

Transitional Campus Council (TCC)

March 7, 2022 Meeting Minutes

TCC Members present: Nina Benedetti, Shelby Burke, Jessica Cain, Phyllis Esposito, Katie Jensen, Lisa Jones, Cathy Leaker, Sharon Moore, Tim Rager, Betsy Stam, Mike Story

Introductions and Committee Share-Outs

Budget Advisory Group (BAG)

Shelby Burke reported that the BAG meets next week; all have been busy with budget development. No update.

VP Cathy Leaker, representing the president.

Cathy is following up with VP Laurie Franklin and Erica Dias about having standing committees for Student Services and College Services. Their bylaws may not be ready until next year. From a leadership standpoint, the Campus Council (CC) and/or the Transitional Campus Council (TCC) may want to be involved in the Strategic Plan implementation and accreditation. This is not a focus for this meeting and may not get to it this year.

Guided Pathways Committee (GPC)

Jessica Cain, co-chair of the GPC, reported that the committee is close to having Articles II and III of the bylaws approved and done. They are also pretty close to finalizing the purpose and charge and the membership sections.

Instructional Council (IC)

Mike Story, co-chair of IC and math instructor reported that the bylaws IC subcommittee met Friday. They will be bringing a lot of questions to IC tomorrow to get feedback.

Technology Advisory Group (TAG)

Tim Rager reported that the TAG met a few minutes ago. They had good discussions and have at least four sections to work through, but they are making progress.

Assessment Committee (AC)

Sharon Moore, chair of the assessment committee, reported that AC has started working on the charge and purpose. They are pretty close to finalizing those. The decision making section is done and they are moving forward with members, roles, and responsibilities. AC meets again this week to continue working on the bylaws and will wrap up the work at the beginning of Spring Quarter.

Dean Katie Jensen

Co-chair of IC, echoed Mike that the more we dig into the bylaws, the more questions there are.

Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)

Lisa Jones reported that SEM has a bylaws subcommittee. They agreed on Article II, the charge, and it is posted at the top of the SEM intranet page. The most current enrollment snapshot is posted as well. SEM created a new subcommittee for process mapping and those members will outline entry points for students which will help create a new communications plan around enrollment management to feed into the SEM plan. The bylaws subcommittee is currently working on the memberships section.

Review of 2-14-22 Minutes

Draft minutes have been sent to Cathy, Lisa, and Betsy. A final draft will be sent to TCC members for approval virtually.

TCC Bylaws Breakout Sessions

Betsy guided the group into breakout sessions to work on giving feedback on the following bylaws sections:

- Article II and Decision Matrix
- Articles III, V, and VI
- Article IV
- Articles VII, VIII, and maybe IX and X

Each of the breakout groups worked on two different documents for 25 minutes each.

Comments from the groups after the breakouts:

Cathy - in her breakout room for Shared Decision Making, they discussed and suggested changing “recommend” to “approve and advance” to make the language stronger (Campus Council action) and “final approval.”

Tim - their group talked about trust. What do you do when you come to the table and people don't trust each other already? They discussed using skill building and group norming opportunities to start building that trust. Cathy commented that the bylaws will create processes where ultimately if someone disagrees, that they trust in the process that there was due diligence on all sides

Mike - this group worked on the Equity document for the full breakout session. Take aways - there are several places in the checklist for equity where questions are raised. Who is going to be answering these questions? It's important to know it's a good representation of people other than those that are usually at TCC and always participating. Nina added that all the questions are valid and valuable, but conversations could get long. Is there a way to take the ideas and consolidate them (maintaining the value of them all) to help keep conversations moving along? A thought Cathy had (would need the Equity and Social Justice Committee to weigh in on this) for major changes such as to the policy for Academic Integrity which would come from IC to CC, is to give the ESJC the right to a prior read to give feedback before it is passed on to CC .

In response to a concern in the chat about the next steps for taking all this feedback and compiling it, Cathy provided her suggestion that the bylaws subcommittee take the feedback, come up with a new draft of the bylaws, and bring it to the April meeting. The TCC can follow the consensus model and go article by article to finalize the bylaws.

Shelby - in her group, they were confused about the “To Council” examples and what is really policy. It seemed like a lot of the examples were sensitive in nature or contractual based on collective bargaining agreements. Maybe more language is needed, for example, “Hiring.” What is meant by hiring? Cathy responded that items that may be more contractual, it was suggested that if a CC member says it is contractual, the Council would either table it or not take it up and take it to the union. They agreed that the CC would at least have a consulting role to allow for

conversation, discussion, and transparency. We all want to build trust and have brave conversations but not turn the CC into an adversarial body. Sharon Moore agreed with Cathy, sometimes items brought to CC might be more informational or CC might make decisions or be advisory but not become adversarial.

Nina - her group had good conversations. We are here for students and question if the student voice is represented well enough. For example, maybe the administration has been asking students about the return to campus and offering more face-to-face classes, but if they are only asking faculty senate members who are on campus all the time, this may not represent all students. It is important to consider a broad depth of the student view. Azrael added to that. He was looking for the student presence within EvCC and did see that in the membership section where there are two representatives from each of the senates including the student senate. Are two representatives from each enough? Going back to student representation, should there be more student representation overall in decision making? Cathy explained that when the model was developed, two was a random number. There could be an argument to have more representation from students because they are likely not represented in any standing committee. There might be other student groups that could be looked at. In the chat, a suggestion was made for two at-large students. Cathy commented that any way of increasing student representation would be really important. TCC can absolutely take a look at this.

Phyllis - commented that she was thinking not only in terms of representation, but when there is dissection on the bylaws that talks about impact, we need to be thinking of not just our own departments, but for any impacts or decisions, we need to think how they impact students. It needs to be in the center or in the forefront of our work, but she doesn't see it named in the bylaws. It may make it appear we are in agreement when we are not. We might need to make that visible in some way. Cathy suggested that be part of the decision making process. Prior to moving into consensus, there has to be clear articulation of impact on students. Anything that comes forward from a standing committee has to indicate impact on students. We hold ourselves accountable for having that discussion. Nina expressed that related to making sure we hear from a broad base and representation, there should be some agreement that attendance will be adhered to. It is hard for students because they have so much on their plate, but we don't want them to drop away and not get their voices heard. It goes for all of us too, we are all here representing different departments and groups. Cathy stated this is especially important in the first couple years so it is not looked at as just busy work and people drop away.

Cathy needs to come up with a budget for Campus Council/Shared Governance and may want to have a small subcommittee. She thinks it is fair that students get paid for attending CC meetings, so that should be built in the budget from the beginning.

Betsy suggested for Nina's concern of attendance, we could say CC will have six meetings instead of four, knowing things happen and still end up with four.

Azrael suggested considering representation from Club Council as they do represent a lot of the student voice. Cathy, speaking for the bylaws subcommittee, asked Azrael to please send

thoughts about how to break down student representation to the bylaws subcommittee. She also commented that when the bylaws subcommittee came up with the 2-2-2 representation, they considered if the group became too large, it would be harder to get things done, but she agrees that there needs to be more student representation.

Cathy asked that if anyone would like to work on the budget for shared governance, to please let her or Lisa know. It is also hard to run this without administrative support; she would be happy if anyone wants to work on it.

Betsy thanked everyone for digging in on this. Cathy thanked the bylaws subcommittee; their work is appreciated.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35.