GROSSMONT
COLLEGE

GROSSMONT COLLEGE
College Council
Thursday, October 24, 2024
3-5 p.m.
GRIFFIN GATE

MEETING SUMMARY

Purpose: The College Council is the apex governance body which provides guidance and recommendations to the College President regarding institutional policies, planning, and processes in support of the college mission. It engages all college constituency groups (students, faculty, classified professionals and supervisors/administrators) and the governance system as a whole through the maintenance of clear governance practices and policies, coordination of committee work across functions, and a commitment to continuous improvement and consensus building. The constituent-based representatives of the council serve the college by maintaining a broad, college-wide, and student-centered view of the needs of the institution – both in the weighing of the input from its committees and in bringing forward items for consideration and discussion. In all matters within its purview, it will maintain a focus on the goal of equitable outcomes for all students as a key value informing decision-making.

CONVENER	ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE (ASGC)		ADVISORY	
☒ *Denise Whisenhunt, President*	☒ Lu Tri Vi Huynh		☐ *Colleen Parsons, CSEA*	
	☐ Cesar Nunez		☐ *Julio Soto, AFT*	
	☒ Isaac Collier		☐ *Administrators Association Rep*	
	☒ Anahi Mendez		☐ *TBD, VPSS*	
			☒ *Agustin Albarran, Int. VPAA*	
			☒ *Sheree Stopper, VPAS*	
			☒ *Joan Ahrens, Sr. Dean, CPIE*	
			☒ *Ernesto Rivera, Director of College and Community Relations*	

ACADEMIC SENATE	CLASSIFIED SENATE	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION
☒ Perla Lopez	☒ Andrew Hellier	☒ Courtney Willis
☒ Carmina Caballes	☐ Vacant	☐ TBD
☒ Jeff Waller	☒ Brandi Tonne	☒ Nancy Saks
☒ June Yang	☒ Michele Martens	☐ Wayne Branker

RECORDER	GUESTS
☒ *Bernadette Black*	Jennifer Bennett, Denise Schulmeyer, Shawn Hicks, Brodney Fitzgerald, Malia Molina
Italicized = Non-voting	

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome	Denise acknowledged Tate Hurvitz and the staff in technology for getting Griffin Gate back up and running. She also acknowledged Patty Sparks for her work. There will be a Halloween costume contest on October 31st at 12:00PM in the Main Quad. That same evening, the Hyde Art Gallery is hosting a reception in connection with the West Cast Art Alliance. Denise thanked those involved with financial aid's program review. Joan added that we have to keep our rosters current, especially with census rosters, but also rosters throughout the semester. We need to pay attention to when a student drops a class as financial aid is dependent on when they are enrolled. The amount is depended on how long the student is enrolled in a course. The new assembly bill, AB 789, states that students need to know that they have to abide by the institutional policy on satisfactory academic progress to remain eligible for financial aid. Joan will work with Agustin in getting communication out to faculty about census deadlines and maintaining current roster, and other compliance requirements that come out of program review. Denise noted that they are going to pause on the alternative area for the reflection space until we look at feasibility. The approved space for the reflection room is currently under construction. In spirit of honoring the process, they want to look at feasibility. Loren added that they need to look at the state inventory, ADA accessibility, egress, cost, and feasibility for the program and how it affects students. Denise stated that legislative update has been embedded in the agenda.
2. Establish Quorum (50%+1 of voting members)	Quorum was established.
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.
4. Approve Meeting Notes (8/22/24)	Motion to approve: Jeff Waller Second: Perla Lopez The meeting notes were unanimously approved.
5. Public Comment (3 min max per comment)	No public comments were made.

DISCUSSION OF PRIOR AGENDA ITEMS / OLD BUSINESS	
1.Standard 1 Feedback	This fall, governance committees were asked to review the draft of Standard 1 and provide feedback. The goal is to make the feedback form easier for Standard 2 as it was too lengthy and intimidating. Standard 1 shows what we are doing to support our mission and is pretty factual. Standard 2 will be reviewed next month. There was a question about evidence. Joan stated there's a new process and ACCJC provides suggestions on what evidence we might include and what we are required to include. As a piece of evidence Perla suggested including the process we used for updating our Mission Statement as it showed collaboration and inclusivity. Denise Schulmeyer led the Council through the review of each substandard and feedback was provided. Joan stated for Standard 2, she wants to have a robust conversation at our next meeting, and if time permits, to have breakout discussions. For the spring semester, Standards 3 and 4 might be divided out to the specific groups that the Standard pertains to.

FOR CONSENSUS *	
* On College Council, consensus is reached when at least three-fourths (75%) of voting members present are in agreement, and if there are no more than two members from any one constituency who disagree, then consensus to move recommendation forward to President is reached.	
1. Tri Chair Format for Governance Committees	Joan stated at the last planning meetings and governance retreat where the governance structure was evaluated, it was realized that all co-chairs were either all faculty or all classified professionals so we did not have full representation. We want to allow leadership of committees in a balanced way. There was discussion about having half the committees be co-chaired by faculty and the other half chaired by classified professionals. At the last Council meeting, a tri-chair format was proposed so there's representatives from all groups, and it was brought today for a vote. It was asked how the committees that were impacted felt, and it was noted that it was discussed at the governance retreat. The term for co-chairs would be 2 years. It offers the flexibility for two chairs to run a meeting if one person is out. One member was not aware that this was supposed to go out for approval from constituent groups. Joan added that one not every item in governance has to go back to groups for approval. Representatives are appointed to College Council and those reps have the right to make a decision. Andrew stated he reported it out at Classified Senate and one of the feedback was the concern about availability of classified professionals to serve on governance committees and it puts more pressure on them. June responded asking if it is possible to have tri-chairs with classified in absentia; however, Michele responded that it is important for classified to be a part of the discussions. Victoria added that sometimes offering Zoom options makes it easier for everyone to join, even if they have to multi-task. After discussion, it was agreed to pull this item to continue discussions with their groups. Joan asked that this be brought to the meeting in December to allow time for the next meeting to review Standard 2.

1. Student Art	Jennifer Bennett brought to the Council a recommendation from the Facilities Committee to allow a student group project e placed on campus. The request went to the Facilities Committee from the students to create art work out of plastic bottles with a wood base and have it placed on campus. She added that students are allowed to place in the art quad for two weeks as a temporary display with a sign explaining the art work. The art work they are presenting is called "Trash Tree" to represent recycling. This would be a good opportunity to post our recycling procedure next to the display as well. The timeframe for putting it on display would be after Thanksgiving through the end of the semester. The dimensions is 6 to 8 feet tall and a few feet wide. She would work with facilities to ensure that the installation of the art is stable and secured. It was asked if the art display is something we can inherit or keep as perhaps it can be displayed on Earth Day. Jennifer said she would talk with the students. Motion to approve: Issac Collier Second: Jeff Waller The recommendation was approved to move forward to the president for a decision.
INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION	
1. Strategic Hires (informational only) • CDC Aide (CL-00236) • Administrative Assistant III/CPIE (CL-00629) • A&R Assistant (CL-00184) • VRC Coordinator (New) • A&R Supervisor (SU-00027) • A&R Assistant Sr (CL-00166)	The strategic hires were presented to the Council for informational purposes.
2. Faculty Staffing Prioritization	Brodney Fitzgerald presented on the process for faculty staffing prioritization. It was noted the AUPs are due November 1st. The resource requests will be sent to the faculty staffing prioritization committee to evaluate, followed by presentations and then final rankings. The final rankings is then recommended to the Staffing committee who then brings to College Council as a recommendation. He noted that last semester, they presented at College Council, chairs and coordinators, and academic senate the list and rubric to make sure they received feedback from all committees. Brodney highlighted what data is reviewed when the committee is prioritizing the requests. There was further discussion about the rubric and the changes made, and concerns were shared about being able to provide feedback. Perla asked if the faculty members appointed to the

3. Faculty Staffing Prioritization (con't)	prioritization committee should have the opportunity to bring back to Senate for feedback. Joan reminded the Council that this is an item where the constituent groups elected their reps to the committees. The faculty staffing prioritization committee designed the rubric. After each round, they then reflect and make improvements. It's the responsibility of the Staffing committee to have discussions with the faculty prioritization committee about the rubric and how it went. The rubric does not come to College Council for a vote. It was brought here today because of a concern about the process. It was reminded that feedback was collected and changes were made in Nuventive based on that feedback. Because of the concerns brought up in Academic Senate and chairs, the president asked to run an assessment of the AUP process. Joan drafted a survey and will send to the researcher to review and administer at the end of November or early December. The survey will just go to the chairs as they are responsible for completing the AUP, and the committees who are involved in the prioritization process. It was reiterated that the rubric should not be discussed outside of the faculty staffing committee as it is their responsibility to reach consensus. There was further discussion about whether a process can be created that allows those who just went through the process to provide feedback on the rubric and their experience. There was another concern about shared governance and the need to have the rubric reviewed and considered by the Staffing committee. There seems to be a gap in the process. Further, the Staffing committee needs to write a Staffing Plan but there's no guidance on what the school is all about. Denise noted that there have been discussions about the Staffing committee and what that should look like and agreed we need to do a deeper dive. It was noted that presenters of staffing requests need to know if there are any changes so they know what the committee wants. Expectations from the prioritization committee needs to be made more clearly. Joan reminded the group that the design of the questions and changes in Nuentive went through the governance process; Nuventive then helped streamline questions to reduce repetition. June asked what determines the deadlines of the timelines. Joan responded that we started the discussion on timeline about a year ago. As a result of that, they tried redoing the timeline because our governance stops in the summer and January since faculty are off contract. When the AUP was designed, it was designed to plan for next year. When we previously had immediate funding, we were able to get positions the same year. Now, we are aligning with the fiscal timeline. Joan encouraged all governance committees to read the AUP handbook. She also noted that the responsibility of reviewing our processes is through PIEC and invited anyone to attend their next meeting.

4. Legislative Updates	Not discussed.
5. Next Meeting – Date Change – December 5th?	Not discussed.

CONSTITUENCY AND COMMITTEE REPORTS (2 minutes maximum)	
1. Constituency Updates: ASGC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Administrators Association	
2. Budget Committee (BC)	Budget Committee Report Out
3. Facilities Committee (FC)	
4. Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC)	
5. Professional Development Committee (PDC)	
6. Staffing Committee (SC)	
7. Classified Staffing Prioritization Committee (CSPC)	
8. Faculty Staffing Prioritization Committee (FSPC)	
9. Student Success & Equity Committee (SSEC)	
10. Technology Committee (TC)	
11. Accreditation Steering Committee	

12. Governance Priorities Workgroups Report Outs
    a. Overall campus engagement *(Graylin Clavell, Diana Torres, Agustin Albarran)*
    b. Training *(Tate Hurvitz, Denise Whisenhunt, Jennifer Bennett, Perla Lopez)*
    c. Participation *(June Yang, Wayne Branker, Julio Soto, Karo Macias, Courtney Willis)*
    d. Communication *(Ernesto Rivera, Carmina Caballes, Diana Torres, Sheree Stopper)*	

FOLLOW-UP		
Who	**Item**	**Timeline**

Participatory Governance:

College Council Website

Governance Handbook

<u>**NEXT MEETING:**</u> **November 28, 2024 – 3:00-5:00PM – GRIFFIN GATE – TO BE RESCHEDULED**

Committees are to establish norms

In order to create valued outcomes, a commitment to participation, dialogue, and the pursuit of value in the form of useful output by all is necessary. It is acknowledged that there are power dynamics in a room. Work must be done to create the equitable and inclusive environment sought for effective and active participation. To do so, council/committee members will establish behavioral norms that include the following meeting rules of engagement, make use of meeting tools, and respect the roles of each member.

Engagement Norms
In participatory government, a high level of collegiality, respect, and civility is expected. Those expectations include the following rules:

1. Free flow of conversation and raising hands when needed.

2. Thumbs up/Thumbs down/Thumbs sideways to convey individual council members vote toward action items.

3. Parking lot for ideas and possible future action items.

4. Summarize talking points with similar language for constituency representatives to take back to their respected constituency and taking the last 5 minutes of the meeting to do this.

5. Estimated times for each agenda item is up to the Convener of the council.

6. No rank in the room, but those that wish can use salutations.

7. Please keep dialogue respectful.

8. Reminder – body language.

9. Once a semester we have a social gathering.

10. Starting and Ending the meeting on time.

11. Respect each other.

12. Repeating what was voted on after the vote.

13. Education/background from other committees to make appropriate decisions.

14. Use of technology/cell phones is only in an emergency, and to be mindful and professional of the meeting.

15. Norms will be revisited once a semester for now.

Virtual Norms (Established April 2020):

1. Consensus / voting: (a) state item for vote in the chat, (b) record votes in chat grouped by constituencies.
2. Use the raise hand feature in the participant window when you wish to speak.
3. Mute microphone when not speaking.
4. Record the meetings for note taker to use as needed.
5. Consider ways for guests to observe (i.e. use "Registration" feature for meetings. Keep the chat area reserved for voting and advisory members.