

Shared Governance Task Force Mtg_5-20-2021

Attendees (names taken from ZOOM screen):

- Scott Olsen
- Mylinh Pham
- Kimberly Lam
- Jim Nguyen
- Melinda Hughes
- Eric Mendoza
- Tracy C-T
- Keri Kirkpatrick
- So Kam Lee
- Tim Shively
- Jennifer Mahato
- Beniam Gebrat

Discussion:

1. Email to Dr. Holmes requesting some clarification (Task Force – finalized email).
 - a. Request to re-establish the Campus Budget Team announcement at College Council
 - i. What is the relationship of this team to other committees and College Council
 - ii. Previous Campus Budget Team - Committee offered that prior Budget Team didn't really have decision making capabilities
2. Review of PBT Structures:
 - a. Reviewed Shared Governance at Foothill College (Tim S.) – separate constituent based committees

Committees will have 12 voting members — 4 Faculty, 3 Classified Staff, 3 Students, and 2 Administrators. A member can only serve on one committee.

- College Advisory Council
- Community and Communications
- Equity and Education
- Revenue and Resource

Tim S. Notes:

Advantages of this model

- Could incorporate Lloyd's separate "budget" committee (would probably be easier than trying to fight him and College Council on that--which might not be successful anyways)
- Could eliminate redundancy of function, number of constituents needed
- Affinity groups might not be stretched as thin (I have a separate proposal to address)
- Could curb any constituency dominance by decentralizing oversight (e.g. the VP of Instruction wouldn't be overseeing Instructional Planning and Budget)
- Might result in more equitable distribution of power among stakeholders

Disadvantages of this model

- Need to insure president doesn't interfere in operations.
- Charges need to be very well defined, avoid overlap
- Need to insure that decision making of committees is honored (true of all models)
- Committee should be more than just advisory: a hurdle.

3. Affinity Groups participation – diversity on the committees
 - a. Ideally we diversify the constituent groups
 - b. Establish a practice to include diversity from the constituent groups first; then go to the affinity groups as needed (to alleviate some over stressing of the participation on smaller affinity groups).
 - c. Affinity groups should be welcomed to participate – but have the ability to
4. Equity Action Council
 - a. Representation on committees
5. Getting information to others (from each committee, council, task force, etc.)
6. Where is the planning & budgeting being brought together?
7. What would re-structuring solve? Re-shape the entire shared governance...how far do we go?
 - a. What is really necessary in ALL areas of the campus?
 - b. Is this taking the 'B' out of the PBTs?
8. **What do we know is NOT working:**
 - a. Separate silos
 - b. Representation lacking on all these separate groups
 - c. Impact of time commitment to participation within all these separate groups
 - d. Communication between groups and the larger population
 - e. Educating everyone on the funding that is up for discussion (what is restricted and not restricted) – there is confusion who has money or what money can be used for
9. **Examples of things that seem to work:**
 - a. CTE is a good model that is working (Mary P.)
 - b. One collegewide budget committee (umbrella) – and then programs underneath that are specific (like technology, instructional, etc.).
 - c. We need to be able to be more flexible with our funds
 - d. Faculty and Student Services work together closely
 - e. Need clear defined process – written down and accessible everyone in an equitable manner

TASKS:

- NEW: Task Force Move to hold Weekly Meetings
- History of Shared Governance & Review other models of Shared Governance
- Work on building a “roadmap” or workflow – how information flows into committee (input & output):
 - Mary P. to help get this started and put on ShareDrive for committee.
- Dr. Holmes invitation to next meeting (Karen Chow and Heidi King)
 - Intention of the Re-establishment of Campus Budget Team