add Jamboard from last meeting? Asha did not have the Jamboard so Laura will send it to her and we can include in attachments | Minutes from March 5th meeting not approved. Will approve at next meeting.  Question as to whether minutes are posted online prior to final approval. Simon clarified that minutes should be posted online as DRAFT and then as Final once they are approved.  Lene motions to have minutes approved as written. Martha seconded  Vote  10 Aye  0 Abstain  0 Nay  Minutes from 3/19/21 are approved | Laura – send Jamboard to Asha so she can include in attachments. |  |
| 3 | Student Report – Monica & Jozie | Monica: There are events going on every day for Muslim Heritage Month.  Busy with elections: getting new members acquainted and getting ready for elections.  Jozie: Want to discuss resolution, especially recommendation to create quad-chair with student representation. Thank you for including that document for today’s discussion.  Vanessa: Would the quad chair need to be an ASFC member or open to any student.  Priya: We do want to encourage students who are not in ASFC to participate in governance.  Laura: Has compensation been discussed?  Priya: We do have a scholarship that helps to pay students but we do need to compensate students.  Ellen: She does think that students should be paid. She thinks that C&C should recommend that all people involved in governance should be compensated.  Lene made motion to create quad-chair representation for next year. Laura questioned whether this should be part of the Task Force. Martha put forth motion to create quad chair immediately and to have Task Force deal with issues such as compensation.  Lene agreed with idea of having two separate motions as we want to make sure that students have a voice when making future decisions. The Task Force will be a long-term project.  Jozie would like to put forward motion to have R&R explore compensation for governance participants. | Lene: The motion is #1 for C&C to recommend to all constituent groups that student Quad-Chairs be added to the councils for academic year 21-22. Motion#2 - recommend to R&R that they pursue the motion to have governance participants compensated for their time.  Ellen seconded motion.  Motion #1 – Recommend to all constituent groups to add quad chair to allow student compensation  In favor: 10  Abstentions: 0  Objections: 0  Motion is passed.  Motion #2 – recommend to R&R to explore governance participants being compensated  In favor: 10  Abstentions: 0  Objections: 0  Motion is passed.  Kathryn would like C&C to not only inform President Nguyen of their approval of motions but also inform all of the constituent groups (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, etc.) |  |  |
| 4 | President’s Report | Governance memo: professional development credit to serve as mentors. Looks like we have 40 mentors.  Symposium on May 20th. Allison Herman and Mike McCusker have done a great job and a lot of work. There will be little bit of competition, opening and closing event. Please come to it and promote it. Nearly 150 student exhibits.  Sent memo so everyone could see information about redesign of governance and continuous improvement.  When governance was redone three years ago, PARC made a statement that redesign does not land on an existing governance structure but be a new group.  Task Force will need to look at whether we make changes to existing structure or do a complete redesign. |  |  |  |
| 5 | Break |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Governance Evaluation – Preliminary Findings | Lene: Please go right to Page 29 of Preliminary Findings – Appendix D: Recommendations  Lene: Hopefully, everyone had chance to read report. In next meeting, reps from RP group and our IR group will be here to report. They will talk about how report was conducted and carried out, not the “nitty gritties”. Last two pages are condensed list of recommendations to updating governance training books, agendas that get more work done, roles of different people on campus, making sure councils have better composition, how to include students more, etc.  Then, there are overall recommendations. Laura: Wanted to open it up to committee and figure out next steps. Also, explore how does Academic Senate letter affect the recommendations.  Tri-chairs came up with list of questions to get started with discussion.  Thuy – She has been thinking she needs to be more proactive as far as telling councils where each of the memos to the President stand. She can include in her President’s Report that she received a memo, preliminary thoughts and also timeline of when she may respond to memo.  Martha: If President can give update of what she is thinking about, it will give council a chance to reflect whether it has correctly reflected the thoughts of the council in the memo and a chance to clarify any points.  Doreen: What are next steps in terms of disseminating report?  Laura: sent to senate presidents, participatory group, President’s Council, all the tri-chairs. We should invite people to come who are willing to come.  Kathryn – Recommendations echo a great deal of what things have been brought up in data is really good and let’s be mindful of the scope that it had and that it would be interesting idea to assess all of governance. Be mindful of what part of that scope this assessment covers. Governance of a college includes Academic Senate, College Curriculum, etc. and that was not assessed here.  Lene: Are you saying that it would have been useful to assess all of governance and that our scope was too small?  Kathryn: Saying that we need to be mindful of what we intended to find out and how we set about to find it. It is useful to know your “givens” and how to work within those.  Martha – Gay had question about new government memberships. Have been talking about onboarding and make clean transition. Don’t know what’s been done, where you’re going, what focus has been, and what is the history. As we go forward in Fall:  Where do we want to go? Are we going to keep things as they are?  Simon: A lot will depend on decision taken in terms of redesign, working group, what our governance will look like going forward. In the past, we have had full day meetings at beginning of year but we were not able to do that last year. We did do onboarding last year in an abbreviated virtual meeting.  Bruce: There is a lot of good information in this. The small number of students who answered survey is problematic. We need to expand scope of study to some kind of larger ad-hoc group that involves all constuents has better chance of addressing all the needs. Concerned about narrow focus limiting recommendations. As C&C, we have four different proposals that affect how our governance works: letter from President, proposals from classified, letter from students, Academic Senate. Not sure C&C is equipped to handle all of these and include all of the constituencies involved so suggests we move this to a more inclusive group to make decisions going forward on governance improvement. We can focus on smaller chunks.  Ellen: Agree with creating group that is dedicated to this governance structure. As far as onboarding, it would have been helpful to be put in contact with person who had held that position before her.  Teresa – highlight the oversight in organization should still be done by C&C for the adhoc group.  Vanessa: Is governance something we want to present on at Day on the Hill? As another way to get involved.  Simon: Looking forward to working with all the constituencies to fine tune. Governance is going to require constant tuning going forward.  Laura: Tri-chairs need specific training.  Josh: There will be opportunity at Day on the Hill to ask students who have served on governance to participate.  Kathryn: This is not “one and done” and needs to reflective but we have some important structural elements that need to be addressed – challenge of relationship between all the representatives to all the councils and Academic Senate. Shuts out other councils and Academic Senate if we leave it solely with C&C.  Teresa – Anchoring it in C&C is based on the task force that was formed five years ago to map out all of governance and that included Academic Senate, Classified Senate and all other constituencies and it eventually died out. This overall committee needs to be institutionalized somewhere so perhaps it could start with C&C.  Josh: Classified Senate had meeting yesterday and motion was approved to support #7 calling for this task force. They have desire to not have this on C&C’s plate. |  |  |  |
| 7 | Academic Senate Letter to President Nguyen &Governance Memo regarding Governance Assessment from President Nguyen | Kathryn – shared letter with all the council tri-chairs and they decided to put on the agenda. Happy to respond to any questions but was not anticipating being on the agenda.  Laura: As C&C, we’re being tasked with questions from President Thuy. She was appointed by Academic Senate as were Sam, Bruce and Ellen to serve and be the voice of the Academic Senate on the C&C. Now, this letter is stating that C&C should not be making the decisions and it’s difficult to organize. In handbook, it says 3-5 hours per month but it takes a lot more time than that. Leaves it to the rest of the committee to decide what to do next.  Lene: Try to give each other grace as they meet to talk about this. Campus cannot move forward if we can’t mend these relationships. There is a lot of tension right now and that’s not a good place for any of us to be. We need to find a place where we can be comfortable with each other. She doesn’t want C&C to say anything that would make things worse. She would like Kathryn to speak to pieces that are most important.  Kathryn: #7 which Josh referred to earlier - asking for SWOT analysis and preparing recommendations, etc. as listed in item 7 in the memo. Do this as a task force and get it going right away.  Bruce: When he started at Foothill, his dean said that every conversation should start with, “It would be better for the students if…”. In October, students sent a letter about things that needed to be addressed and question was “who should respond” and if we have to discuss that, it highlights problem with the governance structure. Feels tension and urgency from faculty, classified and students. Maybe if we want some top-down look at ways we govern, maybe it should be dealt with like IP&B over the summer with report put out in the Fall. Need time and place to do this and C&C doesn’t appear to be the place.  Lene: We should always be examining what we’re doing but self-reflection maybe should be built into governance structure. We will be spending the entire next meeting, including presentation for IP and IR groups. All of us need to be able to talk about what we’re going to do.  Ellen: comment about President’s memo – Question D. speaking on behalf of p/t faculty. From website and data from a few years ago - 29 administrators, 112 classified, 166 FT faculty, 384 PT faculty and about 1500 students. PT faculty are doing about half of teaching on-campus. PT faculty have different perspective from FT faculty so their voices are essential on governance. No group should be singled out but should be all be look at. They should be paid for their time.  Thuy: Having PT faculty in governance was very purposeful. Governance memo was very purposefully in the form of questions. This is just to lay it out for council’s deliberation, including question of task force. There is no doubt that it was part of the accreditation process that we be self-reflective. Makes sense to have it separately because that’s how it was formed before. Does not want to create workforce without blessing of C&C. If C&C gives its blessing, she can work with leadership team to form that workforce and note that in the accreditation report. C&C can decide that now and the accreditation will include that we will be forming task force group. Academic Senate and Classified Senate have now asked for it.  Bruce: Would like to wait until we can have a larger conversation in May.  Martha: Question in chat as to who decides who’s on the task force?  Thuy: leadership groups would each put forward a person. | Would like to have larger conversation in May. |  |  |
| 8 | Accreditation – Finkelstein & McLeod | Report is due 4/30.  Doreen: We do have tell what next step in governance will be when we submit accreditation report. It then goes to Elaine and Kelaiah and then out to everyone. It goes to printers in June. One of our next steps is to tell the accreditors what we are going to do More specificity as to what we will be doing going forward, the better.    Bruce: Final report from RP due next month. I would like to have a more robust conversation about who runs this, who should be part of it, timeline, and charge for the group.  Doreen: this is mid-term report. There are hyperlinks in the document to take you to the information.  Bruce: under this, we still must have language in report such as “C&C is currently charged with…” In terms of accreditation, this is a snapshot in time. C&C is listed as touchpoint for dealing with questions. If path is unclear, that’s okay because we are in process of continuous improvement. There’s a lot of information on plate of governance.  Doreen: Elaine did emphasize being specific such as C&C will deliberate in spring rather than just say that C&C will discuss.  Martha: Maybe someone from C&C can be tasked with being part of this task force and report back to C&C  Kathryn: says to take all of information from C&C so put in accreditation that it is C&C and task force. | Lene: In light of this information about accreditation, she makes motion to make recommendation to create task force with caveat that how that task force is formed and shaped should be done by all parts of governance, with input from various constituencies.  Martha: Second the motion to create task force.  Do not have quorum to vote. Can have separate meeting | Thuy can begin to reach out to Academic Senate President and other groups to start thinking about who would be making up the task force.  Martha: Ask for meeting to just vote on this – not two hours long. Then could move forward as a council.  Asha will connect with Thuy to arrange that. |  |
| 9 | Study Group Update |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

\*Include the person(s) and or group responsible for next steps.

## MEMBERS PRESENT

### Voting

Tri-Chairs: Laura Gamez, Martha Rubin, Lene Whitley-Putz

Administrator: Betsy Nikolchev

Classified Staff: Jackie Lauese, Carlos Pacheco

Faculty: Bruce McLeod (FT), Ellen Judd (PT), Sam Connell

Students: Negar Bagheri, Iman Haq, Ria Vidyasagar, Jozephine Yen

Guests: Veronica Cassis, Colber Prosper, Adiel Velasquez

### Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Doreen Finkelstein, Gay Krause, Debbie Lee (Dean-Fine Arts), Kathryn Maurer, Thuy Nguyen, Teresa Ong, Josh Pelletier, Simon Pennington, Vanessa Smith (Marketing)

Recorder: Melia Arken

Facilitator: Asha Jossis