

**College Council
Summary Report
September 19, 2012**

In attendance: James, Carranza, Juanita Celaya, Susan Estes, Elizabeth Hoffman (new member), Fauzi Hamedeh (new member), Jennifer Hughes, John Killac, Maggie Ko (new member), David Locke, Medelline Lowe, Bev Madden (co-facilitator), Milla McConnell-Tuite(co-facilitator), Dave Mclean, Eileen O'Brian, Hayley Sharpe (new member)

CONCLUSIONS:

During this meeting, College Council agreed to convene a workgroup that would report back to the larger committee (in a month, if possible).

The workgroup would review the document. "Implementing Shared Governance, 1993" and make recommendations to update the document. When analyzing the document, the workgroup would:

- Outline
- Research
- Review

Focus areas would include defining various aspects of shared governance* including:

- Leadership Development
- Oversight
- Training

It was agreed that the group should be a "manageable" size. Bev Madden agreed to serve as "shepherd" or facilitator.

Volunteers: Jennifer, Dave, Juanita, James, Elizabeth, Paige, and Hayley.
Follow-up: First meeting scheduled for 10/11/12.

*Here is the Education Code reference to "shared governance," compliments of Susan Estes:

California Education Code 90901 b 1.E: " [establishes] Minimum standards governing procedures established by governing boards of community college districts to ensure faculty, staff, and students have the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards."

GOAL FOR 9/19/2012 MEETING:

The overall objective of this meeting was to review the focus group findings (from April 2012) and to decide on next steps for College Council's future based upon those discussions.

First the group reviewed the themes that emerged during the previous College Council focus-group discussions. These themes were seen as important for the group to evaluate and, as needed, to take action upon:

- **Defining Shared Governance**
 - Note: there was initial brief discussion about how AB 1725, the original legislature in 1988, did not use the term "shared governance"; nor does current Ed. Code use it: the phrase, "participatory governance," is used.
- **Information Clearinghouse**
 - Note: there was discussion about how Council can be a venue for sharing news about campus issues; sometimes those reports are redundant as the same people may present the same news to the same audience.
- **Operations**
 - Note: there was discussion about how since the elimination of the administrative position in Operations, certain topics have emerged which need discussion or review in some venue and have, thus, been discussed at Council. These are "operational" college issues (e.g. garbage can placement).
- **Voice of the Community**

ADDITIONAL ISSUES DISCUSSED REGARDING SHARED GOVERNANCE:

Training in Shared Governance:

- Currently there is a yearly orientation to College Council but training used to be more complete. Training in shared governance (how to be a participant or chair of a committee) could potentially include leadership training in meeting facilitation, among other areas.
- Training could also potentially include an orientation to CSM's planning processes and perhaps articulate some standards for constructing agendas and reporting; this could possibly be offered to all of those participating in planning at CSM.

- Training should be tied to employee development opportunities and could be potentially linked to outside groups such as the Community Leadership Initiative.

Classified Staff and Shared Governance

- There was some discussion that some classified staff reported in the Spring 2012 Campus Climate and Satisfaction survey that they don't feel a part of shared governance.

Participation vs. Representation

- The group discussed the theme identified last semester: for some individuals, there's a disconnect between what they, in fact, "do" on the committee and what they think they should be doing.
- Discussion addressed that participating on a committee does not necessarily mean one is consulting or sharing information with one's constituencies.

Current Planning Structure: College Council & Integrated Planning Committee

- The group discussed the fact that IPC is now central to key decision-making (e.g. resource allocation) at CSM; committees or representatives bring issues for action to IPC who then makes a recommendation to the President.
- This process emerged not as an intentional design to usurp College Council's role, but as an outcome of the new integrated planning model launched in 2008. In that model the chairs of key planning committees (e.g. Distance Education) sit on IPC along with others, as indicated by their roles, such as Academic Senate President and COI chair.

Need for "Intentional" Monitoring of Planning Processes

The group discussed the history of the Art on Campus committee and how, in the face of a budget crisis, the committee's efforts "withered" away. This created a morale problem as well as a loss of committee knowledge and efforts. There appears a need for formal "oversight" of committee efforts so that institutional history or committee work is not lost (when a committee disbands), but consciously considered and acknowledged in some fashion.

College Council possibly could "receive and log" issues or incidents specific to committees' needs and status.

OVERALL QUESTIONS POSED:

- Does College Council have a decision-making mandate that no other committee has?
- Could College Council take on a monitoring function of committee work?
- Could/should College Council become a committee that reports to IPC like other planning committees with a mandate to have "oversight" over shared governance
- How do we define "oversight" and "participatory governance"?
- Could we identify what values are important in (re)defining shared governance?

Note: discussion concluded that "oversight" might mean ensuring that that "genuine participation" is occurring broadly, not as a reaction to an unpopular decision.