

Transitional Campus Council (TCC) February 14, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Present: Nina Benedetti, Shelby Burke, Jessica Cain, Phyllis Esposito, Katie Jensen, Lisa Jones, Cathy Leaker, Kelsey Lindstrom, Sharon Moore, Terry Paull, Tim Rager, Betsy Stam, Mike Story,

Review of 1/24/22 Minutes

Draft minutes for the January 24, 2022, meeting were approved. The minutes will be posted to the webpage.

Subcommittee Bylaws Update: Sharing Articles(s) II

Accreditation Committee (AC)

Sharon Moore shared 2019 draft bylaws that were already created. The committee is currently looking at those to decide which parts still apply or need revised. The committee is using Jamboard to go through bullet points one by one and collect thoughts. There is a lot of thought about accreditation being part of the AC. There is overlap between the AC, Instructional Council (IC), and the Center for Transformative Teaching (CTT). AC is trying to be collaborative with these groups before writing the AC charge to make sure the right function is with the right committee. The group discussed the process for recommendations. It is anticipated that if AC wants to recommend a policy, they would collaborate with CTT, IC, and Equity and Social Justice and the recommendation would go through Campus Council for discussion and consensus and then go to the Board of Trustees for action.

Budget Advisory Group (BAG)

Shelby reported for the BAG and shared draft material. The bullet points part of the purpose statement was developed last year. They have started to draft bylaws and still like the purpose statement. This group is an advisory group, but it was not stated before who the group advises, so it was added that the BAG advises the president and the Campus Council (CC). The bulleted items are the Guiding Principles for the purpose statement.

Cathy commented that it sounds like the BAG would inform and bring forth information to the CC but not items the CC would necessarily vote on. Betsy explained that the Bylaws Committee made a decision that advisory groups would not be voting members based on the word “advisory.” Others agreed. Shelby confirmed that the BAG would bring advisory information such as how the budget is looking as a whole, training, and guidance, rather than bringing forth items that need action. The purpose is more about cost saving by bringing forth information for the CC to think about. It’s more about processes not budget allocation.

Betsy suggested inviting all the standing committees to think about what things they would want the CC to vote on. What comes forward to the CC may be driven by the standing committees.

Equity and Social Justice Committee

This group has a huge charge from the state. Phyllis reported that they are a work in progress and are thinking about the same questions that Sharon and Shelby mentioned. They are discussing if they are a consultant, recommender, or facilitator and have had good conversations.

Guided Pathways (GP)

Jessica Cain shared a draft purpose statement with language that was written before with a different group of people. The group plans to revisit it and think more deeply. Additionally, there was some language about GP that had been sent to the state last year. The purpose statement may need to be a blend of the two. Cathy recommended that the group think about what kind of decisions about GP or what actions in addition to information would the group want to bring forward to the CC that would then go to the Board.

Instructional Council (IC)

Mike Story shared a draft for IC. It includes some language found from 2013 and some from IC bylaws subcommittee brainstorming. Cathy suggested they might want to consider adding to the charge reviewing the academic integrity policy.

Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)

Lisa Jones shared SEM's draft. This committee existed before and was reestablished under Dr. Willis. This draft includes the charge the committee was given at that time in consultation with Swim Digital Group. Cathy commented that this group would constantly be updating CC on enrollments and how GP and IC intersects with SEM. There may or may not be items that need brought forward for action. This would be a place where information is collected, exchanged, and disseminated because SEM impacts every other group.

Technology Advisory Group (TAG)

Tim reported that the group had a lot of conversation around scope including, policy, data governance, budget, strategy, etc. They are focusing right now on budget because that seems to be the most pressing need. It is possible TAG would have some need to bring items to CC to vote on. For instance, they have a strategic plan subgroup which may want to pass something up.

TCC bylaws subcommittee

Review of proposed edits

Betsy reported for the group. The Bylaws subcommittee took some of the feedback from previous meetings to identify actions they would take and added to the purpose statement. The important part added is that proposals be approved or sent back to the originating committee. Denying approvals is currently listed also, but the group needs to think about whether that should stay in.

Article II: Follow-up: Draft Decision-making matrix

Betsy shared a draft decision matrix. Actions are listed in the left column and the different approving and participating bodies are listed across the top (Board of Trustees, President, VPs/Deans, Campus Council, Relevant Standing Committees, Senates, and Unions). Boxes are filled in on the matrix with suggested levels of actions (approve, consult, initiate, recommend, report).

Betsy went through the draft matrix as it currently stands. Generally, the Board of Trustees (BOT) and the President are the approvers. The VPs and deans are not approving bodies. The Campus Council is mostly a consulting, recommending, or reporting body and will increase the

transparency of shared governance. The BOT basically approves everything. Should we, as an institution, look at that and determine if there are decisions that do not have to rise to that level of approval? Betsy reviewed the questions she came up with that were listed on the draft matrix at the bottom; no discussion ensued:

- What components and actions are we missing?
- **Recommend is currently the strongest action; do we need something different?**
- What are the decisions being made at the standing-committee level?
- Campus Council can be a communications hub for a "single stop shop," but what other reporting needs to be done and by whom?
- How do we prevent conflict of interest or duplicate representation? i.e., If someone makes a proposal, do they recuse themselves/their committee from voting?

At the last meeting, the group talked about what items would and would not go to CC and what items the Council could act on (see comments listed at the bottom of the draft matrix). At this point, broad additional community input is needed.

Article IV: Equity Considerations

The subcommittee has not finalized a proposal for draft equity considerations yet. This article will be discussed at a future meeting.

Article VII: Campus Council Procedures

Betsy reviewed the language in Section 1: Decision-making. There have been some concerns that consensus for decision making could take too long and not be productive. It could be that group norms are established and are broken out as a formal part of the bylaws but the committee wants greater input. How are meetings conducted, does everyone speak, are you limited in your time, what are participation expectations, etc.? The consensus model is when everyone has reached a point where they allow the initiative to move forward. There is a defined process in the draft bylaws for voting if a consensus cannot be reached. A decision needs to be finalized on expected timing for a decision from the president about an initiative and timing of how soon it moves forward to the BOT with the intent of a formal response and formal movement.

Section 2: Meetings

Betsy reviewed the draft language for meeting format and scheduling. Some of the highlights include that although the TCC is meeting once a month, the recommendation for the CC is to meet twice per month for one and a half hours including the summer. Faculty and students who participate in the summer would be compensated. Mike took over reporting and commented that writing of an agenda is some form of power with how it gets written and who decides what the CC will talk about. The subcommittee suggested this be a function of the CC Chair to decide on the agenda based on submission from the entire campus. The idea is anyone can submit an

agenda item. All submissions should be on record and if items are not put on the agenda, there is public information as to why the initiative did not go on the agenda. Equity needs to be kept in mind when determining agenda items. There needs to be an effective way of determining agenda items so the CC does not take on too much or too little and the process is transparent.

The recommendation for minutes was reviewed. Highlights include that the function for taking minutes is assigned and not be the chair or a random council member. There are set timelines for minutes, and agendas and minutes will be posted to the Shared Governance web page.

Article VIII: Records and Reporting

The Shared Governance web page should have links to all agendas and minutes of all standing committees (maybe have their own webpages). Information should be posted timely so people can see what's going on in each of their groups. Recommendations for moving initiatives forward or returning them back to where they came from should be transparent and posted on the webpage.

Betsy commented that it needs to be stated and restated that the draft bylaws are recommendations at this point. There is no way in any one session the group can work through all of it. This is a lot of information and it is a place to get started with conversations.

The Zoom chat was open for any questions. Lisa placed a link to the bylaws project webpage in the chat so people can open the draft bylaws and see what the committee has been doing. For transparency and to have an accurate log, each time the subcommittee meets, they save the work as a different file.

Betsy asked if there were any questions so far. At this point there were none. Betsy commented that the subcommittee is not looking for suggestions on wordsmithing or grammar, but rather is there anything missing? Anything they've got wrong? How much minutiae should be put in bylaws? Does going deeper help solve problems later? Walla Walla has a guidance manual on top of their bylaws. Maybe this unfolds over the next year of working with the bylaws. The subcommittee tried to capture things that people expressed in the last meeting. They tried to address concerns about the consensus model not being productive. The draft bylaws call for an annual review so they can be modified as needed.

Lisa stated that she appreciates the spirit of transparency and accountability that are being built into the bylaws and not just for the CC, but for standing committees as well. Betsy replied that this work is a priority and having it fully accessible to campus is key.

Cathy asked if the decision matrix is helpful? Could it be a guide? Are we in the ballpark? Will it be helpful for CC next year? Discussion concluded that it is necessary to guide people on how to move initiatives forward; it has not always been clear. Sharon pointed out, however, that on the draft matrix, decisions are all made by the president or BOT. If that is the reality, do we need the matrix? There needs to be conversation about this and whether decisions can be made at

some of the lower levels. Cathy commented that in looking at the RCW's, the president and BOT are the decision making authorities although there may be some wiggle room with curriculum. It doesn't mean that recommendations are meaningless, and it means something if they get turned down. Maybe there needs to be a stronger word than "recommend" and language that indicates that there is some power and authority resting with the CC. Betsy commented that even if we are not a definitive, approving body, the job of the CC is to radically improve transparency. If there is a decision that counters the recommendation, it is transparently documented.

Cathy commented that "recommend" should be the strongest action because it is what moves something forward to another body. Terry pointed out that even though the CC makes recommendations, there is nothing in the bylaws that says it can't take holistic action should the president turn down a recommendation. Cathy mentioned the CC does need to follow the RCWs and WACs as in the case of the Bachelor of Science degree. If the BOT had said no, the college couldn't do it; there is no action the CC could take, but it does have opportunities to have discussions and make thoughtful recommendations. Maybe the CC asks the BOT to look at an initiative again. Decisions and authority rest with the BOT, and they have the authority to delegate to the president. This is going to be very important as we think about governance. We don't want people to feel it is worthless because a recommendation was not approved or moved forward. Getting back to Terry's thought, what authority the CC could have on decisions that come to mind. Don't think veto power could exist; if we think of this as a showdown, governance would be doomed before it started. We need to be honest with constituents and think about how the legislative process can become so persuasive and powerful that it would make it hard to turn something back because the CC did its due diligence. That's why the subcommittee built into the bylaws that the president would give a timely, formal response and articulate the reasons for approval or not. Cathy thought it would be helpful to go through and look at the matrix more and tweek, add or change language to alleviate concerns. Lisa asked if there were any more questions about the matrix or other articles? There were none.

Betsy brought up that she has had thoughts that as a bylaws component, do we say, CC is the most important thing you are doing? There needs to be an understanding of expectations for attendance, being prepared for the meetings, being prepared to speak up, and staying present while in the meeting. Cathy agreed as this group is setting the terms of engagement for next year. It's important for everyone to understand the ground rules and how to work together to, (1) solve problems and create a forum where different constituents come together to address significant issues the college faces, and (2) create an alternative way of interacting with each other so we are not always in opposition. This really does matter because if there are issues next year, the CC will look at the bylaws.

Proposed meeting schedule March - June 2022

Lisa shared the proposed meeting schedule. The group discussed dates and modality and whether to allow interaction from non CC members. The decision was to stay with Mondays, from 3:00 - 4:30 and the March 7, May 2, June 6 dates work. The April 4 date is the first week of

Spring Quarter. Cathy and Sharon Ralston will look at an alternate date for April, possibly April 11. Everyone also agreed that the modality will stay as hybrid, the chat will be left open, and a smaller room will be used to help with acoustics.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.