



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

SFO Airport Westin
1 Old Bayshore, Millbrae, CA.
(650) 692-3500

Wednesday, April 9, 2014
11:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.
12:15 to 12:45 p.m. Lunch
12:45 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting Tonya Davis at (916) 445-4753 or by sending a written request to Ms. Davis at the Executive Committee's address 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525, Sacramento, CA 95816 or tonya@asccc.org no less than five working days prior to the meeting. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

Public Comments: A written request to address the Executive Committee shall be made on the form provided at the meeting. Public testimony will be invited at the beginning of the Executive Committee discussion on each agenda item. Persons wishing to make a presentation to the Executive Committee on a subject not on the agenda shall address the Executive Committee during the time listed for public comment. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes per individual and 30 minutes per agenda item.

Materials for this meeting are found on the Senate website at: http://www.asccc.org/executive_committee/meetings. Please note that the Executive Committee meetings are taped and kept for 30 days for the purposes of accurate note taking only.

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Roll Call

B. Approval of Agenda

C. Public Comment

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

D. Calendar

E. Action Tracking List

F. Dinner Arrangements

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Caucus Recognition, B. Smith

The Executive Committee will consider for approval continued recognition of the Part-Time Caucus as an ASCCC Caucus

B. Executive Committee Minutes, Bruno

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the Executive Committee minutes from the December 13, 2013, January 3 – 4, 2014, and the January 31 – February 1, 2014 meetings.

III. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE (Action, as necessary), Morse – 30 mins.

IV. OLD BUSINESS (Possible Action)

A. Minutes - 30 mins., Bruno

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the minutes from the February 28 – March 1, 2014, Executive Committee meeting

B. Internal Policy Committee Recommendations– 40 mins., Bruno

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the minutes and public comments sections in the Open Meetings policy and review the other sections.

C. Faculty Leadership Institute – 30 mins., B. Smith

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the Faculty Leadership Institute Program.

D. Professional Development College – 30 mins., Grimes Hillman

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the PDC Leadership Module pilot timeline for the Professional Development College

E. Spring Session Final Planning – 35 mins., B. Smith

The Executive Committee will discuss the final planning for the Spring Plenary Session.

V. NEW BUSINESS (Possible Action)

A. ASCCC Governance, Roles and Responsibilities – 30 minutes, Bruno, Grimes Hillman, Stanskas

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval a special meeting in May. Additionally, the Executive Committee will consider specific actions to immediately improve the functioning of the Executive Committee.

B. Budget and Finance Committee Recommendations – 40 mins., North

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the Budget and Finance Committee Recommendations.

C. Budget Decision – 30 mins., Grimes Hillman

The Executive Committee will hold a roll call vote to retain a Human Resources (HR) Specialist lawyer at \$360 per hour.

D. Recommendation to Retain an HR Firm, 40 mins., B. Smith, Bruno, Crump

The Executive Committee will consider for approval funds to hire and retain an HR firm for general support and expertise on personnel matters.

E. Elections – 20 mins., Crump

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval addressing the proposed resolution 1.01 S14 to modify the ASCCC Rules related to elections if the delegates pass the resolution.

F. Survey of ASCCC Committee and Task Force Evaluation – 20 mins., B. Smith

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval a survey to be distributed to Executive Committee members and current committee and task force members about their experiences this year.

G. Recommendation on Deferral Payback– 15 mins., Morse

The Executive Committee will offer feedback or if appropriate direction to the Senate president and vice-president regarding Senate positions on the proposed State Budget to be used in a meeting with other faculty leaders.

VI. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (*Time certain: 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm*)

A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report – 15 mins.,

A liaison from the Chancellor's Office will provide the Executive Committee members with an update of system-wide issues and projects.

B. Liaison Oral Reports (*please keep report to 5 mins., each*)

Liaisons from the following organizations are invited to provide the Executive Committee with update related to their organization: AAUP, CCA, CCCI, CFT, FACCC, Part-time Faculty, and Student Senate

VII. FIRST READING (No Action)

VII. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (No Action)

A. Board of Governors/Consultation Council – 20 mins., B. Smith/Morse

The Executive Committee will be updated about the Board of Governors and Consultation Council Meetings.

B. C-ID/TMC Update – 20 mins., Bruno

The Executive Committee will be updated by on the work of C-ID/TMC and the issues, processes, and policies.

C. Presidents Report

D. Executive Director

E. Foundation Report

F. Committee Reports

1. Curriculum Committee, Stanskas
2. Operational Oversight Committee, Bruno
3. Resolutions Committee, Freitas
4. Standards and Practices Committee, Grimes-Hillman

G. Task Force Reports

1. Academic Integrity Task Force, Davison
2. Distance Education Task Force, Freitas

H. Liaison Reports

1. California Community College Administrators of Occupational Education, North
2. Economic & Workforce Development, North
3. Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, B. Smith

I. Grant and Project Reports

1. C-ID, Bruno
2. ICW, Bruno

J. Local Senate Visits – 20 mins., Davison

The Executive Committee will review the local senate reports for recent visits to West Valley College and San Jose City College

New Business (*No action/Next Agenda*)

Adjournmentt


April 2014

Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																																																										
		1	2	3	4	5																																																																																										
6	7	8	9 Executive Committee Meeting: SFO Westin	10	11 Diversity Award presentation	12																																																																																										
Spring Session: SFO Westin																																																																																																
13	14	15	16	17 Consultation Council Meeting	18	19																																																																																										
20	21 CI: Prelim Presenters List Due	22	23	24	25	26																																																																																										
27	28 FL: Final Program due to Julie FL: Presenter Travel and AV Requests Due	29	30	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; margin-right: 20px;"> <caption>Mar 2014</caption> <thead> <tr><th>S</th><th>M</th><th>T</th><th>W</th><th>T</th><th>F</th><th>S</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td></tr> <tr><td>30</td><td>31</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"> <caption>May 2014</caption> <thead> <tr><th>S</th><th>M</th><th>T</th><th>W</th><th>T</th><th>F</th><th>S</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1 2 3</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		S	M	T	W	T	F	S							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31						S	M	T	W	T	F	S							1 2 3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																										
						1																																																																																										
2	3	4	5	6	7	8																																																																																										
9	10	11	12	13	14	15																																																																																										
16	17	18	19	20	21	22																																																																																										
23	24	25	26	27	28	29																																																																																										
30	31																																																																																															
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																										
						1 2 3																																																																																										
4	5	6	7	8	9	10																																																																																										
11	12	13	14	15	16	17																																																																																										
18	19	20	21	22	23	24																																																																																										
25	26	27	28	29	30	31																																																																																										

May 2014

Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																																																																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Apr 2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> <td>24</td> <td>25</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Apr 2014							S	M	T	W	T	F	S		1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30				<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Jun 2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> <td>24</td> <td>25</td> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Jun 2014							S	M	T	W	T	F	S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30						1	2	3
Apr 2014																																																																																																								
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																																		
	1	2	3	4	5																																																																																																			
6	7	8	9	10	11	12																																																																																																		
13	14	15	16	17	18	19																																																																																																		
20	21	22	23	24	25	26																																																																																																		
27	28	29	30																																																																																																					
Jun 2014																																																																																																								
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																																		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7																																																																																																		
8	9	10	11	12	13	14																																																																																																		
15	16	17	18	19	20	21																																																																																																		
22	23	24	25	26	27	28																																																																																																		
29	30																																																																																																							
4	5	6	7	8	9	10																																																																																																		
11	12 FL: Program to Print	13	14 CI: 2nd Reading Executive Committee Agenda Deadline	15 Consultation Council Meeting	16	17																																																																																																		
18	19	20	21	22	23	24																																																																																																		
25	26  Office Closed	27 CI: Presenter Travel and AV Requests Due FL: Digital Materials due FL: Early Registration Ends	28	29	30 Executive Committee Meeting / Orientation	31 Executive Committee Meeting / Orientation																																																																																																		


June 2014

Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																																																																		
1 Executive Committee Meeting / Orientation	2 CI: Final Program Due to Julie	3	4	5	6	7																																																																																																		
8	9 CI: Final Program to Printer FL: Shipping Deadline	10	11	12	13	14																																																																																																		
				Faculty Leadership Institute (San Diego)																																																																																																				
15	16	17	18	19 Consultation Council Meeting	20	21																																																																																																		
22	23 CI: Digital Materials Due	24	25	26	27	28																																																																																																		
29	30 CI: Early Registration ends	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; margin-right: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">May 2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> <td>24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> <td>31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Jul 2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19</td> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> <td>24</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> <td>31</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					May 2014							S	M	T	W	T	F	S					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	Jul 2014							S	M	T	W	T	F	S				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
May 2014																																																																																																								
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																																		
				1	2	3																																																																																																		
4	5	6	7	8	9	10																																																																																																		
11	12	13	14	15	16	17																																																																																																		
18	19	20	21	22	23	24																																																																																																		
25	26	27	28	29	30	31																																																																																																		
Jul 2014																																																																																																								
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																																		
			1	2	3	4																																																																																																		
5	6	7	8	9	10	11																																																																																																		
12	13	14	15	16	17	18																																																																																																		
19	20	21	22	23	24	25																																																																																																		
26	27	28	29	30	31																																																																																																			

July 2014

Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																	
<table border="1"> <caption>Jun 2014</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> <td>24</td> <td>25</td> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30						1	2	3 CI: Final confirmation email out	4  4th of July -- Office Closed	5								
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7																																																	
8	9	10	11	12	13	14																																																	
15	16	17	18	19	20	21																																																	
22	23	24	25	26	27	28																																																	
29	30																																																						
6	7 CI: Shipping deadline	8	9	10	11	12																																																	
Curriculum Institute (TBD)																																																							
13	14	15	16	17 Consultation Council Meeting	18	19																																																	
20	21	22	23	24	25	26																																																	
27	28	29	30	31	<table border="1"> <caption>Aug 2014</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>25</td> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S	M	T	W	T	F	S						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31							
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																	
					1	2																																																	
3	4	5	6	7	8	9																																																	
10	11	12	13	14	15	16																																																	
17	18	19	20	21	22	23																																																	
24	25	26	27	28	29	30																																																	
31																																																							



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Caucus Recognition		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: II. A.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval continued recognition of the Part-Time Caucus as an ASCCC Caucus.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

The ASCCC Caucus process requires current caucuses to submit each May their intent to continue as a recognized caucus (see <http://www.asccc.org/caucuses>). The PT Faculty Caucus has submitted its intent to continue as an ASCCC Caucus and provided current membership.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



March 17, 2014

Dear Ms. Adams,

I am writing to inform you that the ASPT Faculty Caucus intends to stay active and looks forward to having our next meeting during the 2013 Spring Plenary. Please find the attachment that lists our members enclosed in this email.

Sincerely,

Stacey Burks
Chair, ASPT Caucus
Butte College

Cc: David Milroy

Membership:

Amy Wilson, Diablo Valley College
Mary Ellen Goodwin, De Anza College
Dr. Jonathan Knight, Los Medanos College
Valerie Colber, Diablo Valley College, Las Positas College, Los Mendanos College
Julia Ashmore, Los Medanos College
Lynn Knight, Contra Costa College
Victoria Sansome--Chabot College
Teya Schaffer--College of Alameda (Peralta District)
Dave Welton--Butte
Stewart Winchester--Diablo Valley College
Tara Grover Smith--Butte
Daniel Najjar--Berkeley City College--Peralta
Wendy Brown--Butte

Jodi Rives--Butte
Teresa Richards--Butte
Lisa Westwood--Butte
Ann Larson--Butte
Perry Snyder, Ph.D. Palomar College
John Martin--Butte
Teresa Ensslin--Butte
Shanna Mariev--Butte
Monique Vallance Modesto Jr. College
Maryanne Galindo La Trade Tech College
Pablo Rodriguez City College of San Francisco
Steve Hall--Butte
Bob Eddy--Diablo Valley College
Cliff Liehe--CCSF
Sally Saenger—SBCC
Kathryn Pinna College, SF
Paulette Bell-- Santa Rosa Jr. College, Sonoma County College
Jennifer Paris--Rio Hondo College and Mira Costa College
Martin Tuller--Grossmont College
Jodi Baker -- Grossmont
Rob Leadbeater--West Valley Mission College District
Candace Khanna—Laney College
Dave Bush—Shasta
Dana Davis—San Diego--Berkely City College/Contra Costa College
Jennifer Yeh--Chabot-Las Positas District—
Elsa Ramirez-Brisson--Hartnell College
Margie Allen--Butte College
Cynthia Mahabir--Peralta
Andy Vranich--Butte College
Cheryl Battles--Butte College—
Ola Teslenko-- Laney College
Judith Rathbone--Laney College
Sandra Niemann--Berkeley City College
Jay Citron--Peralta Community College
Robert Melsh--College of the Sequoias
Nancy Wendt--Diablo Valley College
Bruce D. Olsen-- L.A. Trade Tech College and L.A. Southwest College
W. Rudd--Santa Rosa College
Martin Goldstein--Santa Monica
Don Nikkel—COS
Celeste Roberts—COS
Jo Anne Cripe--Butte College
Kenneth Bearden--Butte College
Shawn Smith—Butte College



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Executive Committee Meeting Minutes		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: II. B.	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Bruno	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the minutes from the December 13, January 3 – 4, 2014, January 31 – February 1, 2014, and February 28 – January 1, 2014 Executive Committee meetings.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

At its meeting January 3 – 4, 2014, members discussed the minutes from the December 2013 special Executive Committee meeting and asked for clarification regarding when the attorney declared that the Executive Committee could go into closed session, as well as questioned the proper format for minutes. Pending clarification the Executive Committee tabled the minutes until the January/February meeting for consideration.

On January 31, 2014, the Executive Committee met but did not discuss the minutes. B. Smith directed that the minutes not be put on the agenda until such a process was developed by IPC. The Executive Committee met on March 3 – 4, 2014, and discussed the proper format for the minutes and approved an outline of the process to be further developed by IPC.

Included in this item are the December 13, 2013, January 3 – 4, 2014, January 31 – February 1, 2013, and February 28 – January 1, 2014, meeting minutes for discussion and possible approval. Note: only the minutes from December 13, 2013, were changed based on the new process.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Draft Minutes
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
The Westin Sacramento
4800 Riverside Blvd, Sacramento, CA 95822
Tower Room
December 13, 2013

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Roll Call and Welcome Guests

President B. Smith called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed members and guests.

Members present: Julie Bruno, Dianna Chiabotti, Dan Crump, Dolores Davison, John Freitas, Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Lesley Kawaguchi, David Morse, Wheeler North, Cynthia Rico, Phil Smith and John Stanskas (by telephone).

Guests present: Karen Diepenbrock (Diepenbrock Law Firm); David Diepenbrock (Diepenbrock Law Firm); Jane Patton, ASCCC Past President (2009-2011); Michelle Pilati, ASCCC Past President (2011-2013); Shaaron Vogel, past ASCCC Executive Committee member; and Ian Walton, ASCCC Past President (2005-2007)

B. Approval of the Agenda:

Members requested clarification on the purpose of the closed session. B. Smith remarked that the purpose of the session was to seek advice from the attorney on pending litigation as well as to review the communication survey results completed by the Executive Committee at the November 6, 2013 meeting. B. Smith stated that no action would be taken during closed session.

Members questioned the role of the attorneys. It was clarified that the attorneys represent the organization. A question was posed as to the possibility of members' comments in closed session being used in litigation. K. Diepenbrock stated that under the Bagley Keene Act, boards are provided the opportunity to go into closed session to discuss personnel issues.

Members questioned the requirements necessary for a committee to go into closed session under the Bagley Keene Act. K. Diepenbrock stated that the Bagley Keene Act is a complicated piece of legislation. Court cases have interpreted Brown Act and Bagley Keene to allow committees to discuss certain issues in closed session including personnel matters. This provides the opportunity for committee members to make comments when needed on sensitive matters. Members requested that the attorneys introduced themselves and provided background on their firm.

North questioned the legality of going into closed session. Members discussed the purpose of closed session. B. Smith stated that the Executive Committee purpose of closed session is to seek guidance and that no action would be taken. It was noted that if information is shared that could lead to an evaluation of the executive director, the employee has the right to request an open meeting. K. Diepenbrock noted that the committee could make a motion to go into closed session to discuss whether the committee should hold a closed session. It was also noted that if the committee approve the agenda as written, the committee would be going into closed session.

Action:

MSC (North) Motion to go into closed session to discuss reasons for closed session.

Second: Kawaguchi
Ayes: 11 Nays: 1

The Executive Committee convened in closed session to discuss moving into closed session.

C. Open Session:

President B. Smith reconvened open session and reported out of closed session that the Executive Committee did not take any action.

Action:

MSC (Chiabotti) Motion to adopt the agenda

Second: P. Smith

Roll Call Vote:

Julie Bruno, - no

Dianna Chiabotti - yes

Dan Crump - no

Dolores Davison - yes

John Freitas - yes

Michelle Grimes-Hillman - no

Lesley Kawaguchi - no

David Morse - no

Wheeler North - no

Cynthia Rico - yes

Phil Smith - yes

John Stanskas - yes

Beth Smith - yes

Point of Order: I. Walton (Past ASCCC president) questioned whether a member's vote could count when the member is not present. North requested clarification on a member's participation in a meeting by telephone, including a vote on a motion, without proper notification to the public. K. Diepenbrock stated that she believed it was allowable as long as a roll call vote occurred but she would need to research the issue. B. Smith stated that the Executive Committee has engaged in the practice during prior meetings.

D. Public Comments:

B. Smith recognized the guests present for public comments. Bruno informed the members that she had received six letters to be read into public comments. B. Smith stated that the letters would not be read but instead would be submitted as part of the official minutes. Bruno distributed the letters to the Executive Committee and individuals present. The following letters were submitted: Kate Clark, past ASCCC President (2003-2005); Greg Gilbert, past Executive Committee member; Mark Wade Lieu, past ASCCC president (2007-2009); Richard Mahon, past ASCCC Executive Committee member, Hoke Simpson, past ASCCC president (2001-2003); and Mark Snowwhite, past ASCCC Secretary.

B. Smith stated that public comments would be limited to 3 minutes.

Point of Order: I. Walton challenged this pronouncement by stating that the Executive Committee has no policy on the restriction of public comments and that this restriction was not noticed to the

public on the agenda. B. Smith stated that the Executive Committee does not have a policy but that she contacted the Chancellor's Office for guidance and was told that the Board of Governors limits public comments to 3 minutes. B. Smith stated that the Executive Committee would follow the same restriction.

Jane Patton, past ASCCC president (2009 – 2011), (Shaaron Vogel, past Executive Committee member, and Ian Walton, past ASCCC president (2005 – 07) addressed the Executive Committee about governance issues and other challenges faced by the current Executive Committee. They requested that the December meeting be held in the open so that all the facts could be made public. Additional public comments from the following individuals were submitted: Kate Clark, past ASCCC President (2003-2005); Greg Gilbert, past Executive Committee member; Mark Wade Lieu, past ASCCC president (2007-2009); Richard Mahon, past ASCCC Executive Committee member, Hoke Simpson, past ASCCC president (2001-2003); and Mark Snowwhite, past ASCCC Secretary.

All public comments are included as an appendix and available on the ASCCC website: asccc.org.

E. Closed Session: The Executive Committee went into closed session.

F. Open Session: President B. Smith reconvened in open session.

The Executive Committee reported out that the president and Executive Director would enter into mediation and that the Executive Director would notify the Executive Committee of any change in her personal leave schedule on a weekly basis.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:45

Respectfully Submitted,
Julie Bruno, Secretary

Shaaron Vogel

Butte College Nursing Faculty

Were not read due to time shortage.

Concerns for the ASCCC

I am Shaaron Vogel and I am here today as a member of the community college faculty and a member of the body. I am also a current member of my local senate.

When I first came on the ASCCC executive board there was great division and strife. Members would yell, burst into tears, and walk out of meetings. The board struggled to keep focus and get critical work done. The body was very aware of this and used their votes to change the voices at the table. The last 8 Presidents worked very hard to earn the ASCCC respect statewide and now the ASCCC voice is valued and respected. You are jeopardizing this hard work. Do not destroy what has been built.

Julie was there through it all and has worked under at least 9 presidents who had very few issues with her performance. She earned her BS, masters and now working on her PhD. She has brought to the ASCCC her expertise, special certifications and many grants. Now within less than two months the current President has issues with Julie's performance. Today you are requested to do a closed session. This is denying the public and the body access to the discussion that is to take place.

Procedures are not being followed and items are not being brought to the full exec and full board. It has been stressed that the ASCCC values transparency and accountability yet I am not seeing that. The lawyer opened with how she values collegiality, respect and fairness yet this is not happening at this time on this board. A few members of this board have attempted a mini coup and sadly my own past local President got pulled into this division. We need unity and focus to keep and build on what the ASCCC has--- do not destroy all the hard work with division. The word of this division and lack of focus is already known to some around the state so do not give them a reason to pull back from valuing our voice and knowledge.

Stop fighting and focus on the greater good. The body will be watching.

On the ASCCC website it has posted the values: Leadership, Empowerment and Voice yet I am hearing that these values are not being honored by all. I also brought with me a book called "The Real Healthcare Reform" by Linda Leekley and Stacey Turnure. It talks about the lack of civility, gossip, bullying and conflict resolution in the healthcare industry. Examples of these are: using demeaning or disparaging language, gossip or slander, intimidation, sabotage, bullying, offensive written communications, and hate. I am hearing about some of these behaviors exhibited at times on the executive board and it is so sad because the results are physical and psychological stress on all members. I have several quotes from the book but will not include due to time.

Do not destroy what many have worked so hard for. Stop this division and focus on the work to be done.

December 9, 2013

Dear Senate Colleagues,

It is gratifying to know that a Senator Emeritus may yet on occasion have a voice in Executive Committee deliberations. As you have likely surmised, I am writing concerning Executive Director Julie Adams' December 3, 2013 request for assistance. As sadly disturbing as the concerns expressed in her letter, even more disturbing is that Julie Adams, of all people, our Julie, who has served the Senate so faithfully for nearly two decades, should feel compelled to resort to such measures. Surely you must agree that village elders such as Julie deserve our gratitude and respect, not shunning condemnation for striving to fulfill their historic roles.

It has been my honor to work closely with the Senate for many years, and I know firsthand the joy of serving on an Exec that addresses differences through thoughtful discussion and a sense of shared mission. I have learned also that the character exhibited by an organization often finds its direction through the example set by its leadership. Respect for differences of opinion, acceptance of our human foibles, transparency, balanced and thoughtful approaches to dealing with personnel situations, principled adherence to our codes and regulations, and collegiality that celebrates our best efforts, these are among the hallmarks of effective leadership.

As a student of our Senate, I've long marveled at its growth and development, its ability to evolve through devastating setbacks and come back as strong and effective as ever. And I can say with absolute conviction that Julie Adams has been the common thread that gives unity to nearly two decades of Senate achievements. In my post-Exec years of committee service with the AAUP and CHEA, I've come to understand that our Academic Senate is the envy of educators everywhere, an incalculably vital institution in a world defined increasingly by profiteers and external monitors, a tenuous treasure that requires vigilance unencumbered by invective disharmony within its leadership. In the end, I believe that energy expended on rancorous behavior and political schisms will be measured in squandered opportunities of service to our mission and the loss of organizational unity.

My service on the Senate's Executive Committee provided an unparalleled opportunity to make a positive impact on a system that serves one-fifth of America's college and university students. I am grateful for those leaders, particularly Julie Adams, whose professionalism is such that Exec became a harbor of shared energy, transparency, and collegiality, a place where we could make good use of our time. My sincerest wish is that members of the present Executive Committee may one day look back on their service and know as I do that meaningful work can be accomplished collegially, with the respect and compassion that is central to our profession as educators.

Collegially,
Greg Gilbert
ASCCC Emeritus

Thursday, December 12, 2013

Dear Executive Committee:

Writing this letter really pisses me off. I'm pissed at you, the Exec members, for being in the position where you might have to read it. That you got yourselves in that position means that you are, at this moment, wasting the mental, emotional, and financial resources of the Academic Senate, and are failing the over fifty-eight thousand faculty and two point three million students who are depending on your leadership.

On November 22nd, you received an email telling you that, on December 13th, instead of your scheduled strategic planning meeting, you would attend a closed session, in which the Senate's attorney would inform you of your options regarding "our employee." (And since you have only one employee, that would be a reference to Julie Adams.)

If any of you had a clear comprehension of what you were elected to do, you would have responded as follows:

"I will not be attending the meeting proposed for December 13th on the grounds that such a meeting would be a waste of Senate resources. You, the President, and the Executive Director, are at a negative impasse with respect to your ability to work together constructively and collegially. That's a problem between the two of you. Dismiss the freaking attorney, hire a counselor, and work it out. Fast. It's essential to the well-being of the Senate that the President and Executive Director have a positive working relationship. It's detrimental to the well-being of the Senate that I, an Exec member, get dragged into this and spend my time, energy, and Senate money trying to decide whose side I'm on. I'm on the Senate's side. From my side, it's clear that you two have to work well together. So get help, and get over it. Fast. Am I repeating myself?"

Now that I've told you what you should have done but didn't, I'm going to tell you where I'm coming from. Those of you with ADHD, pop a Ritalin because this will take a while.

By now you probably know that I love and respect Julie Adams, and am certain that the Academic Senate has become the force for good that it has in no small measure as a result of Julie's dedication and competence. You probably know this because you probably know, at a minimum, that I negotiated that financial penalty clause in her contract that's designed to ensure that, when and if Julie leaves the Senate, it's by her choice. Now, why would I have done such a thing? Obviously because I think she's a treasure; she's dedicated to the mission of the community colleges and to the Academic Senate's role in fulfilling that mission, and she's good and helpful and efficient and proactive and downright superhuman in the time and energy she commits to helping the Exec achieve its goals, which, of course, are the goals of the Body. She's even superb at helping to achieve goals that are not the goals of the Body - yet. Many's the time, as president, that I walked in and said, "Julie, I want to initiate blah," and she said, "You can't initiate blah. There are no resolutions calling for blah, and the president, exalted and worthy of reverence as he (in this case) may be, does not make Senate policy on his own. The Pope does that, but that's a different institution." At such junctures, I would turn away, my body language articulating dejection and disappointment, but also slyly smiling. Because invariably, and I mean *invariably*, within at most two days, and usually less, Julie would come to me with a strategy for getting blah rolling, while staying firmly within the bounds of Senate procedures. Unless she thought blah was stupid, in which case we talked about it, and I

abandoned the idea, or Julie developed a strategy for advancing blah to the point where other people could tell me it was stupid. Or not.

But there's another side to why I wanted that clause in her contract, and that is that I saw this day coming. In my few years with the Senate, I must have heard several dozen times that "Julie has too much power," that she doesn't grasp that the senate is a "faculty" organization. (That, of course, is mistaken. She fully grasps that it's a faculty organization - that's why she's committed to it. And she completely understands that she has only so much authority as the Exec gives her.) At times this has been a genuine misperception of Julie's role; and, as often, it has just been a cover for someone whose personality doesn't synch with Julie's. Happily, most of our past Exec officers and Committee members have had a deep appreciation of the help and support they received from Julie, and for the continuity she has provided between their own brief passages on the Senate stage. However, it was inevitable that someday the necessary adjustments between each new President and the Executive Director would not gel, and in that event I wanted Julie to have significant protection against an unjust dismissal. Full-time faculty, who are protected on all sides by tenure and due process, should understand this sentiment.

It's also my perception - and please raise your hand if you disagree here, but otherwise remain silent - that faculty have often led rather sheltered lives, going from high school to college to grad school and on to work in.....school. This can make them somewhat childlike, or, in the right situations, resemble nothing so much as screaming squirrels. Faculty don't have employees, they have no training or experience in how to deal with employees, and they have no knowledge of how to resolve conflicts between employees and their employers. So you can see why I had little confidence that, when the inevitable impasse between a President and the Executive Director occurred, it would be resolved artfully. Instead, I suspected that the effort might quickly become grotesque, and my suspicion is borne out by the meeting to which you have committed yourselves on the 13th. Canceling real and important Senate business (strategic planning), calling for a closed meeting on "our employee," explaining to the Executive Director in a legalese-up letter why she will be excluded from the meeting, and Executive Committee members consenting to such a meeting - all of this serves as a perfect model for The Screaming Squirrel/Child In A Sandbox Approach To Conflict Resolution.

If you think that I'm placing blame on the President, here, don't. What I just said is that I think the 13th meeting is a terrible way to handle this conflict, but that there's no reason to suppose that faculty would be anything but terrible at this sort of thing. You may not know about my relation to Beth Smith, and I want to tell you about that. The fact is that I have a long, personal relationship to Beth, and have great affection for her and the utmost respect for her leadership abilities. I worked for many months with Beth's husband, Bill Bradley, on a document for Grossmont College defining the faculty role in planning and budgeting, and consider that work with Bill to be one of the highlights of my academic career. Our document was later turned into a paper for the Academic Senate, the first on that subject in the Senate's history. Beth and Bill have visited my wife, Kate, and me in France, as have Julie Adams and her husband, Ken. Beth and I have kept in touch by email over the years, and I have strongly encouraged and supported her involvement in the Senate, up to and including her run for the presidency.

At one point in our correspondence, Beth expressed discouragement at the lack of relevancy of Exec's functions to the real lives of students. You ADHD people should pop another Ritalin, because I'm going to reproduce a large chunk of my reply, and I'll tell you the point later. What I said, in large part, was this:

"...If you're going to withstand the drudgery of serving on Exec--especially as an officer--and more especially with the aim of becoming president--you have to believe that ASCCC serves a vital function at a level that can't be addressed by local senates....

"I know that one of the things that got me involved in the ASCCC in the first place, and that kept me going right through my presidency, was the elitist relegation of CCs to 3rd-class status, as bespoken in the history of CCs in America, and as reflected in the current-day funding of CCs in CA. As president, I was able to get the "Real Costs of Education" project off the ground and a considerable distance down the road. The Chancellor's office was actually taking the lead on the research, and the BOG was paying attention. I would argue that, even in today's economic atmosphere, a radical revision of the funding of CCs is warranted--but who would listen? This remains, though, a clear example of something that you can only accomplish at the state level, as opposed to the local.

"Another subject that, in fact, I made no headway on, but about which I felt passionately, was that of faculty evaluations/peer review, and the necessity of tying that to a robust, cradle-to-grave, program of faculty development. Funding for faculty development was always the first thing to get cut in the state budget negotiations, and that seemed to me a huge mistake. I see faculty development as critical to high faculty morale, superior faculty performance, and hence to student success. That's a case that needs to be, and can only be, made at the state level. The statewide Senate--working with FACCC and the unions--could/should take the lead on this, with ASCCC lighting the way to the development of robust, effective local programs. But again, we're talking, in part, about increased funding, and who's going to listen to that? (I noticed in the current Rostrum that the Faculty Development Committee is reminding people that they still exist.)

"Finally, I'll mention the fight against SLOs. I've watched in dismay as CC faculty have acquiesced in, and perhaps even embraced, this abomination imposed by the Accreditation people. I think the whole concept--or constellation of concepts--involved in SLOs needs to be challenged, beaten back, and ultimately dismissed. The ASCCC ought to be reminding faculty and students that "You are not a gadget!" and that teachers should not teach in order that their students should please an algorithm. The ASCCC should be taking the lead in defining and championing true learning, and should not facilitate those people and programs that would steal its soul. There was a point at which it could be argued that "apparent acquiescence" in the Accreditation Commission's demands could be seen as a form of jiu-jitsu, yielding in order to defeat; but it looks to me as though that point has long passed, and that what we've got now is simple submission. The Senate seems to have drunk the Kool-Aid.

"I guess what I'm saying is that, for me, there were and still are issues that warrant one's involvement in ASCCC. But I'm not there, and I'm not butting up against the CA economy--but I can certainly see how being there and doing that could be demoralizing."

Here's the point. Beth thanked me and she stayed the course. We were discussing big ideas; we talked about the role of ASCCC President as engaging the faculty in the development and execution of those ideas, and as communicating to faculty, through her service, the worth and nobility of the almost impossible jobs they are asked to do. Beth got it; she persisted and assumed the vice-presidency and the presidency with the goal of enhancing the education of California Community College students in ways that were real and immediate, and that could only be accomplished at the statewide level.

So we have a President, committed to creating a richer education for students, and an Executive Director, equally committed to facilitating the achievement of that goal. So why can't they work together?

There are, of course, times when the shit really comes down between two people, and there's just no way. I absolutely hated my last department chair, and would have slit my wrists before I worked with her. But I saw her as an unethical, unprincipled person. And I couldn't maintain my friendship with the guitar player in my last band, because he went so far out on the right politically that I felt he had lost all human empathy. But these were situations where the other person and I had fundamentally conflicting value systems. I don't see that level of conflict at all in the case of Julie and Beth. Au contraire. Moreover, they have worked together collegially and productively in the past.

So, in case anyone is still the least bit inclined to listen to what I'm saying, here, again, is what I recommend:

That the Executive Committee absolutely not engage in a performance review, or a closed meeting, or any activity that has a whiff of determining blame in the conflict between the President and the Executive Director.

That the Executive Committee direct the Executive Director and the President to seek the assistance of a counselor/mediator to assist them in resolving their differences.

That the two principals take the advice of a friend, that the goals that they share are too important to get lost in this sort of distraction.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Hoke Simpson
Past President

To: ASCCC Executive Committee

From: Ian Walton, Senator Emerita, Past President (2005 – 2007)

Date: 12/13/13

Topic: Executive Committee Responsibility

Madame President, Executive Committee Members,

I'm Ian Walton; I am one of a long line of past presidents of this fine organization. Many of us have helped over the years to balance the perspectives of President, Executive Director, Executive Committee and the body, for the ultimate good of the faculty. Today, several of us are increasingly concerned that the Senate is experiencing a severe dysfunction that is negatively affecting both its operations and its statewide reputation.

While the dysfunction seems to center on the working relationship between the Executive Director and the President, it is actually impeding the ability of each Executive Committee member to do the job you were elected to do – to be fully informed and to participate in all decisions, as you serve our faculty colleagues throughout the state. While it is not your fault, it is now clearly your responsibility to determine all the facts and to implement a solution.

By way of background, you will all have heard that the transition to a new president always involves changes in work and communication styles on the part of both individuals. Some past presidents have described how it was initially difficult – for example, a long established role of the Executive Director is to raise concerns in areas where new Presidents may not fully understand the statewide ramifications of actions that would be acceptable at a local level. But much more importantly, every one of those past presidents successfully collaborated as a professional with the Executive Director who is a fellow professional, and quickly developed an excellent working relationship.

For the first time in nine presidents this process has failed. It seems astoundingly premature to blame that on just one of the two parties. And make no mistake, that's what today's agenda is doing. By its very nature, an out of sequence performance evaluation is disciplinary. It would be equally premature to hold a vote of no confidence in the President today.

Today's actions are being taken without fully informing or consulting the Executive Committee as a whole, and most worryingly without significant agreement from the three elected officers. The dysfunction was also deliberately hidden from the body at the recent Fall Session. Several suggestions for mediation appear to have been rejected by the President.

I therefore propose that the Executive Committee should own up to its part in this malfunction and take the following immediate remedial actions, today:

- 1) Conduct this meeting and future meetings in public – as formally requested by the Executive Director;
- 2) Table the portion of Agenda Item D “Performance Evaluation”;
- 3) Initiate a public discussion of the conduct of both the President and the Executive Director, with the goal of finding and implementing solutions to the current inability of the Executive Committee to carry out its proper role;
- 4) Under the second portion of Agenda Item D, receive public advice, if necessary, from the Senate Attorney, subject to it being clear that the attorney works for the Executive Committee as a whole – not for either the Executive Director or the President;
- 5) Take no precipitate personnel action against either the President or the Executive Director until all the facts are openly determined and better solutions such as mediation have been completed.

I will provide a copy of this testimony to Secretary Bruno and request that it be included in the formal minutes of the meeting.

Thank you for listening and for your hard work on behalf of the faculty.

JP testimony at Exec 12-13-13

When I got on Exec, the committee was in very bad shape---after several years of contentious fighting and divisiveness. Members were in one camp or another, and what suffered besides the individuals' stress level was the quality of work & the reputation of the ASCCC. In-fighting means time was spent on things *other* than the state business.

Fortunately with a change of leadership and membership, Exec got back to being a collegial team---one that I was happy to serve on for 10 years. In addition, the ASCCC's reputation and stature grew to the highest level ever.

Over the years, anytime I encouraged local faculty to run for Exec, I assured them that the state senate was very different from many local senates: instead of personality conflicts and the local petty stresses, the ASCCC focused on the work.

While I believe I was well prepared to be president, I was nonetheless astonished by the workload and responsibility. We were struggling with issues of state-wide significance---pre reqs, SB 1440, and SSTF---in addition to the myriad regular ASCCC activities. Managing these huge tasks required a collaborative team of officers, Exec members, executive director, staff and local faculty appointees.

It would have been impossible to accomplish what we got done without the full time support of the exec director and office staff. The marginalizing of the exec director this year is frightening to me ----for many reasons, but mostly because no one can be president---and do the necessary work---without the exec director's institutional memory, multi-tasking skills, and daily attention to a vast array of details. For anyone attempting to do this work alone I would ask what critical business on behalf of the state's faculty is being ignored? Yes, I can find things to criticize about the ED (and I have)---but I could find things to criticize about each member of Exec—including myself. But we had to work together, and together a great deal was accomplished. I truly fear the climate now could lead to the demise of the ASCCC----and people like Bob Shireman are looking for opportunities to weaken if not destroy the local as well as state senates.

It is the responsibility of the each Exec member to insist that 1) ASCCC is functioning at its highest level which means focusing on the academic business for the state's faculty and students, and 2) collegiality is the daily guidepost, which likely means immediate mediation is necessary. Please do not settle for any less.

JP testimony at Exec 12-13-13

When I got on Exec, the committee was in very bad shape---after several years of contentious fighting and divisiveness. Members were in one camp or another, and what suffered besides the individuals' stress level was the quality of work & the reputation of the ASCCC. In-fighting means time was spent on things *other* than the state business.

Fortunately with a change of leadership and membership, Exec got back to being a collegial team---one that I was happy to serve on for 10 years. In addition, the ASCCC's reputation and stature grew to the highest level ever.

Over the years, anytime I encouraged local faculty to run for Exec, I assured them that the state senate was very different from many local senates: instead of personality conflicts and the local petty stresses, the ASCCC focused on the work.

While I believe I was well prepared to be president, I was nonetheless astonished by the workload and responsibility. We were struggling with issues of state-wide significance---pre reqs, SB 1440, and SSTF---in addition to the myriad regular ASCCC activities. Managing these huge tasks required a collaborative team of officers, Exec members, executive director, staff and local faculty appointees.

It would have been impossible to accomplish what we got done without the full time support of the exec director and office staff. The marginalizing of the exec director this year is frightening to me ----for many reasons, but mostly because no one can be president---and do the necessary work----without the exec director's institutional memory, multi-tasking skills, and daily attention to a vast array of details. For anyone attempting to do this work alone I would ask what critical business on behalf of the state's faculty is being ignored? Yes, I can find things to criticize about the ED (and I have)---but I could find things to criticize about each member of Exec—including myself. But we had to work together, and together a great deal was accomplished. I truly fear the climate now could lead to the demise of the ASCCC----and people like Bob Shireman are looking for opportunities to weaken if not destroy the local as well as state senates.

It is the responsibility of the each Exec member to insist that 1) ASCCC is functioning at its highest level which means focusing on the academic business for the state's faculty and students, and 2) collegiality is the daily guidepost, which likely means immediate mediation is necessary. Please do not settle for any less.

JP testimony at Exec 12-13-13

When I got on Exec, the committee was in very bad shape---after several years of contentious fighting and divisiveness. Members were in one camp or another, and what suffered besides the individuals' stress level was the quality of work & the reputation of the ASCCC. In-fighting means time was spent on things *other* than the state business.

Fortunately with a change of leadership and membership, Exec got back to being a collegial team---one that I was happy to serve on for 10 years. In addition, the ASCCC's reputation and stature grew to the highest level ever.

Over the years, anytime I encouraged local faculty to run for Exec, I assured them that the state senate was very different from many local senates: instead of personality conflicts and the local petty stresses, the ASCCC focused on the work.

While I believe I was well prepared to be president, I was nonetheless astonished by the workload and responsibility. We were struggling with issues of state-wide significance---pre reqs, SB 1440, and SSTF---in addition to the myriad regular ASCCC activities. Managing these huge tasks required a collaborative team of officers, Exec members, executive director, staff and local faculty appointees.

It would have been impossible to accomplish what we got done without the full time support of the exec director and office staff. The marginalizing of the exec director this year is frightening to me ----for many reasons, but mostly because no one can be president---and do the necessary work---without the exec director's institutional memory, multi-tasking skills, and daily attention to a vast array of details. For anyone attempting to do this work alone I would ask what critical business on behalf of the state's faculty is being ignored? Yes, I can find things to criticize about the ED (and I have)---but I could find things to criticize about each member of Exec—including myself. But we had to work together, and together a great deal was accomplished. I truly fear the climate now could lead to the demise of the ASCCC----and people like Bob Shireman are looking for opportunities to weaken if not destroy the local as well as state senates.

It is the responsibility of the each Exec member to insist that 1) ASCCC is functioning at its highest level which means focusing on the academic business for the state's faculty and students, and 2) collegiality is the daily guidepost, which likely means immediate mediation is necessary. Please do not settle for any less.

KATHERINE W. CLARK

1389 Terrace Way
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

December 12, 2013

Executive Committee Members of the
Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
5555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Executive Committee Meeting, December 13, 2013

Dear Executive Committee Members—and Friends:

With a heavy heart, I write to share my perspective on actions being contemplated at your Executive Committee meeting this Friday, December 13, 2013. I am unable to travel to Sacramento to deliver these thoughts personally, so I must trust that my written words can convey my deep concern for your positions of leadership and for the resultant direction of the Academic Senate in the forthcoming years.

Above all else, my message is this: please do not act precipitously in a manner that endangers the Academic Senate's reputation among local senates, its standing among peer academic groups and within ICAS, or its singular, long-standing achievements in the eyes of others in the community college system and beyond. It is incumbent upon all Executive Committee members to act in concert and after due deliberation about the long-term impact your decisions might have upon others. Certainly I would urge the Executive Committee to exercise its responsibilities for seeing that all options have been exhausted, that Executive Committee members as well as any staff member in question engage in professional mediation prior to any final decision being made by the Executive Committee. Ultimately, the behavior and performance of all Executive Committee members is in question as well and must be justifiable to the larger whole around the state.

At the Fall 2013 Plenary Session, the body seemed largely oblivious to any internal tumult; judging by the phone calls I have received in the past weeks, that no longer seems to be the case. It is increasingly apparent that others, outside the immediacy of the Executive Committee, have identified a level of dysfunction within their elected Academic Senate; they, like me, are troubled and saddened. Further, as we all know from experience with our local senates, external parties are quick to seize upon disruption—or rupture—to further weaken a senate body. That cannot happen, and it will not happen if all Executive Committee members assume their responsibilities for ensuring health, honesty, and transparency of the Academic Senate's actions.

While some Executive Committee members may have ideas about new Academic Senate directions and future endeavors, the body can assist you in defining and debating those plans. However, no vision can be enacted and no grand goals pursued if some Executive Committee members continue to act in isolation or exclusion, or without the clear, unambiguous support of the entire Exec body; your actions cannot be seen as driven by any single individual or small group.

Others who may be present at your meeting or communicating with you will perhaps attest to the experiences they have had with individuals caught in this conundrum. I urge you to also see your actions as larger than the skirmishes between personality and as a larger issue calling upon your individual and collective leadership to resolve.

The sheer number of former Academic Senate Presidents and officers who may address you attest to the gravity of this situation and our concern for our beloved Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. I'd hope you would consider our advice as emerging from our collective experiences and fondness for the historical Senate we all served—and for your own status as current elected officers and members.

Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts as you begin your deliberations.



Kate Clark
Senator Emerita
Past President,
Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (2003-2005)

MARK SNOWHITE

December 6, 2013

ASCCC Executive Committee Members

Dear Executive Committee Members:

I have worked on behalf of the Academic Senate for Community Colleges for many years. I served on the Executive Committee for ten years, six of those as secretary. Before that I was a delegate representing my local senate and member of the Standards and Practices committee. I am now retired from full-time teaching but still teach part-time and work on a faculty review committee and as a reviewer in the C-ID program. I have worked for many years for the betterment of our system through this organization, and I care deeply about its success to bring affordable, quality post-secondary education to all Californians. So I am very much concerned about the current conflict between the organization's executive director and current president, a conflict which appears to endanger the effectiveness of the Academic Senate.

I will not comment on the particulars of this matter since I have no direct knowledge about the specific relevant details, but I do want to express my confidence in the abilities and—more importantly—the character of Julie Adams.

In the ten years that I served on the Executive Committee, Julie provided me with immeasurable help in fulfilling my responsibilities. As a member of the Standards and Practices committee, she coordinated the committee's efforts with the Senate office and helped devise new, more efficient ways to accomplish our mission, especially Disciplines List review and executing the process for senate awards. During sessions, she worked tirelessly with the Resolutions committee editing and re-editing the resolutions so they were available on time. When I was secretary, she took thorough minutes and helped me edit the final drafts. When I coordinated IMPAC meetings, she provided me with all the information I needed about the participants and background information for my reports. Also, she worked hard writing key parts of grants that I worked with her on, putting together all of the parts of those grants so that the Senate succeeded in gaining funding. I could easily go on. But these examples clearly demonstrate her

considerable abilities and dedication to this organization. I'm sure that each of you could add to my list of examples.

On a more personal note, I have always found working with Julie very enjoyable. She consistently expressed the critical distinction that she is charged with *executing* Senate policies, not *determining* them. When she was a member of committees and work groups I participated on, she focused on the executive functions of the organization. While she is a woman of conviction and considerable experience handling Senate matters—certainly far more experience than any one Senate officer whom she supported—she was an excellent listener and considered opposing opinions about executive matters analytically. She always contributed a great deal and with an open, cooperative demeanor.

The Academic Senate has grown consistently through the years that she has overseen its executive functions. This is certainly not a coincidence. When she began, she performed routine secretarial duties and arranged for session twice a year; now she is overseeing an office with a multitude of responsibilities and arranging for institutes and other functions continuously throughout the year. She has developed the considerable skills of developing internal procedures; hiring, training and evaluating staff; coordinating with other organizations and the Chancellor's Office; providing high quality promotional materials; and working successfully with an assortment of Senate officers with very diverse needs and personalities. She has worked for many years earning the admiration of those with whom she works and the gratitude of those whom she has supported so unfailingly. While I can not comment on the current conflicts, I can certainly attest to her strength of character, her amazing productivity, and her demonstrated ability to work with others.

Please realize that her work has been most vital to the success of the Academic Senate, through which the faculty voices its positions and discharges its other statewide responsibilities. I hope that for the sake of the Academic Senate and the many faculty members it represents, the current conflicts are favorably resolved in a way that allows Julie to continue to provide the executive functions so vital to its health and effectiveness.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Snowwhite, Senator Emeritus

MARK SNOWHITE

December 6, 2013

ASCCC Executive Committee Members

Dear Executive Committee Members:

I have worked on behalf of the Academic Senate for Community Colleges for many years. I served on the Executive Committee for ten years, six of those as secretary. Before that I was a delegate representing my local senate and member of the Standards and Practices committee. I am now retired from full-time teaching but still teach part-time and work on a faculty review committee and as a reviewer in the C-ID program. I have worked for many years for the betterment of our system through this organization, and I care deeply about its success to bring affordable, quality post-secondary education to all Californians. So I am very much concerned about the current conflict between the organization's executive director and current president, a conflict which appears to endanger the effectiveness of the Academic Senate.

I will not comment on the particulars of this matter since I have no direct knowledge about the specific relevant details, but I do want to express my confidence in the abilities and—more importantly— the character of Julie Adams.

In the ten years that I served on the Executive Committee, Julie provided me with immeasurable help in fulfilling my responsibilities. As a member of the Standards and Practices committee, she coordinated the committee's efforts with the Senate office and helped devise new, more efficient ways to accomplish our mission, especially Disciplines List review and executing the process for senate awards. During sessions, she worked tirelessly with the Resolutions committee editing and re-editing the resolutions so they were available on time. When I was secretary, she took thorough minutes and helped me edit the final drafts. When I coordinated IMPAC meetings, she provided me with all the information I needed about the participants and background information for my reports. Also, she worked hard writing key parts of grants that I worked with her on, putting together all of the parts of those grants so that the Senate succeeded in gaining funding. I could easily go on. But these examples clearly demonstrate her

considerable abilities and dedication to this organization. I'm sure that each of you could add to my list of examples.

On a more personal note, I have always found working with Julie very enjoyable. She consistently expressed the critical distinction that she is charged with *executing* Senate policies, not *determining* them. When she was a member of committees and work groups I participated on, she focused on the executive functions of the organization. While she is a woman of conviction and considerable experience handling Senate matters—certainly far more experience than any one Senate officer whom she supported—she was an excellent listener and considered opposing opinions about executive matters analytically. She always contributed a great deal and with an open, cooperative demeanor.

The Academic Senate has grown consistently through the years that she has overseen its executive functions. This is certainly not a coincidence. When she began, she performed routine secretarial duties and arranged for session twice a year; now she is overseeing an office with a multitude of responsibilities and arranging for institutes and other functions continuously throughout the year. She has developed the considerable skills of developing internal procedures; hiring, training and evaluating staff; coordinating with other organizations and the Chancellor's Office; providing high quality promotional materials; and working successfully with an assortment of Senate officers with very diverse needs and personalities. She has worked for many years earning the admiration of those with whom she works and the gratitude of those whom she has supported so unflinchingly. While I can not comment on the current conflicts, I can certainly attest to her strength of character, her amazing productivity, and her demonstrated ability to work with others.

Please realize that her work has been most vital to the success of the Academic Senate, through which the faculty voices its positions and discharges its other statewide responsibilities. I hope that for the sake of the Academic Senate and the many faculty members it represents, the current conflicts are favorably resolved in a way that allows Julie to continue to provide the executive functions so vital to its health and effectiveness.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Snowwhite, Senator Emeritus

December 12, 2013

Dear Members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges:

While it has been more than four years since I last served as a part of you, I was given the privilege of working with almost all of you on the Executive Committee and the chance to grow in my appreciation of the strengths that each of you bring to this organization. You bring to this organization a breadth of experience and viewpoints, all of which serve to make the Academic Senate more inclusive, more judicious in its actions, and stronger as a leadership body than any single individual could hope to achieve on his/her own.

As one of the few Academic Senate presidents to transition into an administrative position at a college after serving, I can say that working with such a diverse group of individuals – in background, learning style, conviction, and viewpoint – has been key to my preparation for serving as a dean. By working with such a diverse group, I improved my ability to listen with a bigger set of ears and not just the ears I was used to, ones that were only attuned to a familiar frequency. I learned to listen beyond myself, and that allowed me to better understand the perspectives of others, and that has made me a better administrator and has helped me to work more effectively as a part of the larger whole, which, in my case, is Ohlone College.

You are all strong individuals. You could not be leaders otherwise, and you would not have been elected to the Executive Committee. You, too, have been tasked with serving effectively as a part of a larger whole, one representing the thousands of faculty who work for California community colleges. I ask that all of you use all of the strengths that you bring to the table to work together to bring an end to the divisiveness that is now plaguing the Executive Committee. But even more than your individual strengths, I ask you to listen to one another. I ask you to use the talents and skills that assist you in leading the faculty of the California community colleges to work through the issues that threaten to tear apart the Executive Committee and, by extension, the Academic Senate as a whole.

Trusting in your ability to work cooperatively in the best interests of the faculty that you represent and the students that we all serve,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Wade Lieu". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Mark Wade Lieu
Dean, Language and Communication – Ohlone College
Former President, ASCCC, 2007-2009

December 12, 2013

Dear Members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges:

While it has been more than four years since I last served as a part of you, I was given the privilege of working with almost all of you on the Executive Committee and the chance to grow in my appreciation of the strengths that each of you bring to this organization. You bring to this organization a breadth of experience and viewpoints, all of which serve to make the Academic Senate more inclusive, more judicious in its actions, and stronger as a leadership body than any single individual could hope to achieve on his/her own.

As one of the few Academic Senate presidents to transition into an administrative position at a college after serving, I can say that working with such a diverse group of individuals – in background, learning style, conviction, and viewpoint – has been key to my preparation for serving as a dean. By working with such a diverse group, I improved my ability to listen with a bigger set of ears and not just the ears I was used to, ones that were only attuned to a familiar frequency. I learned to listen beyond myself, and that allowed me to better understand the perspectives of others, and that has made me a better administrator and has helped me to work more effectively as a part of the larger whole, which, in my case, is Ohlone College.

You are all strong individuals. You could not be leaders otherwise, and you would not have been elected to the Executive Committee. You, too, have been tasked with serving effectively as a part of a larger whole, one representing the thousands of faculty who work for California community colleges. I ask that all of you use all of the strengths that you bring to the table to work together to bring an end to the divisiveness that is now plaguing the Executive Committee. But even more than your individual strengths, I ask you to listen to one another. I ask you to use the talents and skills that assist you in leading the faculty of the California community colleges to work through the issues that threaten to tear apart the Executive Committee and, by extension, the Academic Senate as a whole.

Trusting in your ability to work cooperatively in the best interests of the faculty that you represent and the students that we all serve,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Wade Lieu". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Mark Wade Lieu
Dean, Language and Communication – Ohlone College
Former President, ASCCC, 2007-2009

To: ASCCC Executive Committee
Topic: Executive Committee Leadership

Friday, 13 December 2013

Members of the Executive Committee:

I understand from conversations with several members of the Executive Committee that as the fiscal crisis of California and our colleges has subsided, that the energy and much of the focus of the Executive Committee has turned inward in a destructive way, and that much of this unproductive energy revolves around the relationship between the President and the Executive Director.

I served on two Curriculum Committees (and thus two Curriculum Institutes) before being elected to the Executive Committee, on which I served for an additional five years, and thus I have worked extensively with the Executive Director on too many committees, too many institutes, and too many resolutions even to count. In 30+ years of professional life in higher education, at both the University of California and in California Community Colleges, I have *never* known an individual more committed to her work and whose work is as much a labor of passion as the executive director, Julie Adams. That passion can lead to disagreements, sometimes sharp, between Julie and members of the Executive Committee. I had multiple occasions to disagree with Julie. She was often right; when she wasn't, she acknowledged it immediately, and those disagreements *never* became personal or interfered with her work as Executive Director or the work of the Senate so far as I could see. I can imagine working closely with Julie would be a challenge; I cannot imagine working with Julie for *any* period of time and not recognizing what an invaluable resource she is to the Senate, our colleges, and our students.

I served on the Executive Committee with the President, Beth Smith, for three years. Beth and I often disagreed, often about foundational issues such as the mission and role of the Senate itself. Beth and I (and Wheeler) ran for the position of vice president three years ago; Beth won that election and I chose not to trickle. Despite frequent strong disagreement on matters of principle, however, I have always believed that Beth wanted what she believed to be best for the Senate.

Whatever might be best for the Senate, no construction of that question can imagine that deep conflict between the President and the Executive director reflects well on the Executive Committee, the Senate, or the faculty we serve, and it is, I believe, of the greatest importance that the Executive Committee identify means of resolving this conflict.

As you may know, after leaving Exec, I ran successfully for one of the faculty positions on the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Some commissioners, especially those from outside our system, see the Senate and the faculty unions through the same lens: all we care about is promoting the selfish interests of faculty. My deep and abiding love for the Senate is based on the degree to which it has successfully persuaded faculty to put aside individual differences and work together for the common good of our students. It is inconceivable to

me that the Executive Committee could not find a way to resolve this conflict: I believe it is your *responsibility* to do so and to return to a focus on the work for which each of you was elected.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard Mahon
Executive Committee Member, 2006-2011
Professor of Humanities, Riverside City College
2013 Hayward Award Recipient

Shaaron Vogel

Butte College Nursing Faculty

Were not read due to time shortage.

Concerns for the ASCCC

I am Shaaron Vogel and I am here today as a member of the community college faculty and a member of the body. I am also a current member of my local senate.

When I first came on the ASCCC executive board there was great division and strife. Members would yell, burst into tears, and walk out of meetings. The board struggled to keep focus and get critical work done. The body was very aware of this and used their votes to change the voices at the table. The last 8 Presidents worked very hard to earn the ASCCC respect statewide and now the ASCCC voice is valued and respected. You are jeopardizing this hard work. Do not destroy what has been built.

Julie was there through it all and has worked under at least 9 presidents who had very few issues with her performance. She earned her BS, masters and now working on her PhD. She has brought to the ASCCC her expertise, special certifications and many grants. Now within less than two months the current President has issues with Julie's performance. Today you are requested to do a closed session. This is denying the public and the body access to the discussion that is to take place.

Procedures are not being followed and items are not being brought to the full exec and full board. It has been stressed that the ASCCC values transparency and accountability yet I am not seeing that. The lawyer opened with how she values collegiality, respect and fairness yet this is not happening at this time on this board. A few members of this board have attempted a mini coup and sadly my own past local President got pulled into this division. We need unity and focus to keep and build on what the ASCCC has--- do not destroy all the hard work with division. The word of this division and lack of focus is already known to some around the state so do not give them a reason to pull back from valuing our voice and knowledge.

Stop fighting and focus on the greater good. The body will be watching.

On the ASCCC website it has posted the values: Leadership, Empowerment and Voice yet I am hearing that these values are not being honored by all. I also brought with me a book called "The Real Healthcare Reform" by Linda Leekley and Stacey Turnure. It talks about the lack of civility, gossip, bullying and conflict resolution in the healthcare industry. Examples of these are: using demeaning or disparaging language, gossip or slander, intimidation, sabotage, bullying, offensive written communications, and hate. I am hearing about some of these behaviors exhibited at times on the executive board and it is so sad because the results are physical and psychological stress on all members. I have several quotes from the book but will not include due to time.

Do not destroy what many have worked so hard for. Stop this division and focus on the work to be done.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Residence Inn Sacramento Downtown at Capitol Park
1121 15th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 267-6806

Friday, January 3, 2014 meeting

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Roll Call

President Beth Smith called the meeting to order at 10:40 am and welcomed members and guests.

Members present: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, Dianna Chiabotti, Dan Crump, Dolores Davison, John Freitas, Lesley Kawaguchi, Michelle Grimes-Hillman, David Morse, Wheeler North, Cynthia Rico, John Stankas, and Phil Smith.

Guests present: Steve Bruckman, Vice Chancellor; John Frazier, SSSCC; Erik Skinner, Executive Vice Chancellor; and Shaaron Vogel, FACCC.

B. Public Comment

Secretary Bruno informed members that she received two documents to enter into public comments. President Smith declared that the procedure used during the past meeting will be used again this meeting. The testimonies from Past Presidents Patton and Walton, and Past Executive Committee member Vogel and Debbie Klein will be added to the minutes rather than be read aloud.

C. Calendar

Adams informed members about key calendar dates. She remarked that the timelines for spring events are very aggressive and stressed the importance of respecting the deadlines, particularly since staff have many competing projects such as the Accreditation Institute, Academic Academy, Spring Session, *Rostrum* publication, as well as several regional events. The deadlines have been set so that there is enough time to coordinate printed materials, website postings, registration, coordination with hotels, and other staff functions. She highlighted specific deadlines. Concern was raised regarding the tight timelines and the ability for some members to meet these deadlines. Adams noted that if members have a need to extend the deadlines, they should communicate with her about possible flexibility.

Stankas raised concern about all Executive Committee meetings being held in Sacramento and the early start times, which require early flights. He requested that the Executive Committee consider the impact of the early start time on members' productivity during the meeting. For example, beginning at 9:00 am requires that some members need to travel beginning as early as 5:00 am and then participate in the discussion until 5:00 pm. Adams remarked that with the changes in Southwest flights the timing of meetings is difficult to adjust; we have the option of beginning at 9:00 am or 12:30 pm. She also noted that at the last meeting, members suggested that it would be better to begin early, end by 5:00 pm for a short break, and then go to dinner. Stankas suggested that the Executive Committee re-evaluate their decision to hold all Executive Committee meetings in Sacramento. Adams commented that based on the decision by the Executive Committee to hold the meetings in Sacramento, contracts have already been signed for the 2013-14 term. By consensus, Adams will bring an item to a future meeting to reconsider holding Executive Committee meetings in Sacramento for 2014 – 15 including information about the costs savings based on current membership.

Action

- Members will submit their draft *Rostrum* articles to Adams by January 13, 2014.
- Adams will bring back an item to a future meeting to discuss next year's Executive Committee meetings locations and travel.
- Adams will include in this item the amount of cost savings holding meetings in Sacramento.

D. Action Tracking List

Adams reminded members to send changes to Tonya Davis prior to the next agenda deadline on January 15, 2014.

Action

- Members will send Tonya Davis any changes to the Action Tracking List prior by January 15, 2014.

E. Dinner Arrangements

Davis provided members with dinner location.

II. OLD BUSINESS (Possible Action)

A. Accreditation Institute

The Executive Committee discussed the final program for the Spring 2014 Accreditation Institute. This institute is sponsored by Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

MSC (Davison/Chiabotti) to approve the final program for the Spring 2014 Accreditation Institute.

Action:

- P. Smith will send Adams the draft program by January 6, including information about missing presenters. Final presenters will be sent to Adams by January 10.
- Adams will follow up with CCLC regarding whether the program needs to identify which breakouts are targeted toward trustees.
- Staff will send a list of current registered attendees to Rico to use in identifying a counselor who is already attending the event to participate in a breakout.

B. Academic Academy

B. Smith reminded members that Kim Harrell has taken a dean's position at Folsom College and noted that Stankas will assume Harrell's role in leading the Academic Academy. The Executive Committee discussed the final program for the Academic Academy.

MSC (Grimes-Hillman/Chiabotti) to approve the program for the Academic Academy.

Action:

- B. Smith and Morse will finalize the institute program and send to Adams by January 15.
- Adams will send to the Executive Committee a list of UC/CSU faculty members who have registered for the Institute.
- Stankas will develop a blurb as soon as possible to send out to the listservs to encourage registration.
- Staff will send the message developed by Stankas to the listservs for the senate president, curriculum chairs, and disciplines included in the C-ID System.

C. Area Representative Handbook

The Executive Committee discussed the Area Representative Handbook. P. Smith raised concern about the different methods each area has for conducting meetings and suggested that there might be a standard expectation about how each area should operate. Other members felt that each area is unique with a culture of its own that adjusts each year based on the elected Area Representative and the local senate attendees and delegates. The ASCCC should not dictate how each area conducts its business. Instead, guidance should be provided to the areas about the ASCCC process (i.e., resolutions, elections), information about upcoming events, and other key information related to state issues. It is not the role of the ASCCC Executive Committee to tell areas how their meetings should be conducted.

P. Smith also raised concern about the language included in the handbook regarding resolution writing. He noted that many faculty members attend session because of resolutions and is concerned about discouraging people from editing resolutions and recommends that the comment “discourages rewriting or editing the resolutions versus clarifying the content and action” be removed from the Handbook. Grimes-Hillman and members of the Standards and Practices Committee (Bruno, Crump, Adams) reflected on the conversations with past Area Representatives and the need to discourage stylistic changes versus content clarification, which has been a challenge in the past.

Bruno noted that the handbook should be reviewed based on the conversation about the Bagley Keene Act and suggested that the Internal Policy Committee review the language before the handbook returns to the Executive Committee, if necessary. Other feedback was provided for consideration.

MSC (Morse/Davison) to bring back a revised handbook to the next meeting.

Action

- The Standards and Practices Committee will consider the concerns raised during this discussion and address as appropriate.
- Grimes-Hillman will bring back another revision of the Area Representative Handbook to the January/February meeting for review and possible approval.

III. NEW BUSINESS (Possible Action)

A. Bagley Keene Act

At its November Executive Committee meeting, President B. Smith declared that the ASCCC would begin to operate under the Bagley Keene Act. The intent of this item was to discuss whether the ASCCC is legally required to adhere to the Bagley Keene Act and if so, what are the implications on the work of the Executive Committee and its subcommittees and taskforces. She invited the Chancellor’s Office legal counsel Steve Bruckman to assist the Executive Committee in determining its role in operating via open meeting requirements.

Vice Chancellor Bruckman noted that he has always assumed that the ASCCC was under the Bagley Keene Act and until recently, he never was formally asked to investigate whether or not the ASCCC is legally required to operate under the Bagley Keene Act. In reviewing the historical creation of the ASCCC and the requirements of the Bagley Keene Act, his opinion is that the ASCCC is not required to comply with the Act. Specifically, Vice Chancellor Bruckman quoted Government Code §11121, which clearly defines those organizations that are required to follow the Bagley Keene Act. North questioned the Vice Chancellor’s interpretation, particularly as it related to the Board of Governors delegation of authority to the ASCCC on the determination of minimum qualifications and the recognition of the

ASCCC as the official voice of the faculty on California community colleges. Bruckman argued that the acknowledgment of the role of the ASCCC is not a delegation of authority because the Board of Governors retains the final decision-making authority. North commented that Education Code §87357 does say that the Board of Governors shall rely primarily on the advice of the Academic Senate in the area of minimum qualifications, which was written by the Legislature and questioned whether this fits into the description of Legislative Bodies. Bruckman noted that this is a grey area but he still maintained that the Senate is not under the Bagley Keene Act. In addition, the ASCCC does not fit within the requirements stated in the Bagley Keene Act since it was not created by a legislative body but instead was self-created in 1970 and subsequently incorporated as a 501c6 nonprofit organization. While the Bagley Keene Act provides a structure for meetings, it does not appear to be a requirement for the Senate.

After Bruckman left the meeting, the Executive Committee had a lengthy discussion about the Bagley Keene Act and the Executive Committee's current processes. A question was raised about how the Senate's Attorney Diepenbrock determined that we were under Bagley Keene Act. B. Smith clarified that Diepenbrock had checked with Bruckman and he initially stated that the Executive Committee was under the Act. P. Smith asked if we could check with the Attorney to verify that we are not under the Act. Adams noted that the Attorney's expertise is not with open meeting acts but will contracts and leases. Generally, the attorney will reach out to others within her firm whom have such expertise when areas outside of her expertise arise.

MSC (Morse/Davison) to accept the advice of the Chancellor Office legal counsel Steve Bruckman that the Senate is not formally subject to the Bagley Keene Act. North voted no to this motion and requested that his vote be recorded in the minutes.

MSC (Davison/Chiabotti) to maintain our current policies and practices regarding how the Senate holds its meeting until the Internal Policy Committee (IPC) returns with a recommended policy.

Action:

- IPC will draft a statement about the Executive Committee's philosophy on open meetings, transparency, and accountability and an outline for how to handle certain processes.
- Executive Committee members will send ideas to Bruno.

B. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

The Executive Committee discussed the minutes from the November Executive Committee meeting.

MSC (North/Freitas) to approve the November 6, 2013 meeting minutes.

Members discussed the minutes from the December 13 closed session. P. Smith asked about the minutes from closed session and whether they could be shared with other Executive Committee members. Members then discussed how the open session minutes were formatted, particularly the inclusion of the testimony. By consensus, members felt that there should be a standard about how minutes are summarized. P. Smith questioned how the public are identified and should the minutes include their titles. Members felt that individuals should identify in their testimony their title and whom they are representing—possibly via a comment card.

MSC (Freitas/Chiabotti) to postpone the approval of the December 13, 2013, minutes until the next meeting to allow the secretary to clarify the following issues: 1) when the attorney advised the Executive Committee that they could go into closed session; and 2) should the minutes include the full testimony or just attachments.

Action:

- B. Smith will follow up with the attorney about the closed session minutes, particularly if and how they can be shared with other Executive Committee members for review and approval.
- IPC will bring back a recommendation to the next meeting about how best to format the minutes, particularly those that include public testimonies.

C. Curriculum Institute

The Executive Committee discussed the 2014 Curriculum Institute including the scope of the institute, audience size, composition, and thematic strands given the capacity of the chosen location and provided advice. Stanskas raised concern that the Hayes Mansion has limited capacity and the Executive Committee might consider reducing the number of attendees and breakouts. Adams clarified that the Hayes Mansion has a capacity that can accommodate the current trend for the Institute and even more; there are over seven breakout rooms available and the ballroom holds about 900 people. She suggested that the same planning processes and attendance requirements (e.g., no more than 5 attendees per college; six breakout session scheduled) be used as in the past. Staff will monitor the registration and take action as appropriate. If the event grows beyond the current trend (i.e., less people attend the event when it is in the north), then additional breakouts can be added possibility by repeating popular breakouts.

By consensus, Stanskas will discuss options with the Curriculum Committee and follow up with the president and/or executive director as appropriate.

D. Resolutions Committee Operational Recommendations

Freitas informed members that the Resolutions Committee proposes the following four operational improvements to the resolutions process to improve the quality of the resolutions:

Recommendation 1: There should be an appointee to the Resolutions Committee from each Area. Members need not necessarily be Executive Committee members.

Freitas noted that individuals appointed would be required to attend the pre-session Area Meeting and the plenary session. Chiabotti commented that if we require members to attend these events we should cover their travel and registration costs. Several members felt that this would not be necessary as individuals who are already attending both events should be selected. Adams clarified that the past practice has been to select individuals who are already attending the plenary session to participate on the Resolutions Committee. Rarely has the Senate reimbursed travel costs for Resolution Committee members. Members discussed the pros and cons of the appointing such individuals.

Recommendation 2: The resolutions writing guide, the executive committee resolutions manual, and the philosophy document should be reconciled with each other and merged into a unified and publicly available document.

Recommendation 3: Two members of the resolutions committee, including the Resolutions Chair, should be available for resolutions work during the last sessions on Thursday and Friday and should not be assigned breakouts during those sessions.

Freitas discussed the challenges the Resolution Chair and members have when participating in the final breakout session while facilitating the resolutions process. This fall, the resolutions process was less efficient and more time consuming because the members could not start the process until after the final breakout ended. Davison and Adams noted that in the past, the practice was for the Resolution Chair not to be assigned a breakout during this time. Stankas and other members suggested that if the committee members were available, then they should hold “office hours” and be available for any questions.

Recommendation 4: A processes and procedures manual for the resolutions committee should be updated.

B. Smith and Freitas noted that the president’s script should be updated to integrate the consent calendar. Crump noted that the question still remains about whether questions posed at the parliamentary procedure microphone are included or excluded in the resolution time.

MSC (Bruno/Chiabotti) to approve the four recommendations.

Action:

- B. Smith will make appointments from each of the Areas to the Resolution Committee.
- Freitas will implement recommendations 2 and 4.
- Freitas will ensure that he and other Resolution Committee members are not assigned a breakout during the final breakout session. This recommendation will also be recorded to inform future Resolution Chairs.
- Adams will follow up with the Senate Parliamentarian David Mezzera regarding clarifications to the president’s script as noted above.

E. Resolution Assignments

The Executive Committee considered for the assignments for the Fall 2013 Plenary Session resolutions as suggested by B. Smith.

MSC (Rico/Freitas) to approve the assignments as amended.

Freitas discussed the referred resolutions. He noted that the directions from the body for Resolution 2.11 required the Executive Committee to take action, which is different than

other referred resolutions. In response, he communicated with the resolution and amendment contacts the week following plenary and proposed to them that the amendments were actually complementary could each be used to perfect the resolution without conflict. The parties agreed, Beth concurred, and the resolution was perfected resolution. Given the action requested by the body, Adams questioned whether the Executive Committee had the authority to conclude that the perfected resolution would be an adopted position of the body and contacted the Senate's Parliamentarian for advice. The Parliamentarian opined that there were two courses of action after rewriting the resolution: 1) publish the resultant resolution as the will of the 2013 Fall Plenary Session; or 2) report back to the 2014 Spring Plenary Session with a proposed resolution as if it was an original resolution. B. Smith, P. Smith and others stressed the need to have the resolution as an adopted position of the body, particularly since ACCJC would be meeting in January. Adams raised concern about the precedence this type of action could set and provided historical information about past practice on referred resolutions. She suggested that since the Executive Committee has the authority to act for the body between plenary sessions, could language be developed to provide advice about how to handle such situations in the future. By consensus, the Resolutions Committee will develop language regarding referred resolution process.

North noted that the original action by the body should not have been accepted as the motion contains two motions – one to refer and one to act. By consensus, Adams will follow up with the Parliamentarian.

MSC (Davison/Michelle Grimes-Hillman) to approve, as directed by the body, the amended resolution; and including the amended resolution in the president's update, correspondence to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), and on the website as an adopted position of the body.

Freitas presented the other referred resolutions and noted the direction from the body. Both Resolution 9.03 F13 and Resolution 12.03 F13 directed the Resolution Committee to work with the authors to perfect the motion and bring back in Spring 2014.

MSC (Chiabotti/Davison) to direct the resolutions committee on these two resolutions and their amendments with the authors and return if necessary.

Action:

- Staff will post the resolution assignment to on the website under the appropriate resolutions.
- B. Smith will include the perfected 2.11 resolution in the President's Update and in correspondence to the ACCJC.
- Staff will post the 2.11 resolution on the Senate website in the resolution database.
- Freitas will work with the authors on Resolutions 9.03 and 12.03 F13 to perfect the resolution and bring back to the Executive Committee with the other Executive Committee resolutions.
- Adams will follow up with the Senate's Parliamentarian regarding the referred resolution motion possibly containing two motions. If he agrees, she will ask him how to prevent this type of mistake in the future.

F. Spring Session Planning

The Executive Committee discussed the theme, breakout topics, and possible keynote presentations for the Spring Plenary Session. B. Smith presented the theme: Academic Excellence: Strengthening the Core. Members discussed the theme and ideas about how

excellence is demonstrated including celebrating student success, graduation, making progress on goals, and many more.

MSC (Crump/Freitas) to approve the theme “Academic Excellence: Strengthening our Core”.

By consensus, each member will propose two breakout topics.

Stanskas recommended that a resource room be set aside for the Resolutions Committee “office hours” or other discussions and that the room be listed in the program. Members agreed. Adams commented that she received some feedback about adding other information to the program. She requested that Executive Committee members send her the feedback. The Executive Committee will discuss the program information at a future meeting.

Action:

- Adams will work with the Creative Director to design the theme.
- Members will send contact information for keynote presenters to B. Smith.
- Each member will send Adams two breakout topics by January 15, 2014.
- Members will send Adams ideas for information to include in the program.
- Area representatives will send Holly the Area Meeting information by January 15, 2014.

G. Survey of Automatic Awarding of Degrees

The Executive Committee discussed sending out the survey on automatic awarding of degrees. Morse reminded members that the survey was developed previously by another committee and reviewed by the Executive Committee several few times. This year, the survey was assigned to another group to finalize. The survey included in this item has been slightly modified based on feedback from this current group.

MSC (Chiabotti/Freitas) to approve the survey as amended.

Action:

- Morse will send Adams the final survey.
- Staff will format the survey using Survey Monkey and send to Morse for review and approval.
- Morse will provide staff with a transmittal note to include with the survey.
- Staff will email out the final survey to the senate president and curriculum chair listservs.

H. Public Relations

The Executive Committee discussed whether or not the Senate should have a policy on how, when, and who receives gifts from the Senate Executive Committee. B. Smith informed members that members of the body expressed their concerns about others receiving gifts from the Senate and how that decision is made. Given the examples, she felt it was a public relations concern that needed to be addressed with the Executive Committee. B. Smith noted that amenities are a generous gesture and suggested that the Senate find ways to build these gifts into the events in order to benefit the organization.

Adams informed members about the amenities process including how amenities are distributed and noted that the amenities are small gestures such as bottled water and fruit, which are negotiated with other contract items and has been done for many years. She also noted that she includes a personalized card on behalf of the Senate with each amenity.

Individuals are selected randomly and usually those selected are committee members, senate emeritus, Board of Governors members, etc.

P. Smith was concerned about the thank you cards given to individuals; he believed they should be addressed from the Academic Senate and not on the behalf of an individual. He also noted that Adams is an employee of the body and should be negotiating amenities on behalf of the body and not at her discretion. B. Smith reminded members that all members of the Executive Committee work for the Senate and whatever decisions are made should benefit the Senate and its mission, especially in regards to public relations.

Davison recommended that the Academic Senate have a standard card to distribute which will take away the perception of it coming from an individual, rather than the Senate. North was concerned about taking away the personal touch as it is a great motivational tool for new and struggling members.

P. Smith felt that this topic is very challenging for the Executive Committee; however his concerns are with not endangering the integrity of the Senate and empowering certain points of view over others. P. Smith was intrigued by and agreed with Adam's decision to not provide amenities at all.

Adams informed members that she was concerned about the amount of time being spent discussing free amenities that are distributed to members of the body at events since there were so many items on the agenda. She also noted that she felt this was not what the leaders of the faculty on California community colleges should spend their time on. Adams expressed her concerns that Executive Committee members are disturbed that she personalized cards which encourage and thanked faculty members for their continued support and participation in the Senate.

B. Smith noted that if it is important for the Executive Committee to look at transparency and openness, then they should have this discussion. She felt that if the Committee cannot have this discussion, then they are not doing their jobs. The committee needs to be able to understand what is happening on behalf of the organization because they are the guardians of what happens and how actions are perceived by the public.

Members suggested that the Executive Director check in with the President, the Foundation President, and the Executive Committee members about recommendations on who should receive an amenity. Many felt that the hands of the Executive Director should not be tied as she is a representative of the Senate and that we should continue to recognize members who are exemplary in their service to the Senate. Davison suggested that the amenities be accompanied by a card from the Senate and the Executive Director could include a personal note or send a separate card as well.

MSC (Morse/North) to authorize the Executive Director to distribute no cost amenities as she deems appropriate.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Morse, Bruno, North, Davison, Kawaguchi, Rico, Stanskas, Freitas, Grimes-Hillman, and Crump.

No: P. Smith

Abstained: Chiabotti

I. Spring Curriculum Regional Meetings

The Executive Committee discussed the spring curriculum regional meetings. Stankas corrected the information provided on the agenda item form. The Curriculum Committee suggests that the regional meetings be held on March 7 and 14. A San Diego location has been identified for March 14 and the committee is still working on a location in the North for March 7. He asked members from the North for assistance.

MSC (Davison/Freitas) to approve holding the spring curriculum regional meetings on March 7 (North location TBD) and March 14 (San Diego).

Action:

- Members will send Stankas suggestions about possible Northern California locations.
- Stankas will bring back the agenda and topics for the regional meetings to the January/February meeting for approval.

J. Vocational Leadership Professional Development

North summarized the work that has been done in with the Perkins 1B funds. Stankas was concerned that the Executive Committee gave misinformation to the body. He noted that there was a concern from the body that Vocational Leadership Professional Development was omitted. Adams noted that because the Vocational Leadership grant document was not approved by the Chancellor's Office, the Executive Committee made the decision not to hold the Vocational Leadership Institute as a priority. Members noted, in the future it should be clarified what action is taken when referencing priority.

Stankas recommended that we communicate to the field how we are addressing professional development for CTE faculty members. He also noted that this background information will be useful to the field. Adams mentioned that a *Rostrum* article would be included in the next edition.

MSC (Stankas/Rico) to approve the holding the regional meeting for the spring targeting CTE faculty.

MSC (Stankas/Freitas) to support a dedicated strand at the Curriculum and Leadership Institutes and funding through the Vocational Education grant.

MSC (Davison/Rico) to use the Perkins funding to support the CTE faculty to attend the AA and spring plenary session

Action:

- Adams and North will write a *Rostrum* article informing the body about activities related to CTE professional development.
- Adams and North will work with those appointed to workgroup to plan regional meetings.
- Stankas will work with the Curriculum Committee to develop a strand dedicated to CTE faculty and issues.
- Adams will work on the budget for the CTE work taking into consideration the priority of a CTE track at the Curriculum Institute.
- Staff will solicit CTE faculty to attend the Academic Academy, Spring Session, Faculty Leadership, and Curriculum Institute.
- Freitas will bring back a perfected resolution to address issues raised in referred

resolution 12.03 F13.

K. Vocational Education Institute

Discussed under the item above.

L. Vacancy in Area A Representative

B. Smith reminded members that Kim Harrell has taken a dean's position and has resigned from the Area A position. She recommended that the Executive Committee not fill the position but instead assign the Area A responsibilities to several Area A Executive Committee members.

MSC (Chiabotti/Freitas) to not replace the Area A Representative but instead divvy up the responsibilities and notify the Area of who will be responsible for which activities.

B. Smith noted that Stanskas will assume the responsibility for chairing the Noncredit Task Force.

M. Posting Research on ASCCC Website

The Executive Committee discussed adding a webpage on the ASCCC site to house pertinent research for the field. B. Smith commented, and others agreed, that sometimes it is difficult to information about current research or to find recent reports. Members discussed the pros/cons of including such a page on the Senate's site including how to keep the information updated and relevant; how to ensure the readers understand the reports are not positions or support by the Senate but only provided for information purposes; and other issues to consider.

Action:

- Crump will bring back a proposal including possible structure, timeline, responsibilities, workload, and other information relevant to creating and maintaining such a page.

N. Expense Reimbursement Policy

No discussion. This item will be considered during the January/February meeting.

Action:

- Staff will include this item on the January/February Executive Committee agenda.

O. Financial Report

By consensus, the Budget and Finance Committee will discuss this item and bring a recommendation to the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

Action:

- The Budget and Finance Committee will discuss this item and bring a recommendation to the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

P. Board of Governors Faculty Nomination

Member discussed the candidates to interview for the faculty positions on the Board of Governors during the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

MSC (Freitas/Davison) to send forward Joseph Bielanski and Manuel Baca to the Governor with an interview; to interview Charles (Kale) Braden (Cosumnes River College), Timothy Charles Brown (Riverside City College), and John Gerhold

(Bakersfield College), and Johnny Terry (Sierra College); and not to interview Wendy Bass (Los Angeles Pierce College).

By consensus, Wendy Bass will be contacted and encouraged to seek opportunities to serve at the state level.

MSC (Bruno/Davison) to hold the interviews in the closed session. Included in this motion is the note that, based on input from the Chancellor's Office legal counsel (Steve Bruckman), the Senate is not subject to the Bagley Keene Act so the Nomination Applications can be removed from the website and the interviews can be held in closed session.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Morse, Bruno, Davison, Kawaguchi, Rico, Chiabotti, P. Smith, Stankas, Freitas, Grimes-Hillman, and Crump.

Abstained: North

MSC (Bruno/Crump) to add Johnny Terry to the interview pool since 2/3s (nine) of the sitting Executive Committee members did not interview him previously.

Action:

- Adams will remove the nomination packets from the website.
- Staff will schedule interviews for Braden, Brown, Gerhold, and Terry.
- B. Smith will develop the interview questions.

IV. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (*Time certain: 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm*)

A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report

Executive Vice Chancellor Skinner updated members on staffing vacancies in the Chancellor's Office and commented on recruitment activities. He informed members that Vice Chancellor Steve Bruckman has accepted a position as the chief counsel for City College of San Francisco. He then highlighted other system-wide activities and issues including discussions by Board of Governors about the Associate Degree for Transfer; conversations between Chancellor Harris and UC President Janet Napolitano; and activities associated with recent grants – online education grant and adult education. Skinner thanked the Senate Executive Committee for their past work with the Chancellor's Office on committees and task forces, before the Board of Governors, and with all other activities the Senate does to assist the California community college system.

North asked about the \$250M granted by the Legislature for pathway programs. Skinner noted that the funds are administered through the Department of Education with input from the Chancellor's Office. North suggested that the Chancellor's Office continue to support the Senate's Statewide Career Pathway as it is the only large scale project that includes statewide coordination of articulation and is connected to C-ID.

B. Liaison Oral Reports (*please keep report to 5 mins., each*)

- Shaaron Vogel, FACCC vice president, reported on recent FACCC upcoming activities.
- John Frazier, SSSCC representative, reported on recent SSSCC activities.

The Executive Committee recessed at 5:00 p.m. until Saturday morning at 8:00 am.

Saturday, January 4, 2014

V. FIRST READING (No Action)

A. Part-time Paper Revision

The Executive Committee discussed the proposed outline for the revision of the part-time paper and provided feedback. Concerns were raised regarding how to separate union and academic issues when they are so closely related. Members acknowledged the difficulty in developing a paper about part-time issues that clearly separate academic responsibilities with union preview, particularly since many college cultures make determinations that are not consistently applied.

Action:

- Morse will share with the Part-time Task Force the concerns raised by the Executive Committee and advise them that the submitted outline, while useful to outside entities (e.g., unions, professional organizations) would not be an outline that could be supported by the ASCCC for reasons shared during this discussion.
- Morse will seek feedback from the Part-time Caucus during their meeting at the 2014 Spring Plenary Session.
- Morse will bring back another outline to a future meeting.

B. Multiple Measures Paper

Grimes-Hillman noted that only one current task force member working on this paper works directly with multiple measures on a college campus, which creates a challenge for the group. Furthermore, she described other complicating issues related to multiple measures. The Executive Committee discussed the Multiple Measures Paper and provided feedback.

Action:

- Grimes-Hillman will bring back a revised paper to a future meeting for discussion and possible adopted.
-

C. Discipline List Handbook

The Executive Committee discussed the proposed Discipline List Handbook. Grimes Hillman informed members that the Senate continuously refines the review process to determine the disciplines. Currently, every two years, the ASCCC conducts a process to determine what changes, if any, are needed to bring the Disciplines Lists up to date. Local academic senates, colleges and districts, students, other interested parties, and Chancellor's Office staff are solicited for recommendations to change the Disciplines Lists

Members questioned the role of the Executive Committee – are members debating whether the change is needed or not? Adams informed members that the role of the Executive Committee is to ensure that the process is followed and that there is enough evidence to demonstrate the need for the change, particularly since many times members are not the discipline experts. Stankas commented that the Executive Committee should be able to determine whether or not a revision to a discipline is needed regardless if they are discipline experts or not. Adams clarified that the responsibility of the Executive Committee member is to ensure that the process is being followed which includes the author providing the need and evidence for a new discipline and/or the modification. Grimes-Hillman agreed and reminded members that the Executive Committee determine if there is enough evidence that demonstrates there is a need for the discipline to move forward.

Bruno updated members on feedback received from the body during the plenary session

breakout. The body does not want the Executive Committee to act as the gatekeeper for whether the change should happen or not. Rather, the Executive Committee should act as the gatekeeper for whether there is sufficient evidence and/or information for the debate to move to the body on the discipline itself. Bruno also noted that in its current form, a proposal to change the disciplines list appears to be a checklist but it should not be just that simple. The proposal should be supported with sufficient information and evidence so that it is clear that the proposal worthy of debate by the body.

Action:

- Grimes-Hillman will bring back a revised handbook to a future meeting for discussion and possible adoption.

D. Leadership Pilot Module

This item was not discussed and will be considered at the January/February 2014 Executive Committee meeting.

Action:

- Staff will include this item on the January/February Executive Committee agenda.

E. IPC Recommendations

This item was not discussed and will be considered at the January/February 2014 Executive Committee meeting.

Action:

- Staff will include this item on the January/February Executive Committee agenda.

F. Budget Committee Membership Composition

A clarification was made that the Budget and Finance Committee has been assigned this task and will make a recommendation at a future Executive Committee meeting.

Action:

- The Budget and Finance Committee will bring a recommendation about the Budget Committee Membership Composition to a future Executive Committee meeting.

VI. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (No Action)

A. Board of Governors/Consultation Council

No discussion.

B. Senate Grants

This item will be considered at the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

C. Fall Curriculum Regionals Survey Results

This item will be considered at the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

D. Veterans Summit Report and Follow Up

This item will be considered at the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

E. Update Executive Committee Members About the December 6 CCSF Workshop

This item will be considered at the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

F. Credit by Exam Paper

The Executive Committee discussed the draft credit by exam paper and provided direction prior to the first reading at the next meeting.

Action:

- Kawaguchi will bring back a revised draft document for first reading at the January/February Executive Committee meeting.

G. Written Reports

Written reports from the Executive Director, Foundation President, committees, task forces, liaisons, and grants were provided for informational purposes

H. Approved Minutes

The October 4-5, 2013 approved minutes were presented.

Public Comment

No public comment was entertained.

New Business

No new business was discussed.

Adjournment

President B. Smith adjourned the meeting at 12:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Tonya Davis, Executive Assistant
Julie Adams, Executive Director
Julie Bruno, Secretary

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Residence Inn Sacramento Downtown at Capitol Park

1121 15th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 267-6806

Friday, January 31, 2014 meeting

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Roll Call

President B. Smith called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and welcomed members and guests.

Members present: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, Dianna Chiabotti, Dan Crump, Dolores Davison, John Freitas, Lesley Kawaguchi, Michelle Grimes-Hillman, David Morse, Wheeler North, Cynthia Rico, John Stanskas, and Phil Smith.

Guests present: Angel Jimenez, SSCCC Liaison; and Jonathan Lightman, FACCC.

MSC (North/Davison) to approve the agenda as re-ordered.

B. Public Comment

No public comment.

C. Calendar

Adams informed members about key calendar dates.

Action

- Adams will agendize the Leadership Institute and include the program on the March agenda for discussion and next steps.

D. Action Tracking List

B. Smith asked members to update the tracking list.

E. Dinner Arrangements

Davis provided members with dinner location.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Spring Curriculum Regional Meetings

B. Area Representative Handbook

MSC (Rico/Bruno) to approve the consent calendar.

C. Leadership Pilot Module

The Executive Committee discussed a pilot project proposed by the Professional Development College to provide a year-long program to faculty with a focus on leadership in the California community colleges. Grimes-Hillman highlighted the topics and explained that the Leadership Certification pilot is part of the Professional Development College and would include a series of training modules provided by the ASCCC as well as other organizations. She suggested that the Executive Committee consider piloting the Leadership Certification module. The pilot would begin at the 2014 Leadership Institute and conclude a year later at the 2015 Leadership Institute. Participants in the pilot would commit to attending all selected Senate events. Each of the events will have identified breakouts and general sessions which would be selected specifically for pilot participants. Many of the breakouts

selected would be those that are already planned for the events. For example, at the Fall Plenary Session, the Nuts and Bolts breakout session may be selected as part of the program. The funding for this program might come from grants or from a pilot registration fee.

Bruno informed members that the AS Foundation is seeking a showcase project to highlight the mission of the Foundation and its support of the ASCCC. The ASF Board of Directors recommended that the Leadership Certification Pilot be sponsored by the Foundation and any grants received would come through the Foundation as a charitable organization.

MSC (North/Davison) to approve the concept of the leadership module.

MSC (Rico/Davison) ASCCC Foundation to sponsor the Professional Development College.

Action

- PDC will bring back a program, timeline, costs, and other pertinent information to another Executive Committee meeting for discussion and possible approval.

III. OLD BUSINESS (Possible Action)

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

The Executive Committee postponed the approval of the minutes from the December and January Executive Committee meetings until the Executive Committee approves a process that describes what content is to be included and how the content will appear in the minutes

B. Spring Session Planning

The Executive Committee discussed the Spring Plenary Session and approved preliminary program.

MSC (Chiabotti/Bruno) to approve the Spring Plenary Preliminary Program as discussed.

C. IPC Recommendations

B. Smith noted that the Internal Process Committee (IPC) has been tasked with many items and commended the committee for their work. She noted the items that were not addressed at the last Executive Committee meeting asked if IPC could help walk through items brought forward to the Executive committee meetings.

Bruno noted that the ASCCC policies included in the agenda are the same items that were included previously in January but were tabled because of time. Members discussed the Meeting Policy and Process submitted by IPC; how minutes are recorded and published. Bruno informed members that the IPC committee reviewed both the Bagley Keene and Brown Acts for general practices to aid IPC in writing a clear policy for the Executive Committee to review and approve.

North requested that the time spent on each item be recorded to assist members in managing agendas.

Stanskas suggested that public testimonies should be summative with only Executive Committee members, not the public, able to request that the full testimony to be included in the final record. Members suggested that the minutes reflect what action was taken by the Executive Committee. Any content changes to the minutes should be discussed and approved by the Executive Committee. Chiabotti recommended that ASCCC consult with an attorney that works with non-profit organizations, who are not legally bound to the Bagley Keene and

Brown act, to provide direction in developing a procedures for recording the minutes. B. Smith stated that a note should be included on the agenda alerting others that the meeting is recorded and the process for receiving edits to the minutes proposed by members should be an efficient process.

Adams reminded members that over the past six months the Executive Committee has continued to discuss the need for openness and transparency and many of the policies under development seek to provide both. However, the Executive Committee needs to decide if they want to be a transparent organization and if so, ensure that they are transparent in all issues. Not providing all the information about a concern brought forward to the Executive Committee is not transparent. The body needs to know what is going on with their professional organization.

Members continued to discuss how the minutes should be recorded, offering a variety of suggestions, but ultimately could not come to a consensus for action.

MSF (Chiabotti/Stanskas) for the Executive Committee make decisions about how the minutes are recorded until IPC has consulted with a nonprofit organization attorney.

MSC (Grimes-Hillman/Rico) to refer the policy on the minutes back to IPC and bring back a revised process taking into consideration the comments at this meeting.

Stanskas suggested that B. Smith should be included in the IPC conversation about internal policy.

B. Smith informed members that the minutes will not be approved until a process for approving them is approved.

D. Expense Reimbursement Policy

Stanskas introduced the item and asked the Executive Committee to consider reviewing the ASCCC expense reimbursement policy. He shared his concern that frugality should not always be the primary consideration when deciding the method of travel. The current policy states that individuals will only be reimbursed for the most economical method of travel. For example, if a member parks at the airport, he or she will only be reimbursed for parking in the economy lot, which is usually not convenient and possibly unsafe at late hours. Stanskas would like to see ASCCC processes less rigid. Adams reminded members that the processes are aligned with the State policies since many of our grants are reimbursed by the State. The Executive Committee should be very careful making any changes as they may not align with and thus not be eligible for reimbursement through the grants.

MSC (Davison/Chiabotti) to request that the Budget and Finance Committee discuss and return with information about possible grant restrictions and recommendations about safety and the other issues discussed.

E. Resolution Assignments

The Executive Committee discussed the dispositions of the referred resolutions from the 2013 Spring Plenary Session.

MSF (Morse/Davison) to deem resolution 1.08 S13 unfeasible and for the Resolutions Committee chair to write a *Rostrum* article.

MSC (Crump/Davison) to deem resolution 1.08 R S13 unfeasible and for the

Resolutions Committee chair to write a *Rostrum* article on the general use of the parliamentary microphone.

MSC (Freitas/Grimes-Hillman) that the disposition of resolution 10.09 S13 and 10.09.01 S13 will be handled by the adoption of the Disciplines List Handbook.

MSC (Freitas/Davison) to declare resolution 13.06 S13 unnecessary because the ASCCC already engages in the work outlined in the resolution.

F. Distance Education Paper Prompts and Outline Review

The Executive Committee briefly discussed the Distance Education paper prompts and outline review.

MSC (Chiabotti/Davison) to approve the outline of the Distance Education Paper outline.

G. Vocational Education Professional Development

North announced the location of the Vocational Education Professional Development regional meetings: Merritt College (March 7) and Cyprus (March 8). He summarized the intent of the event and explained the issues to be addressed. Based on previous input from the Executive Committee, the regional meeting agenda focuses on specific issues related to CTE faculty and sector navigators such as curriculum process, governance, and the role of industry, as well as the other areas proposed by the Chancellor's Office "Doing what Matters" initiative.

MSC (Davison/Bruno) to approve the dates and proposed agenda for the CTE regionals.

H. Board of Governors Faculty Nomination Interviews

Closed Session 1:00pm

From 1:00 p.m. to 3:20 p.m., the Executive Committee interviewed candidates for the Board of Governors faculty position.

Open Session: 3:20pm

B. Smith reported out of closed session that the Executive Committee will advance Kale Braden, along with Manuel Baca and Joseph Bielanski, as the ASCCC nominees for the Board of Governors.

Additionally, B. Smith reported out of closed session that the Executive Committee requested to discuss reopening the Board of Governors Nomination Process this spring. Members discussed the pros and cons of opening the process again.

MSC (Davison/Morse) to agendaize a discussion prior to orientation (March) to consider ways in which the pool of potential candidates could be expanded to increase diversity of the Board of Governors nominations, as well as other senate committees. In addition, the Equity and Diversity Task Force role will be expanded to discuss this issue and make a recommendation about ways to increase diversity.

Members provided additional direction to the Equity Task Force: The task force will identify a process to recruit a diverse pool of faculty to serve on the ASCCC committees. Additionally, the task force will determine a process to recruit a diverse pool of faculty to serve as nominees for the faculty positions on the Board of Governors. One suggestion was

that Executive Committee could identify a pool of candidates and encourage each of them to apply for the Board of Governors. Stanskas suggested that the Executive Committee be allowed to select and send forward names of faculty who have served on the Executive Committee. Other members, however, felt that this would be problematic because it circumvents the currently approved process. Members were encouraged to recruit faculty to apply when the process is opened again.

Action:

- Adams to send a letter to the Governor providing him with the names of the three nominations.
- Adams to contact all candidates to inform them of the Executive Committee's decision.

IV. NEW BUSINESS (Possible Action)

A. Faculty Development Paper Revision

The Executive Committee discussed the proposed outline for the revision of the faculty development paper. Members provided direction and feedback.

MSC (North/Davison) to approve the outline of the faculty development paper as amended.

B. Consistent Messaging

Postponed to the next meeting.

V. INFORMATION AND REPORTS

A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report

No report.

B. Liaison Oral Reports

- FACCC Liaison Lightman updated the Executive Committee on FACCC activities.
- Jimenez reported on recent SSCCC activities.

The Executive Committee recessed at 5:00 p.m. until Saturday morning at 8:30 am.

<p>Saturday, February 1, 2014 Executive Committee Meeting Resumes</p>
--

VI. FIRST READING (No Action)

A. Credit by Exam Paper

Postponed to the next meeting. However, Executive Committee members were encouraged to send any suggested modification to Kawaguchi.

B. Spring Plenary Session Resolutions

Postponed to the next meeting.

C. Quality Agenda

B. Smith shared with the Executive Committee a discussion she had with other faculty leaders of the Council of Faculty Organizations (CoFO) about collaboratively shaping a Quality Agenda to share with others at the Spring Plenary Session, the Legislature, and Consultation Council. The CoFO faculty leaders discussed the need for a quality agenda

related to student success so that the System focus is not solely on access and success without a commitment to increasing quality as well. A quality agenda might include addressing access to full-time faculty and counselors all around the state. She informed members that the Quality Agenda is getting some traction and requested feedback from members about how to take this idea forward.

Action:

- Crump will research full-time faculty and student success resolutions for use in informing a possible quality agenda.

VI. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (No Action)

A. Board of Governors/Consultation Council

No discussion.

B. Governor's Budget Proposal

Postponed until the next meeting.

C. Financial Report

Postponed until the next meeting.

D. Senate Grants

Postponed until the next meeting.

E. Academic Academy

Postponed until the next meeting.

F. Update Executive Committee Members About the December 6 CCSF Workshop

Postponed until the next meeting.

F. Written Reports

Written reports from the Executive Director, Foundation President, committees, task forces, liaisons, grants, and other events are provided for informational purposes. The public can pull any item from this section for discussion.

G. Approved Minutes

The November 6, 2013 approved minutes were included in the agenda packet.

Public Comment

No public comment was entertained.

New Business

No new business was discussed.

Adjournment

President B. Smith adjourned the meeting at 12:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Tonya Davis, Executive Assistant
Julie Adams, Executive Director
Julie Bruno, Secretary



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Legislative Update		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: III	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Legislation	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	David Morse	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

No specific action

BACKGROUND:

The Executive Committee will receive a report on currently proposed legislation that impacts the Senate's areas of purview and on previous Senate positions that apply to those pieces of legislation where appropriate.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Legislative Report March 26, 2014

Assembly Bills

AB 548 (Salas): Nursing Programs--Authorizes a set of criteria added to the screening process for applying to nursing programs. The reasoning for the multicriteria addition was to allow for a more diverse field of candidates while improving the passing rate for the nursing licensing exam and improving the chances for successful completion in community college nursing programs. This seems to really be just removing the sunset date from previous legislation.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: Our 2005 Paper *The Status of Nursing Education in the California Community Colleges* seems to support this concept, though I could not say so definitively.

AB 977 (Salas): CTE Programs--Requires the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to convene a group of experts in career technical education, business or industry to research and recommend ways to address the technical, policy, and fiscal issues related to implementing differential funding for credit-bearing high-cost, high-demand courses and programs, that regions deem valuable to their economy. Requires the group include individuals from the educational and private sector business or industry.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: Resolution 5.01 S03 opposes differential funding in general and states that all program should be fully funded, but it is not specifically about CTE. I have not found any other positions that apply.

AB 1271 (Bonta): Inmate Education--Waives open course requirements for community college courses offered in state correctional facilities and allows attendance hours generated by credit courses at all correctional facilities to be funded at the full credit rate instead of the noncredit rate. Chancellor's Office supported.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I have not found any positions or resolutions related to this topic.

AB 1348 (Perez): Higher Education Authority – creates replacement for CPEC. Specifics are currently very unclear as to what the authority and composition of the group would be.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I have not found any positions or resolutions related to this topic. We have things dealing with CPEC but not with a CPEC replacement or with this legislation.

AB 1451 (Holden): Concurrent Enrollment--Eases restrictions on concurrent enrollment. Chancellor's Office sponsored.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: We have several resolutions that generally support concurrent enrollment. Two of them are 4.01 F07 and 4.02 F07. Beth wrote a *Rostrum* article on them in 2007, as did Jane (same issue of the *Rostrum*, it appears). While we do not have anything specifically on this legislation, those resolutions seem to generally apply.

AB 1540 (Hagman): Concurrent Enrollment--Authorizes the governing board of a school district to allow a student recommended by community college dean of a computer science department or other appropriate community college career computer science administrator, to attend a community college during any session or term and to undertake one or more courses of computer science offered at the community college.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: See AB 1451 above on concurrent enrollment. This bill is a little more specific and our resolutions do not apply to it as well. I'm not sure we have anything that really fits this one. It does not seem controversial, though.

AB 1577 (Holden): Board of Governors--Adds two members to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, including one voting student member who is a member or former member of the Armed Forces of the United States and one voting member who is a member or former of the Armed Forces of the United States who has demonstrated expertise and leadership in the field of veterans' affairs.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I don't think we have anything on this one. I cannot even find any evidence that it has been suggested before.

AB 1942 (Bonta): Accreditation: Requires the Board of Governors to adopt minimum conditions that meet specified requirements and in developing these conditions the Board seeks and considers input from community college districts and related institutions, students, and academic and nonacademic employees. AB 1942 authorizes the governing board of a community college district to designate a federally recognized accrediting agency for community colleges within its jurisdiction. The bill requires the accrediting agency to base its accreditation decision on compliance with the minimum conditions specified by the Board of Governors. AB 1942 also requires the selected accrediting agency to comply with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and California Public Records Act.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: CCLC has expressed concerns that seem legitimate regarding this bill, and Exec has already discussed the danger of opening up these sections of Title 5. However, a lot of what is here is

consistent with faculty's sentiments and with some of our positions, specifically with Resolution 2.04 S10 which called for us to research alternatives to ACCJC.

AB 1950 (Campos): Career Education Incentive--Creates incentives for school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and community college districts to establish regional career education consortia to coordinate, deliver, and implement high-quality and cost-effective career and college preparation programs in kindergarten and grades 1 to 12.
ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: Resolutions 21.02 F00 encourages faculty participation in regional CTE consortia, although it also calls for ASCCC to make the appointments to such consortia. More recently, Resolution 9.10 F11 sort of applies and seems to speak favor of this sort of effort, but it is a stretch. There are also a couple of resolutions from 1994 but they do not seem very useful for this.

AB 1977 (Hernandez): Educational Partnerships--Provide increased financial support for Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships programs (SAPEP), and grants priority enrollment to high school SAPEP participants enrolled in college courses necessary to meet program goals. These programs include Puente, MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement), EAOP (Early Academic Outreach Program).
ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I do not see any resolutions or positions that directly apply to this one. It is an additional priority enrollment group added on, but on the other hand we have always supported these programs. I suspect faculty would favor this but it is hard to say for sure.

AB 2087 (Ammiano): Special Trustees--Removes the authority of the BOG to assign a special trustee with extraordinary authority by prohibiting the Board from usurping, transferring, or limiting, in any way, the powers of the governing boards of these districts when providing assistance to community college districts that encounter severe management difficulties.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: Surprisingly, we do not seem to have had a resolution on this topic last fall, so I do not think we have a position on it. Many will likely be in favor, but I am not sure everyone would be. In fact, 13.08 S09 pretty much commended the Compton special trustee.

AB 2103 (Gomez): BOG Fee Waiver--Modify the fee waiver program of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges by adding a provision to waive fees under the program where the student's residency status was improperly classified.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: We have positions regarding the BOG Fee Waiver, but not on this specific situation. I think this bill is consistent with our previous positions and discussions on similar issues, though. We tend to favor allowing students to keep their financial aid under just about all circumstances.

AB 2153 (Gray): Special Session Course Offerings--Clarifies definition of "supplant" in AB 955 (Williams, 2013) to supplant means to increase the number of special session program course offerings and to correspondingly decrease the number of regular course offerings at a campus." Seems primarily aimed at CSU special sessions. Eloy Oakley, a major proponent of AB 955, states that he and AB 955 author Williams have received assurances from Gray's office that the bill is not directed at community colleges.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: We were against AB 955, of course, but this legislation, if it has any effect at all, would seem to narrow the pilot, so I think we would at worst be neutral and possibly even in favor of it.

AB 2558 (Williams): Faculty and Staff Development--Implements recommendations of the Chancellor's Office Professional Development Committee. Mostly good or innocuous. Removes outdated language of professional development funding from AB 1725, but does not replace it with any sense of stable or ongoing funding. Chancellor's Office sponsored.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I think a lot of this we would support, or at least I have heard no objections to. This bill does delete the Ed Code section on funding professional development, but the language is confusing anyway and we have not received that funding since 2002. We do have resolutions, such as 5.04 F02, which call for full restoration of professional development funding. I would not say we oppose the bill, but I do think it is insufficient without some level of guaranteed funding for professional development, which the bill does not have now.

AB 2705 (Williams): Faculty Designations--Amends existing law that related to community college faculty to change references from full-time and part-time faculty to regular faculty, contract faculty, and associate faculty.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: Resolution 19.04 S13 called for us to "recommend local senates engage with their part-time faculty in an open and inclusive discussion and democratic decision-making process regarding local terminology used to refer to part-time faculty." What that means for this resolution, I am not sure. On the one hand, we are in favor of more respectful nomenclature for part-time faculty. On the other, our

resolution makes it a local issue. Based on that I could say we would oppose this, but I am not sure that's really what faculty would want.

AB 2247 (Williams): Accreditation--Requires that final accreditation documents be made available to the public through the college's website.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: To this point, this bill is consistent with our positions. It's really just about making documents public so far. For example, Resolution 2.08 F13 calls for transparency in the accreditation process.

Senate Bills

SB 173 (Liu): Noncredit Education--Eliminates some courses and categories of courses from eligibility for non-credit apportionment funding. Two-year bill now in second year. Passed Senate Committee on Higher Ed but currently stalled in the Assembly. Bill is expected to be amended before moving forward.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: We could not be more clearly opposed to this one. Resolution 13.02 F11 attacked the issue directly, even though it precedes the legislation. Resolution 13.01 S13, which calls for local control of noncredit programs, is also applicable.

SB 174 (De Leon): Cal Grants--Requires the treasurer to certify monies available in the CATC Fund each year for allocation to the California Student Aid Commission (Commission), and requires the Commission to administer the funds for the purpose of increasing Cal Grant B Access Awards from \$1,473 up to \$5,000. This bill is contingent upon the enactment of SB 798, meaning both bills must become law to be in effect.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: We have several resolutions in support of Cal Grants and, by implication, in support of increasing access to them. Resolution 20.01 F02 talks about lowering eligibility requirements. Resolution 6.06 S10 talks about defending Cal Grants. I would think that we would support this.

SB 798 (De Leon): Tax Credit tied to SB 174--Allows a tax credit under the Personal Income Tax and Corporation Tax law for voluntary contributions to the College Access Tax Credit Fund (CATC Fund) established by this bill for purposes of distributing Cal Grant B Access Awards to students. This bill is contingent upon the enactment of SB 174.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: We have nothing pertaining to this. It's really just the funding mechanism for SB 174.

- SB 845 (Correa):** Electronic Financial Aid Disbursements--Requires the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Trustees of the California State University, and requests the Regents of the University of California and each governing body of an accredited private postsecondary educational institution, to develop model contracts that would govern at each campus within their respective systems the disbursement of a financial aid award, scholarship, campus-based aid award, or school refund on a debit, prepaid, or preloaded card.
ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I'm not sure we have anything directly on point here. We have resolutions that encourage simplifying student access to financial aid, such as 20.02 S09. But this one could also be seen as intruding on local control, since it seems to tell the BOG to develop the blueprint for financial aid disbursement.
- SB 850 (Block):** Bachelor's Degree Pilot Program--Established a pilot program through which each community college campus could offer on baccalaureate degree with certain limitations. Block is rumored to have agreed to remove nursing as an eligible program in the legislation but has not yet done so as of 3/10/14.
ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: 6.01 S10 took a position against the bachelor's degrees, although that resolution seems to be mostly focused on the financial situation at the time. Resolution 6.09 S10 asked us to explore the issue of granting bachelor's degrees.
- SB 897 (Steinberg):** Career Pathways Trust--Allows public sector entities to participate in the 2013 Career Pathways Trust and requires courses related to elementary and secondary basic skills and the courses for immigrants to include basic instruction in American government and civics.
ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: Bill seems mostly like a restructuring and clarification of current requirements, though the language regarding adding civics to basic skills courses is confusing. I am not sure we have any established positions that are relevant.
- SB 965 (Leno):** CCSF Funding--Requires the Board of Governors to provide a community college district with revenues for the 2014-15 fiscal year to the 2017-18 fiscal year, if the district or a campus of the is in imminent jeopardy of losing its accreditation and the board of governors has appointed a special trustee to manage the community college district. Bill is directed at helping CCSF. Chancellor's Office sponsored.
ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: We have several resolutions aimed at helping CCSF, including 2.07 F13 and 1.04 F12. But these resolutions are not about funding.

SB 967 (De Leon): Sexual Assault--Requires the governing boards of each community college district, the California State University, the University of California to adopt policies concerning campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking, including an affirmative consent standard in the determination of whether consent was given by a complainant. Requires these boards to adopt certain sexual assault policies and protocols.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I don't think we have anything on this specific topic but the idea seems consistent with numerous positions we have taken in the past.

SB 1028 (Jackson): Cal Grants--Requires the number of Cal Grant C awards made each year to be at least the same number of awards made for the 2000-01 fiscal year and specifies the amount of the awards. SB 1028 reserves certain awards for the long-term unemployed and prioritizes occupational training programs and industry clusters.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: See SB 174 above.

SB 1068 (Beall): Accreditation--Currently very similar to AB 1942 but will be amended to address require accrediting agencies wishing to implement new policies or procedures to seek legislative approval and provide community colleges an option to choose any community college or 4-year accrediting agency approved by the US Department of Education.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: As with AB 1942, we need to watch this closely. My comments on AB 1942 apply here as well.

SB 1149 (Galgiani): Cal Grants--Cal Grant Program and Renewal Awards. Makes a Cal Grant award recipient again eligible to renew a Cal Grant award, without reduction, if the student was enrolled in an institution ineligible for reasons specified in the bill during the last academic year before the institution became ineligible.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: See SB 174 above.

SB 1196 (Liu): Postsecondary Education Goals--Requires budget and policy decisions regarding postsecondary education to adhere to three goals and that appropriate metrics be identified to monitor progress toward the achievement of the goals, and these metrics are defined and formally adopted based upon recommendations by a working group.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: This will raise concerns about Performance Based Funding, and we certainly have positions against that. Resolution 5.02 1997 is the most applicable. But I suspect that straight-out opposing this bill, which does not actually mention PBF, would be a

losing battle, and our position on PBF and metrics in 5.01 S11 allows us to engage in the conversation.

SB 1369 (Block): Disability Services Programs--Requires the regulations adopted by the Board of Governors to provide the apportionment of funds to each community college district to offset the direct excess costs ensuring that students with disabilities enrolled in state supported programs or courses receive academic adjustments, auxiliary aids, and services.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I doubt anyone would want us to oppose this bill. Resolution 6.02 F01 supports it fairly directly.

SB 1391 (Hancock): Inmate Education Programs--Similar to AB 1271 on inmate education-- waives open course requirements for community college courses offered in state correctional facilities and allows attendance hours generated by credit courses at all correctional facilities to be funded at the full credit rate instead of the noncredit rate. Also requires the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), in collaboration with the Chancellor, to establish the Innovative Career Technical Education Grant Program to provide grants for inmates and parolees to attend career technical education community college classes in state correctional facilities. It provides that funds for this program be allocated to CDCR for this purpose in the 2014-15 Budget Act.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I have not found any positions or resolutions related to this topic.

SB 1400 (Hancock): Expulsion--Authorizes the governing board of a community college to expel a student if good cause for the issuance of an order protecting a campus of the district, or any person regularly present on a campus of the district, is issued by a court against the student after an evidentiary hearing.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: I do not think we have anything directly addressing this. I would not expect anyone to want to oppose it, though when I think about some of the arguments against the "egregious acts of cheating" resolution, you never know.

SB 1425 (Block): Retroactive Awarding of Degrees--Specifies requirements for the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office regarding degree audits and awarding degrees, certificates, and transfer requirements retroactively earned over the past 5 years. Requires the Chancellor's Office develop or identify a centralized, commercially available program to conduct degree audits throughout the system. Bill is currently recognized by Block's office as ambitious and will likely be amended to become more feasible.

ASCCC Positions/Resolutions: Resolution 13.01 F12 asks us to explore the automatic awarding of degrees, which we are doing. We have had some concerns expressed about the idea, but we do not have a concrete position at this point.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Executive Committee Meeting Minutes		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: IV. A.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Bruno	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the minutes from February 28 – March 1, 2014 Executive Committee meeting.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Residence Inn Sacramento Downtown at Capitol Park

1121 15th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 267-6806

Friday, February 28, 2014 Meeting

I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Roll Call

President Beth Smith called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and welcomed members and guests.

Members present: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, Dianna Chiabotti, Dan Crump, Dolores Davison, John Freitas, Lesley Kawaguchi, Michelle Grimes-Hillman, David Morse, Wheeler North, Cynthia Rico, John Stanskas (arrived 1:30 p.m.), and Phil Smith.

Guests present: Debbie Klein, Gavilan College Faculty (Saturday only); Cris McCullough, Chancellor's Office (Friday only); Richard Mahon, Riverside City College; James Todd, Modesto Junior College faculty; and Shaaron Vogel, FACCC (Friday only).

B. Approval of Agenda (20 minutes)

B. Smith re-ordered the agenda and members added the following items. *Note: while the items were re-ordered for discussion purposes, they remain in their original order to reflect the posted printed.*

Items added:

I. G. Legislative Update, Morse

VI. E. Governance

Bruno requested that two items submitted but not included in the agenda by the President (Governance and Roles/Responsibilities of the Executive Committee) be added to the agenda. She recognized that these items will require a quite a bit of time to discuss; however, she felt that the Executive Committee could discuss the issues, not to necessarily solve them, but instead to better communicate about areas of concern and possible next steps to resolve them. B. Smith agreed to add the items back on the agenda to be taken together at the end of the day on Saturday to ensure that all the items for the plenary session are approved.

MSC (North/P. Smith) to approve the agenda as amended and re-ordered.

C. Public Comment

No public comment.

D. Calendar

Adams noted that all the deadlines have been posted on the calendar and provided to the members.

E. Action Tracking List

B. Smith requested that members send Davis any updates to the action tracking sheet.

F. Dinner Arrangements

Davis provided details information about dinner arrangements.

G. Legislative Update (20 minutes)

Morse updated members about recent legislative activity and discussed the following legislation:

- AB 1451 (Holden) Concurrent enrollment in secondary school and community college
- SB850 (Block) Public postsecondary education: community college districts: baccalaureate degree pilot program
- AB1271 (Bonta) Community colleges: inmate education programs: computation of apportionments
- SB965 (Leno) Community colleges: funding: San Francisco Community College District
- AB 1942 (Bonta) Community colleges: Accreditation
- SB1068 (Beall) Community colleges: Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges
- AB 2247 (Williams) Postsecondary education: accreditation documents
- SB 174 (De León) CalGrants
- SB 798 (De León) Income taxes: credits: contributions to education funds.
- AB1348 (Pérez) Postsecondary education: California Higher Education Authority.
- SB 173 (Liu) Education funding: adult health and safety education.
- AB2558 (Williams) Community colleges: faculty and staff development

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

No items on the consent calendar.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Spring Session Planning (16 minutes)

Members discussed the final planning for the Spring Plenary Session and updated the preliminary program.

B. Credit by Exam Paper (20 minutes)

Kawaguchi presented the Credit by Exam paper for discussion. No modifications were requested by members.

MSC (North/Freitas) to send the Credit by Exam paper, with the appropriate appendices, forward to the Area Meetings and Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

MSC (North/Freitas) to move the informational piece (pages 18 – 28) to the Curriculum Website.

Action

- Kawaguchi will send Adams the final draft of the Credit by Exam paper by March 7, 2014, to include in the mailing to the Area Meetings.

C. Multiple Measures Paper (11 minutes)

Grimes-Hillman presented the Multiple Measures paper for discussion. Members suggested a few modifications.

MSC (Davison/Freitas) to send the Multiple Measures paper as amended forward to the Area Meetings and Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

Action

- Grimes-Hillman will send Adams the final draft of the Multiple Measures paper by March 7, 2014, to include in the mailings to the Area Meetings.

D. Discipline List Handbook (25 minutes)

Grimes-Hillman presented the Disciplines List Handbook for discussion. Members suggested a few modifications, particularly to the purpose of the testimonies and hearings.

The Disciplines List Handbook will be emailed to the Executive Committee prior to sending to the Area Meetings to ensure that discussion items are addressed. Adams noted that the Disciplines List Revisions process should begin this month and asked whether the Standards and Practices Chair Grimes-Hillman felt prepared to implement the process. By consensus, the letter will be modified to alert the field that if the delegates approve the Disciplines List Revision Handbook, the process for submitting Disciplines List revisions, particularly the process associated with evidence, would be modified.

MSC (North/Davison) to send the Disciplines List Handbook as amended forward to the Area Meetings and the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

Action

- Grimes-Hillman will modify the Disciplines List Handbook to address comments raised by the Executive Committee and send to members by email.
- Grimes-Hillman will send the final draft Disciplines List Handbook to Adams to forward to Area Meetings and the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

E. IPC Recommendations (1 hour, 15 minutes)

Bruno presented the Internal Policy Committee (IPC) recommendations to revise the Executive Committee's Open Meeting Policy section on minutes. She noted that since the Executive Committee was not able to reach consensus on what should be included in the minutes during the discussion at the last meeting, she offered the following three options. The options offered are just outlines and IPC will draft a policy depending on which option was selected.

- i. Minutes, similar to Board of Governors, would include a brief description of what was discussed and actions taken.
- ii. Minutes would provide a description and explanation of the issues without attribution and actions taken.
- iii. Minutes would provide discussion and explanations of the issues with attribution and action taken.

Members discussed the three options as well as how minutes may be changed before final approval. P. Smith suggested that minutes can be used to tell a story and may not include the intent of the participants as the intent may not be clearly stated during the meeting but rather may be reflected in the agenda item. Freitas raised concern with changing the minutes to reflect conversations not actually held. North noted that Roberts Rules allows for the minutes of meetings to be changed anytime in the future but would take a 2/3 vote by the adopting body. A question was raised whether keeping the tapes would be an option. Adams noted that tapes are kept only until the minutes are approved just in case information needs to be verified. It is common practice for nonprofit organizations to keep the tapes for a short period of time, particularly because of liability concerns.

Adams shared the past practice in taking the minutes. Depending on the significance of the item, minimal to more thorough details are included in the minutes. For example, during the discussion about papers or surveys, less detail would be noted in the minutes as the responsibility for capturing the recommendations is with the Executive Committee member who will need to carry back the information to the committee to address. This information is not recorded in the minutes. In the past, more detail would be provided during policy discussions. This year, as the staff responsible for overseeing the recording of minutes, more detail has been included because several members raised concern that they were not aware of policy decisions made last year such as the situation with Vocational Leadership Institute.

Chiabotti noted that minutes are a tool to maintain the history of the organization. Morse agreed but added that minutes are also used to inform our members about the decisions made by the Executive Committee.

MSC (North/Davison) to approve the following outline for the policy on minutes:

Minutes provide a description and explanation of the issues without attribution and actions taken and more comprehensive detail on policy and actions items. Members can request that more detail be included at any time during when the item is entertained.

MSC (North/Davison) to approve the following outline on the Executive Committee minutes for further development by IPC.

- Minutes are recorded by staff to capture the discussion and actions made during the meeting.
- Minutes provide a description and explanation of the issues without attribution and actions taken and more comprehensive detail on policy and actions items. Members can request that more detail be included at any time during when the item is entertained.
- The amount of time spent on each agenda item is noted in the minutes.
- Meetings are taped and the recording will be kept until the minutes are approved.
- Minutes Reviewed
 - Draft minutes will be distributed with the Executive Committee agenda.
 - Typos may be submitted to the Secretary or Executive Director.
 - Executive Committee members will submit requested changes to staff and changes will be merged using track changes for discussion at the next meeting.
 - Any significant, substantive changes will be brought forward to the Executive Committee for discussion and potential inclusion in the final document.
- Individuals may request specific information be reflected in the minutes.

Members discussed the IPC recommendation on how public comment is recorded in the minutes. Concern was raised that allowing the public to make a comment at any time during an agenda item might be disruptive. P. Smith asked that the public comment item be operationalized either before or after the Executive Committee discussion otherwise it would not be public comment but discussion or debate. Members discussed whether the public could comment before, during, or after the discussion as well as the time limit for the overall public comment. North noted that both Brown and Bagley Keene Acts guarantee the public the opportunity to participate and suggested that before the item might work best.

B. Smith noted that the chair of the meeting should be able to assist with managing the public. For example, if there are members of the public in the room who are very intent on a particular item, the chair might delay in engaging the Executive Committee to allow individuals to complete their comment card. She noted that if members of the public made an

effort to attend the meeting to communicate with the members, the Executive Committee should accommodate their participation. Bruno agreed and noted that the Executive Committee could always make a motion to suspend the rules to allow the public to comment during an agenda item or make a motion to extend the time for all the public to be heard.

Members discussed whether public comments should be included with the minutes or not. Bruno shared that in her opinion, since we are a public entity all public comments should be made public. P. Smith raised concern about the types of public comments we could receive. For example, some boards have policies about slurs or profanity including not posting or including them in the minutes. Morse commented that he is less concerned with information presented to the Executive Committee than to limit access to issues shared publicly. Chiabotti noted that boards post summative explanations all the time and suggested that the public comment be available upon request. B. Smith asked what would happen if someone walked documents into the meeting and would members be given time to review the written statement.

MSC (North/Davison) to approve the following outline and incorporate items as discussed.

Public Comment

- Public may comment on items not included on the agenda during the “Public Comments” agenda item only
- The Executive Committee may not take action on public comments
- The Executive Committee may not discuss public comments associated with items not on the agenda
- Public may comment on agenda items at the time the items are entertained
- Public comments will not be entertained once deliberation on an agenda item begins.
- A motion may be made to suspend the rules to allow the public to comment during deliberation.
- Public Comments are limited to 3 minutes.
- Public Comments may be limited to 30 minutes per agenda item.
- A motion may be made to extend the time for public comments for individuals and per agenda item.
- Individuals wishing to make public comments will submit a comment card with their name and who they represent which will be included in the minutes
- Oral public comments will be captured in summation for the minutes.
- Written documentation of oral comments and written documents submitted to the Executive Committee at a meeting will be noted in the minutes and will be included in an addendum or an appendix to the minutes on the website.
- A disclaimer will be listed on the website regarding the public comment.

Action

- Bruno to work with IPC to develop a policy on minutes and public comment based on the approved outline.
- Bruno will bring back to a future meeting revised outline of the other areas included in the open meeting policy recommendations from IPC. Members will send Bruno comments on these sections as soon as possible.
- Adams to include minutes from December 13, 2013, January 3 – 4, 2014, and January 31, February 1, 2014, on the next agenda for approval.

F. Operational Oversight Committee – (1 hour, 25minutes)

Bruno presented two documents: Guidelines for Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC and Review Criteria. Members discussed the selection and composition of the task force charged with conducting the review. The OOC recommendation suggests that faculty attendees at ASCCC events would be compiled into an Excel spreadsheet and randomly selected at a spring plenary session.

B. Smith commented on the criteria used as part of the review process, particularly the language in the governance domain. Bruno noted that the language used in the criteria came directly from the Executive Committee Code of Ethics. The exception was the Grants, Program and Planning component, which was developed by OCC to meet the requirements of the resolution. P. Smith noted that the focus of OCC was on the process and not on developing the domains. B. Smith clarified that the focus of the review should be on the right criteria; just because the criteria currently exists does not mean that they are necessarily the right criteria to use.

B. Smith asked about the role of the Executive Committee in the review process. P. Smith noted that the role of the Executive Committee is to be available for interview and provide clarification for errors of fact. Morse added that the Executive Committee would also provide an internal report for the task force to consider. Bruno noted that feedback from the breakout was that any process should be simple. In response to this feedback, OOC recommended that the task force would determine how to use the criteria in the review process. Bruno also noted that if there are any specific changes to the recommendations of OOC that as chair she would need to take the changes back to the committee as the adopted resolution was very clear that the committee makes the recommendation to the body and the body approves the process—not the Executive Committee. Stanskas commented that it appears that the results of one breakout session is driving the content of the process versus the resolution. He suggested that maybe there should be two different recommendations – one prescriptive and one more general – to allow the body to make the decision.

MSC (Stanskas/Chiabotti) to recommend to OOC to consider bring several options for the ASCCC review to present to the body for discussion and debate.

Action

- Bruno requested members to send her any comments regarding the evaluation process.
- Bruno will inform OOC of the Executive Committees comments and will work with OOC to finalize the process for consideration by the body at the Spring plenary session.

G. Governor’s Budget Proposal (40 minutes)

B. Smith shared information and discussions about the Governor’s budget released in January. She will continue to update members as more information becomes available.

H. Senate Grants

This item was not discussed.

I. Part-time Paper Revision (35 minutes)

Morse presented an outline for the revision to the part-time paper. He noted that several suggestions made by the Executive Committee at a previous meeting were incorporated into the draft.

MSC (Chiabotti/Freitas) to develop a paper on part-time faculty issues.

J. Consistent Messaging

This item was not discussed.

K. Update Executive Committee Members About the December 6 CCSF Workshop

This item was not discussed.

IV. NEW BUSINESS (Possible Action)

A. Responding to the ACCJC's Revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards (30 minutes)

P. Smith informed members that the ACCJC released on January 24 its revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards with the public comment period ending April 30. He noted that in the past, ACCJC released the revised standards and then ASCCC would respond with a flurry of resolutions, which he felt was not effective. Responding in this manner suggests that the ASCCC is just completing a surface read of the standards. He proposed to the Accreditation Standards and Assessment Committee that they do a more exhaustive review of the standards, which began by soliciting feedback at the Accreditation Institute. The document, emailed to the Executive Committee this morning, is rather lengthy but he felt that the feedback was useful given that many are reading the revised standards and raising some of the same issues. One problem is how to get feedback out to the field in a timely manner while also getting more time to complete the document. Members discussed the process for sharing the document with the field. Davison noted that since the document is lengthy she has only been able to briefly review but likes the idea of prioritizing comments within the resolution for the Senate to take positions while offering the full document for colleges to use in identifying their priorities.

MSC (Chiabotti/Davison) to allow P. Smith to solicit additional feedback from others on the document "Suggested Edits to the Draft 2014 Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards", alert local senate president via the listserv, post materials on the Senate website, determine if it is feasible to let other colleges outside of the system but within the ACCJC region to know about what the ASCCC are doing, and to explore the option of P. Smith working with B. Smith to host a face-to-face conversation to go over the proposed edits.

A comment was made about the best method to get information out to CIOs and CEOs. B. Smith noted that she has already approached the CIOs and they are interested in working with the Senate.

By consensus, P. Smith will follow up with the State Auditor's Office regarding their work on the ACCJC and work with B. Smith to respond.

B. Spring Plenary Session Resolutions (3 hours, 35 minutes)

The Executive Committee discussed resolutions to forward to the Area Meetings for discussion.

MSF (Chiabotti/Morse) to suspend the rules to allow the public to engage with us about the resolution on the CCC mission.

MSC (Davison/Chiabotti) to approve sending the resolution packet forward to the Area meetings for discussion and debate.

C. Distance Education as the Theme for the 2015 Academic Academy

Postponed until after session.

D. Survey about Recruiting, Screening, and Hiring FT/PT Faculty (12 minutes)

Chiabotti presented a survey to gather information about the recruiting, screening, and hiring of full- and part-time faculty.

MSC (P. Smith/Rico) to use both the official and unofficial listservs in requesting college policies for recruiting, screening, and hiring practices for full- and part-time faculty.

E. Faculty Hiring and Peer Reviews (5 minutes)

Chiabotti presented the idea of holding regional meetings in May to discuss with faculty the recruiting and hiring.

MSC (Grimes-Hillman/Davison) approve the concept of regional meetings on the faculty hiring and peer reviews contingent upon the identification of a source of funding.

Crump asked about costs associated with holding these regional meetings and the implications for staff and the budget. B. Smith noted that there would be minimal costs associated with the event such as travel for presenters and staff time for coordination and communication to the field. Adams noted that there are no funds allocated in the budget for regional meetings. A question was raised about whether or not the funds budgeted for committee work could be used for the regional meetings. Adams clarified that the funds associated with committee work are for holding committee meetings and attending plenary sessions and not for hosting regional meetings. There are a number of areas where expenditures have been authorized without an associated budget.

Action

- Chiabotti will bring back an item to the April meeting for approval of the regional meeting agenda.

F. Campus Climate Index (5 minutes)

Chiabotti requested permission to contact colleges to urge them to complete the Campus Climate Index survey. Crump asked why this item was submitted for discussion—are there costs involved or does this go against any position? Chiabotti noted that she wanted to be sure there were no concerns with her contacting all the colleges.

MSC (P. Smith/Rico) to allow Chiabotti to contact colleges across the state to encourage completion of the survey.

Action

- Chiabotti will send out an email via the Senate listserv.
- B. Smith will include language in the Senate President's Update.

V. INFORMATION AND REPORTS

A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report

McCullough updated members about Chancellor's Office vacant positions and other activities.

B. Liaison Oral Reports

1. FACCC Liaison

Vogel informed members on FACCC activities, particularly their upcoming events and

Saturday, March 1, 2014

VI. FIRST READING (No Action)

A. Executive Committee Meeting Locations (*one hour*)

The Executive Committee began with a discussion about holding the Vocational Leadership Institute and Academic Academy in the 2014/2015 academic year. P. Smith and Stankas updated members about the recently held Accreditation and Academic Academy Institutes. Both events were well attended and successful as noted by survey results and comments. There were concerns with the size of the venue for the Accreditation Institute and the logistics for the Academic Academy. Adams commented that some issues are beyond our control such as remodeling or event meeting space and food issues. She noted that the hotel was aware of our concerns and will address them appropriately.

Members discussed the idea of holding institutes in the fall rather than in the spring as it seems like a scheduling burden on staff and others. Adams noted that planning an institute in fall is much more difficult since there is less time to plan, a number of competing events, and additional staff responsibilities such as awards.

Members discussed the idea of re-instating the Vocational Leadership Institute. Chiabotti commented that there is a need to provide CTE faculty with a venue to discuss issues directly related to their unique disciplines. CTE faculty can often be the only faculty in their department, which can be challenging at times. Furthermore, there are many changes occurring at the state level because of the Doing what Matters Campaign. Adams raised a concern that if the Perkins 1b funds are not available, it might be difficult to get CTE faculty to attend. In the past the Perkins dollars fully funded CTE faculty to attend the Institute—registration and travel were covered by the grant. If we do not have similar funding, then CTE faculty may not be able to secure funding and the ASCCC would be liable for the costs of meeting space and rooms. Chiabotti argued that the Executive Committee should not be concerned about whether or not the ASCCC loses money but rather are we addressing the needs of CTE faculty.

Members discussed alternatives for holding the event such as hosting regional meetings, holding semi-annual events rather than every year, including CTE in the professional development college, or even partnering with other groups. Freitas commented that partnering with CCCAOE is problematic and noted that the ASCCC did not enjoy high visibility when we partnered with CCCAOE this last time,. Chiabotti agreed that the ASCCC should not partner with CCCAOE.

MSC (Chiabotti/Freitas) to create an institute for CTE faculty in the next academic year and to explore opportunities for funding the event so that CTE faculty can attend at little or no cost but to not make the attendee cost of the event a requirement of holding the event.

The Executive Committee meeting dates were not discussed and will return to another meeting for discussion and approval.

B. Leadership Institute Planning (*5 minutes*)

B. Smith presented the program for last year's leadership institute and suggested that we again use our values as the theme for the 2014 Institute – *Leadership, Voice, Empowerment*. Members did not contest this idea. The Executive Committee discussed planning the June

Leadership Institute, particularly the idea of holding a pre-session. Grimes-Hillman reminded members that the Professional Development Leadership Module approved at the last meeting would be a part of this event and will more than likely begin the day prior. B. Smith requested that topics be sent to her prior to the next meeting.

Action

- This item will return to the next meeting for discussion.

C. Curriculum Institute (14 minutes)

Stanskas presented the draft Curriculum Institute draft program and requested feedback.

Action

- This item will return to a future meeting for discussion and possible approval.

D. Evaluation of Accreditation Institute and Academic Academy

This item was discussed under the VI. A. Executive Committee Meeting Locations.

MSC (Rico/Davison) to offer the Accreditation Institute and Academic Academy again in 2015 in February.

E. Governance

This agenda item was tabled until the Spring Plenary Session.

VII. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (No Action)

A. Board of Governors/Consultation Council (40 minutes)

B. Smith presented members with a proposal for the CCC System metrics and performance goals presented to the Consultation Council as information at their February meeting. She commented that she did not believe there is any method for modifying them as they are being separately negotiated. It is critical for members to review them given the way they are being proposed. The metrics include reference to the student success, equity, service, and efficiency. The performance goals were presented at the Consultation Council in November as a first reading and the Board of Governors as an information item at their January meeting. The Executive Committee might want to create a resolution on whether the Senate will endorse them or not.

North asked if the performance goals for CCC were presented and not negotiated with any member of community colleges but instead the Chancellor's Office put the goals forward without consultation. B. Smith informed members that the goals and targets were developed by the Chancellor's Office in discussion with the Governor. Morse added that the goals have been presented at the Consultation Council each month since November for discussion and input from Council members. North requested clarification since it appears as if our representatives were receiving mixed messages. B. Smith and Morse agreed that they knew from the beginning how these performance goals were going to be used. P. Smith added that the Scorecard group with Senate appointees participated in conversations in January about developing the goals and shared with the Executive Committee his report from that meeting.

Adams raised concern that these performance goals and targets have been before Consultation since November and this is the first time that the Executive Committee has reviewed or discussed them. Adams further stated that the Executive Committee should have been providing direction to its representatives as far back as November. The point that these performance goals and targets are now finalized and there is no opportunity for the faculty to

provide feedback is troubling. B. Smith noted that the opportunity to provide feedback to inform the process was not clearly stated at Consultation. Adams noted that the past practice of this organization has been for statewide issues brought to Consultation to be discussed by this body so representatives on the Council would have the advice of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee has not discussed any items on the Consultation Council agenda since last year. She stressed that the Executive Committee should have been made aware of something as significant as the CCC performance goals and targets but instead they are not aware of it and now have no input. B. Smith commented that both she and Morse were at the Consultation Council meetings and provided the best input they could as representatives of the Senate given the information they were given. She agreed that the performance goals or targets did not come to the Executive Committee but have been on the Consultation Council agenda, which is always on the Executive Committee agenda. Adams interjected that in her history with the Senate she has not seen something so important move forward without the Executive Committee providing input to its representatives. However, she acknowledged that it is up to the Executive Committee members how they want to lead the organization and noted that currently decisions are being made without their input. B. Smith disagreed and stated that she and Morse are providing input through the Consultation process with the information they have available to them. Adams commented that there is a problem with the ASCCC when decisions are being made in silos without any input from its elected board. B. Smith stopped the conversation and entertained direction from the Executive Committee about how they wanted to move forward.

B. Smith noted that there was 30 minutes left for the meeting and she had agreed to add the governance item on the agenda. It was now up to members to determine the direction of the meeting. Members felt that both topics were important but that 30 minutes was not enough time to discuss the governance item and that the performance goals discussion was more important given that the Board of Governors would be meeting the next day and the performance goals and targets were on the agenda.

MSC (Bruno/North) Grimes-Hillman, Bruno, and Stanskas will develop an agenda item about how to deal with the governance issues at the Spring Plenary Session.

The Executive Committee spent the final 20 minutes of the meeting discussing the Student Success Initiative performance goals and how to change the targets identified. Grimes-Hillman asked if the proposal would be finalized before the Spring Plenary Session. B. Smith said no as the Board of Governors item is information only; however, she would verify on Monday. Grimes-Hillman then noted that it will be very important to ensure that the proposal is discussed at the Spring Plenary Session since the Executive Committee has not discussed the performance goals or the targets.

B. Smith noted that UC and CSU have performance goals established by the Governor. The Chancellor's Office has been trying to influence the administration but it is still up to the Governor to decide.

P. Smith provided background on the development of the system metrics. When presented with a plethora of possible system metrics, the Scorecard Advisory Group decided to use the Scorecard metrics for the performance goals. The faculty participating on the Scorecard Advisory Group were not supportive of the metrics but felt that if performance goals had to be developed and using the Scorecard metrics might drive certain behaviors. Bruno sought clarification about the purpose of the current discussion and what the Executive Committee hoped to accomplish by the end of the agenda item. B. Smith clarified that members need to know about the performance goals and provide guidance. She also noted that CoFO

discussed the performance goals but did not provide any guidance about how to proceed.

Rico raised concerns and asked what would happen if the performance goals are not achieved. She stated that these performance goals currently do not have any implications; however, as with No Child Left Behind, there might be implications in the future. The Scorecard was created for colleges to gauge how they are doing in certain areas each year – not as a tool for comparison to other campuses. How do we ensure that there are no ramifications for not performing? B. Smith clarified that the performance goals are aggregated and will not be published by college. Crump responded that while the performance goals are aggregate, they are tied to the Scorecard so information by colleges would be available.

B. Smith noted that there are no funds attached to the performance goals. Instead, they are generic goals for the System, which will be used for accountability purposes only. The Governor gave us additional funds this last year for Student Success and the performance goals are a way to demonstrate what we have accomplished with the additional funds. Members raised concern about how the performance goals will be used in the future. Morse shared that Chancellor Harris said in Consultation that the performance goals would be revisited and potentially revised if necessary.

Klein asked to be recognized as a member of a Senate committee for two years on this topic. B. Smith denied the request.

Morse shared that his impression on the Scorecard is that they are less about real accountability and more about making the CCC System look good to the public. B. Smith agreed that the performances goals were crafted very carefully by the Chancellor's Office (i.e., attainable goals which would reflect well on the System) rather than just allowing the Governor to develop them without guidance from the Chancellor's Office. B. Smith commented that the Senate has a number of positions on performance-based metrics but none on targets, which is why we need more information.

Crump suggested that B. Smith or Morse write a statement expressing that the Senate has concerns with the performance metrics. B. Smith and Morse will speak with the faculty board members to request that the Board delay any decision until May after plenary. It was determined that more information will be provided at the April Executive Committee for discussion about possible resolutions. Additionally, there is a breakout slot available for a breakout session on the performance goals and B. Smith will seek out someone from the Chancellor's Office to participate in the discussion about the performance goals. Rico requested that an update on the performance goals be provided at the Area meetings. B. Smith agreed. Freitas also requested that information be provided to the field alerting them to the discussion about the performance goals. B. Smith agreed and said that more information should be available after the Board of Governors meeting.

Crump commented that it is unfortunate that in the past we have been unable to get through all our agenda items. However, as members we have the responsibility to review the agenda. It is incumbent on all members to be informed about the Consultation and Board of Governors agendas, which many times cannot be delayed. B. Smith requested that paper copies of the Consultation Council and Board of Governors agendas be included in the packet rather than just the links to the items.

Bruno noted that in the past, the president provided an oral report. These reports not only contextualized the items on the agenda but also alerted members to important issues that

should be on members' radar. She appreciates the weekly president email updates but they are one-way communication which at times do not express underlying issues or allow for discussion.

B. Smith concluded the conversation by stating that throughout the performance goals discussion at Consultation Council no one presented information that was either negative or a bad approach for the System. If that had happen, either she or Morse would have voiced a concern.

A. C-ID/TMC Presentation and Update

Item pulled by President B. Smith due to time constraints.

B. Written Reports

Written reports from the Executive Director, Foundation President, committees, task forces, liaisons, grants, and other events were provided in the printed agenda for informational purposes.

New Business (*No action/Next Agenda*)

Stankas commented that when the Executive Committee discusses the Governance agenda item at the April meeting, members should be ready to decide that if a special meeting is held in May, whether that meeting is open or closed since that meeting will need to have a copy of the Executive Director's contract if we are to review how we operate with our bylaws, constitution, and concerns with governance.

Adjournment – Meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Tonya Davis, Executive Assistant
Julie Adams, Executive Director
Julie Bruno, Secretary



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Internal Process Committee Policies		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: IV. B.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	J. Bruno	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

To approve the Minutes and Public Comments sections in the Open Meetings policy (3/26/14). To review the other sections and provide comments.

BACKGROUND:

At the February/March meeting, the IPC brought forward an outline for an Open Meeting Policy. The Executive Committee provided direction and approved a modified outline for two sections of the policy: the Minutes and Public Comments. IPC used the approved outline to craft the sections and is submitting them for the Executive Committee's approval. Additionally, IPC would like feedback on the other sections of the document so that they may finish writing the policy.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Executive Committee Member and Staff Guide on Ensuring Open Meetings

Draft March 11, 2014

ASCCC Philosophical Statement for Open Meetings

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges shares and enacts the values that are important to the organization including dedication to the public good and accountability to the public. The Executive Committee members' interactions, deliberations, and decision-making are guided by the core values of respect, trustworthiness (or should it be "trust"), honesty, openness, and transparency. The Executive Committee enacts these values and shows its commitment to meeting its obligations to the organization by engaging in genuine and responsible behavior as defined in its policies and procedures.

Meetings:

- Executive Committee
- ASCCC Committees, Taskforces, and Workgroups
- Plenary Sessions

Meeting notices

- Executive Committee
 - Yearly schedule of meetings posted in August
 - Agendas posted 5 (as opposed to 72 hours for Brown Act? And Brown Act doesn't state "calendar" or "business") calendar days prior to meeting via website calendar and senate presidents' listserv and per written request from individuals
 - Agendas include contact information
 - Conference calls are permissible by request
 - Locations must be identified in the meeting (must this location be accessible to the public? Believe that is what Bagley Keene requires)
 - Votes must be taken by roll call
- ASCCC Committees, Taskforces, and Workgroups
 - Agendas posted 3 calendar days (or wording of 72 hours as noted for Brown Act?) prior to the meeting via website calendar
 - Agendas include contact information
 - Conference calls are permissible by request
 - Locations must be identified in the meeting (must this location be accessible to the public?)
- Plenary Session
 - Agenda (Preliminary Program) posted one month prior to the meeting
 - Final agenda (program) is posted 5 calendar days (or 72 hours?) prior to the meeting via website

- Agendas include contact information

Agenda Content

Executive Committee Agendas

- Provide a brief description of agenda items
- Utilization of approved agenda form
 - Agenda items not submitted on the approved agenda form will be returned to the requestor
- Items not on the agenda cannot be discussed by the Executive Committee
 - Urgent items may be added if it adheres to the following criteria/criterion:
 - Action needs to be taken before the next meeting

ASCCC Committees, Taskforces, and Workgroups Agendas

- Brief description of the topics

Plenary Session

- Plenary Session Program provides detailed descriptions and information

Supporting Documentation for Agenda Items for all ASCCC Meetings

Available by Request if not posted on the website

Executive Committee Decision Making

- Motions are used for approving or disapproving action items
- Consensus is often used for discussion items and to provide direction when a motion is not required
- Roll Call votes may be requested by any member of the body and recorded in the minutes (but conference calls MUST have roll call vote?)

First and second readings

- Certain items require first and second readings:
 - Papers up for adoption
 - Surveys
 - Session and Institute Programs
 - Author Requested by Author
- All other items may use -a first reading and action
- Information items include committee minutes, reports, etc.

Communication among Executive Committee members on agenda items

- Executive Committee members should avoid strategic communication around any item that will go before the committee for deliberation
- Executive Committee members should avoid any action that will intentionally circumvent the Executive Committee's ability to govern as a collective

Closed Session of Executive Committee

- Circumstances that may warrant Closed Session:
 - Personnel matters (do we want to say "review" or what?)
 - Board of Governors interviews
 - Formal legal action pending
 - ASCCC policies violations by Executive Committee members, ASCCC Committee, Taskforce and Workgroup members, and faculty volunteers
 - Closed session in this instance only happens after the ASCCC Violations policy has been followed, including consultation with the officers
- Closed session will be noticed on the Executive Committee meeting agenda
 - Should a circumstance that warrants a closed session be identified outside of the regular meeting schedule, a Special Closed Session meeting will be called and properly noticed with the Closed Session as the only agenda item
 - Individuals involved in the closed session matter will be notified when the agenda is posted
- All Executive Committee members, hired and elected [DD1], are included in closed session
- Any individual involved in a closed session matter may request an open meeting hearing or ask to be included in the closed session
- Closed session minutes
 - The secretary will identify a recorder not associated with the organization to take the minutes
 - The minutes will be circulated (hard copies distributed and collected) during the next meeting in closed session to be approved
 - The secretary will maintain all closed session minutes to be passed to the next secretary
 - Only action will be reported out in the open meeting

Minutes

Recording the Minutes

Minutes are recorded by staff to document the information provided on salient issues as well as the deliberations of and actions taken by the members of the Executive Committee. The minutes are descriptive in nature and provide an explanation of the issues without attribution unless a member requests attribution (e.g., "Let the minutes reflect..."). Additional comprehensive detail will be provided

on policy and action items. Members may request that more detail be included at any time during deliberation on an item. To facilitate completion of the agenda and effective time management, the amount of time spent on each agenda item will be noted in the minutes. All meetings of the Executive Committee are taped for the purpose of facilitating accurate minutes and to rectify disagreement over content of the minutes, if necessary. The tape recordings are discarded once the minutes are approved by the Executive Committee.

Approval of the Minutes

Draft minutes are distributed to the Executive Committee with the current meeting agenda. The draft minutes will be disseminated as a Word document to facilitate edits. Members may submit typographical errors and edits to the Secretary or Executive Director which will be corrected immediately unless the edit significantly changes the meaning or content of the section. Any substantive changes, including additional information or details to provide context or intent, will be submitted to staff. Staff will merge all changes and comments submitted by Executive members into one document to facilitate discussion at the next meeting when the minutes are scheduled for approval. The inclusion of significant, substantive changes in the final document will be decided by the Executive Committee.

Public Comment

The "Public" is defined as any member of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as well as individuals not affiliated with the organization[DC2]. [JB3] We need to consider the role of liaisons – would they be considered "public" or would they have their own separate category? From time to time, an issue may arise which a liaison might know more about than other members of Exec, especially from the Chancellor's Office.

The public may comment on agenda items at the time the items are entertained. Public comments on an item will only be taken at the beginning of the discussion to ensure appropriate time management of the agenda item. Public comments will not be entertained once the Executive Committee begins deliberation on the agenda item. An Executive Committee member may make a motion to suspend the rules to allow comment from the public during the Executive Committee's deliberation on an agenda item.

The public may comment on items not included on the agenda during the "Public Comments" agenda item only. The Executive Committee may not discuss nor may they take action on public comments associated with items not on the agenda. If an Executive Committee member determines that the issue needs further discussion, the member may submit an agenda item dedicated to the issue at a subsequent meeting.

Public Comments are limited to 3 minutes per individual and 30 minutes per agenda item. Executive Committee members may make a motion to extend the time for public comments for individuals and per agenda item.

Individuals wishing to make public comments will submit a comment card with their name and the organization or entity that they represent which will be included in the minutes. A summary of public comments will be captured in the minutes. Written documentation of oral comments and written

documents submitted to the Executive Committee at a meeting will be noted in the minutes and will be included in an addendum or an appendix to the minutes on the website.

Other

- Provide accessibility for physically challenged
 - Meeting venue
 - Documents in the appropriate alternative format (upon request)

DRAFT



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Faculty Leadership Institute Program		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: IV. C.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Tonya Davis	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the Faculty Leadership Institute Program.

BACKGROUND:

The program for the Faculty Leadership Institute for 2014 is based upon the program from 2013. Exec members were asked to submit suggestions for the 2014 program which have been included in the draft. General sessions still need to be defined by Exec, and the breakout strand themes seem OK to keep. Please note that the Professional Development College would like to offer an orientation for those faculty participating in the PDC on Thursday morning. Also, the theme of Leadership, Empowerment and Voice was recommended last year as a standing theme for the institute. Is this still the will of Exec?

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Leadership, Empowerment and Voice
Faculty Leadership Institute
June 12-14~~5~~, 2014~~3~~

Thursday Morning dedicated to PDC pilot orientation for leadership strand

12:00 noon Lunch -

1:00 PM General Session - Welcome and State of the Senate -

1:30 PM Bases for Academic Senates: Laws and Regulations for Senate Purview

During these challenging times, when senate purview over “academic and professional matters” may be circumvented or ignored, local senate leaders need more than ever to have a clear understanding of the law and regulation that provides the basis for our participation in governance within California’s community colleges. This session will cover what you need to know to build a strong foundation in the 10+1 areas of faculty purview and the role of the academic senate in college policies and processes.

2:30 PM Break

2:45 PM Building Networks

3:00 PM Community College Budgets - Do we want to have a general session on budget?

Understanding the history of community college funding is important for senate presidents as they begin the process of understanding the local college and district budgets. In this presentation, California's unique and often challenging approach to funding community colleges will be addressed along with some tips for recognizing regular features of the local budget, reporting requirements, and how to access more information for local analysis.

5:00 PM Break

5:30 PM Reception -

Attendees will sign up for dinner at various restaurants near the hotel led by Executive Committee members.

Friday, June 14

8:30 AM General Session - Staying Connected to the Mothership: Who, What, Why and How of the ASCCC

You are not alone!! Being a senate leader shouldn't be an isolating experience. Maintaining a relationship with the statewide Academic Senate is invaluable in helping you do your everyday job as a senate leader as well as being essential in ensuring that local academic senate authority is protected. What does the ASCCC do? What can you expect from the ASCCC? How do you stay connected to the ASCCC? How can you participate in activities of the ASCCC? This session will focus on building an effective and mutually beneficial relationship with the statewide Academic Senate.

9:45 AM Break

10:00 AM First Breakout

NUTS AND BOLTS --

Empowering Local Senates: Resources for Developing Local Senate Authority

This interactive session will assist you in assuming new responsibilities and review the resources available to help you understand the legislation and regulations that affect academic senates; your unique responsibilities as a senate president or new faculty leader; as well as suggestions for ensuring that your colleagues can be most effective in meeting their academic and professional responsibilities.

PROCESSES --

Resolutions: Why All the Bother?

Resolutions approved by the delegates at plenary sessions are among the most significant directives the ASCCC receives. Local senates also use resolutions as a means to take policy positions, and to make recommendations on local policies and procedures. What is the statewide resolutions process? How are resolutions formulated, enacted, and tracked? How can resolutions, both statewide and locally, help direct policy and procedures at your home campus? Join a pair of self-proclaimed resolutions geeks to discuss these and other questions around resolutions.

IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS --

Challenges to Higher Education Now and in the Future

The landscape for higher education faculty and students is changing due to competing and conflicting interests and priorities. Join this breakout to discuss in depth the challenges that you see to our students, colleagues and programs. Share your insights about the future challenges that are peeking over the horizon. As senate leaders, it is important to keep your eyes on emerging issues as well as on those affecting us today.

11:15 PM Break

11:30 PM Lunch (scheduled with an extra 30 minutes to allow teams to meet) *Gardenia Room*

1:00 PM Second Breakout

NUTS AND BOLTS:

Budget 101 – A Primer

As a senate leader, you may not understand the basics of your district's budget. Do not be dismayed. Even seasoned accountants might find them confusing. What is a CCFS-311? P3? General Funds? Reserved Funds? Come learn the faculty role in the budget process and the key fiscal planning basics you need to unlock budget mysteries.

PROCESSES:

Faculty Qualifications, Equivalencies, and Assigning Courses to Disciplines (recommendation to keep)

Academic standards and state statute and regulations require that qualified faculty teach all courses. As senate president, you may have to resolve process and implementation issues for determining faculty qualifications, equivalencies, faculty service areas and course assignments within a variety of disciplines. Come learn about these issues and more.

IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS –

Growing a Strong Senate Family Tree

Are the same handful of faculty filling all the leadership roles on your campus? What are the barriers that prevent new faculty from taking on greater responsibility and what can you do about faculty who are reluctant to move out of leadership roles? When do you know it is time to move on? Come join us for a discussion about methods for growing a strong senate family tree. Learn why leadership succession and widespread faculty engagement are the Miracle-Gro® for a healthy senate and institution as a whole!

2:15 PM Break

3:00 PM Third Breakout

NUTS AND BOLTS:

Meetings, Motions and Manipulations: Deliberative Process at its Best (or Worst)

Organized bodies are formed to serve a purpose; processes are then adopted to assure effective progress while protecting the rights of participants and members. This breakout will focus on best practices and resources to run productive meetings and to ensure representatives carry out the business of the people in a fair and open manner. Topics include parliamentary processes, ground rules, laws affecting how we conduct meetings, and some strategies to help you thrive as a leader.

PROCESSES:

Accreditation: 2014 and Beyond

A topic of concern on virtually every California Community College campus is accreditation, and concerns over sanctions, recommendations, and the new standards remain a high priority for senate leaders. What are the issues facing colleges? What changes will the new standards bring? How can senate leaders work with the campus community to ensure the best possible results of the accreditation process?

IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS:- Breakout Room:

Drive Thru Education?: The Associate Degree and the Completion Agenda

More and more public debate on education is focused on minimizing unit accumulation while accelerating time to degree completion. This framing of higher education affects the perceived value of a college degree – or does it? Are we doing our students a disservice if we attempt to adhere to the “completion agenda”? Is a degree more than just an accumulation of units? If so, what is its value and can that value be measured? How do you ensure the instructional quality and integrity of a college degree? Join us for a candid discussion about the value of a degree in today’s society.

4:15 PM Break

4:30 PM Table Discussions and Problem-Solving in Specified Categories [bs1]

Participants will select up to four tables to visit and discuss the topics listed below.

Table Topic
Access to and Use of Data
Board policies and admin procedures
Curriculum Issues
Developing Processes
Governance Challenges
History of AB 1725
Legislation
New Title 5 regulations for Student Success Support Program and Funding
Online Issues
Professional Development
Scorecard
Senate/Union Relations

5:45 PM Dinner on your own

Saturday, June 15

8:30 AM Fourth Breakout

NUTS AND BOLTS -

Whose Role Is It? The Senate's? The Administration's? The Board's?

Senates, administrations, and boards each have roles to play in policy development and policy implementation processes. How do you know who has what role? Should we rely primarily or mutually agree? Have you read your college's Board Policy on the Senate? This breakout will be an interactive session exploring the roles each plays on our colleges and why knowing the role is essential in being an effective senate.

PROCESSES:

Program Initiation and Discontinuance

Prop 30 and the May Revise have stopped a lot of bloodletting, but they do not make everything rosy. Colleges are still taking a close look at the viability of many programs, especially in the career technical education areas. Yet other programs are being proposed (sometimes in response to grant opportunities or legislatively-driven mandates). Does your college have policies and processes in place for informing and making these decisions? Are they being followed? What is the senate's role in these decisions? Join us for a discussion about the issues surrounding program creation and discontinuance in these uncertain times.

IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS:

Ethical, Credible Senate Leaders

Senate leaders have the opportunity to model professional, dignified leadership at our colleges. But staying on the high road when leading colleagues can be challenging. People may perceive sinister goals from your actions, instead of the noble goals that drive you as a leader, and your actions are often challenged. Join this breakout for a deep discussion of how to maintain your integrity (and sanity!) while serving your faculty colleagues. Bring your ideas on what it means to be an ethical and credible leader, and join us for a conversation on how we as leaders can do the best possible job we were elected to do.

9:45 AM Break

10:00 AM General Session - Views of Participatory Governance -

12:00 NOON Adjournment

Topics to add/keep:

Brown Act

Nuts and Bolts

Effective Meetings

Senate Union Relations (or more general topic of how the senate works with other groups)

Newbie strand

Area Meetings



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Professional Development College		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: IV.D	
		Attachment:	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Michelle Grimes-Hillman	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	X
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will review the PDC Leadership Module pilot timeline for the Professional Development College.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

The Executive Committee approved the concept of the pilot project for a yearlong leadership program to California community college faculty at the January/February meeting. This pilot module would begin with June 2014 Leadership Institute and approximately 12 faculty members who would be a senate president within one year will be invited to participate.

Questions/Recommendations for the Executive Committee

1. Pilot of five participants is not representative of the system. Task force recommends a cohort of 10-15 faculty with a goal to balance out north/south, single/multi districts, rural/urban, college size, experience, etc. Only one faculty member per college would be desirable.
2. Cohorts should be placed into teams of three with a mentor assigned. Mentors could be current or former Executive Committee members or other seasoned faculty leaders. Mentors will be provided with checklists and guidelines for advising pilot participants.
3. Costs should reflect mandatory participation at both leadership institutes, plenary sessions, and one other institute (curriculum or accreditation or CTE)
4. Mandatory participation both leadership institutes, plenary sessions, and one other institute (curriculum or accreditation or CTE), area meetings, and two other events to be determined.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

5. Potential participants will fill out a “statement of interest” during session. This statement of interest will be circulated to the Executive Committee for feedback but the intention is to have the forms available at session (send of agenda item for draft statement).
6. Marketing should include spring breakout, Foundation announcements (Julie Bruno), Senate President Listserv, ASCCC President update, Rostrum article (post session).
7. Selected participants will attend an orientation (9AM-12PM at 2014 Leadership Institute) and will complete a contract outlining the individual learning needs of each participant.
8. Graduation will be held at the 2015 Leadership Institute with next incoming cohort.
9. Assessment should be evaluated by a combination of Executive Committee members and other experts. For example, Accreditation Chair would evaluate Accreditation assessments.
10. Oversight of the PDC would be a shared responsibility of the Executive Committee but should be specifically included in the formal assignment of at least one Executive Committee member.

The proposed timeline is subject to change to provide maximum flexibility for participants and connect with Senate events and other potential activities.

TIMELINE

Start: June 2014 at the Leadership Institute

The faculty members would participate in an orientation the morning of the Institute. This morning session will provide the participants with information about the pilot program as well as covers the purpose of the Leadership Institute, assign breakout sessions, and discuss assessment. Regularly held breakout sessions which might be assigned to these leaders are:

- Nuts and Bolts
- Effective Meetings
- Brown Act

The pilot participants will be assigned homework prior to the event including reading the “Empowering Local Senate Handbook” and research on the Senate website. Assessment will include responding to the Event survey after the event, a short report (two pages) on what they learned at the Institute (or some other topic) and/or a possible discussion board.

July 2014 at the Curriculum Institute (optional Institute)

The pilot participants will arrive early and discuss the Curriculum Institute program, homework, and assessment. Each pilot participant will be assigned homework prior to the event including reading Senate papers related to curriculum as well as research on the Curriculum website. Assessment will

include responding to the Event survey after the event, a short report (two pages) on what they learned at the Institute (or some other topic) and/or a possible discussion board.

August through September 2014

Pilot participants will attend an ASCCC regional meeting in their area (e.g., curriculum, CTE, or others) OR research their local Student Success or Equity Plan. Their homework will include researching related Senate papers and relevant ASCCC resolutions, and developing a two-page document sharing their findings as related to their own campus. Assessment will be to prepare a short article for the possible inclusion in an October *Rostrum* article or for posting on the website.

October 2014

Pilot participants will attend their area meeting and provide a very brief update about their experience with the pilot. Homework will include preparation for the plenary session including reviewing the Senate Bylaws, Resolutions Process, and all other Session related materials, which will be provide to them. They will also work very closely with their senate president to participate in the plenary session. Assessment will be to complete the Senate event survey, and to develop a two page document that compares and contrasts the Senate resolution process with local process.

November 2014

Pilot participants will attend the fall plenary session. They will be provided with a list of required breakouts, which might include MQ/Equivalency, Disciplines List, Nuts and Bolts, I'm New, as well as attending the delegate session, resolution writing, Area meetings, and any discipline hearings. Participants will be required to stay through resolution voting on Saturday. Homework will include a review of all session materials (papers, resolutions, processes, etc.) and might include a discussion board on questions related to the above session on topics such as local equivalency processes or responsibilities of a delegate. Assessment will include responding to the event survey, a written report to their local senate (working with their local senate president), and a two-page report of lessons learned.

Participants will check in with mentors to re-evaluate contract status and learning needs

December – January 2014

Pilot participant will be required to read selected papers/articles, attend a leadership or CCC webinar or professional leadership conference or Board of Governor/Consultation Council meeting, and write short 2 – 3 page report about their first six months in the pilot based on a developed outline or leadership book/article. Assessment will be determined based on which homework participants decided to complete and might include survey, *Rostrum* article, or short brief.

February 2015 (Choose one)

Pilot participants will attend the Accreditation Institute, the Academic Academy, or other leadership event. Depending on which event participants select, breakout sessions will be identified such as soft skills for leadership (leadership conference), ACCJC Standard newbie breakout (Accreditation Institute), or other session to continue their leadership development. Homework will include a two-page paper about what they hope to gain from the event and how that will help them in their leadership journey. Assessment might be a discussion board where they respond to a series of questions such as "Identify your local accreditation process including any recommendations your college is currently considering," or "Evaluate your own leadership skills and provide areas of excellence and improvement, as well as how you hope to develop your own skills."

March 2015

Pilot participants will attend a Senate Regional Meetings, professional leadership conference, or other activity associated with leadership development. Homework will be a two page paper incorporating something learned during the past nine months and how this lesson will influence their leadership style or impact their local senate. Participants will also attend their local area meeting and review all the Session materials including the resolutions, papers, elections process, etc. Assessment will be an evaluation of the two-page homework assignment.

April 2015

Pilot participants will attend the plenary session, participate in assigned breakouts, and stay through voting on Saturday. Homework will be to review the session material (resolutions, papers, programs, etc.) prior to the event. Assessment will be responding to the event evaluation, a two-page paper summarizing their experience, and a discussion board posting answering several questions such as what are the lessons learned, the "ah ha moments," observations, improvements, etc.

Participants will check in with mentors to re-evaluate contract status and learning needs

Post session: The Executive committee will examine continuation and/or expansion of the PDC.

May 2015

Pilot participants will participate in a webinar on targeted local senate issues such as "getting others to volunteer", "finding your successor before you start," "conflict management," or any other subject that has not been covered since the June Leadership Institute. Homework: each participant will be required to develop a *Rostrum* article about their experience with the pilot project, including

events, homework, assessment, etc. Assessment will be a final survey (to be developed) on the pilot project and contain questions about areas for improvement.

June 2015 at the Leadership Institute
--

The Leadership Pilot will conclude at the 2015 Leadership Institute. Prior to the Institute opening general session, pilot participants will meet to discuss their overall experience and prepare for the event. A general session will be dedicated to their graduation and sharing of their experience.

DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTEREST:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges invites interested faculty to participate in a yearlong leadership module to develop incoming Senate leaders for the California community colleges. This module, the first in the ASCCC's Professional Development College, will begin with June 2014 Leadership Institute. Faculty members who will be a local senate president within two years are invited to apply.

Statement of Interest

Name:

College:

Discipline:

Contact Information (phone and email):

Current Senate position, if applicable:

Please provide a short statement about the strengths within leadership that you possess, and those that you would be interested in improving upon (ie, running meetings, delegating responsibility, knowledge of budgets, etc)



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Spring Session Planning		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: IV. E.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss final planning for the Spring Plenary Session.

BACKGROUND:

The Executive Committee will discuss the final plans for the Spring Plenary Session.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: ASCCC Governance, Roles and Responsibilities		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: V. A	
		Attachment: ASCCC Bylaws	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	J. Bruno, M. Grimes-Hillman and J. Stanskas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will determine whether a special meeting in May, facilitated by an individual well versed in nonprofit organizations, is necessary to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Executive Director, the President, and members of the Executive Committee as well as address specific governance issues to improve the functioning of the organization. Additionally, the Executive Committee will consider specific actions to immediately improve the functioning of the Executive Committee.

BACKGROUND:

Defining the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges - Background

The Academic Senate is defined in our bylaws, Article 1B.

Academic Senate: As defined in Title 5 “An Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been established through ratification by local academic senates or faculty councils so that the community college faculty of California may have a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of state policies on academic and professional matters” (Title 5, Section 53206, California Code of Regulations).

The Academic Senate also holds nonprofit organizational status - 501(c)(6). The IRS defines such an organization as:

An IRC 501(c)(6) organization is a membership organization characteristically supported by dues. While such an organization may receive a substantial portion or even the primary part of its income from non-member sources, membership support, both in the

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

form of dues and involvement in the organization's activities, must be at a meaningful level.

The IRS requirements to meet the 501(c)(6) status are:

1. It must be an association of persons having some common business interest and its purpose must be to promote this common business interest;
2. It must be a membership organization and have a meaningful extent of membership support;
3. It must not be organized for profit;
4. No part of its net earnings may inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual;
5. Its activities must be directed to the improvement of business conditions of one or more lines of business (discussed under "**The 'Line of Business' Requirement**," page 21) as distinguished from the performance of particular services for individual persons;
6. Its primary activity does not consist of performing particular services for individual persons; and
7. Its purpose must not be to engage in a regular business of a kind ordinarily carried on for profit, even if the business is operated on a cooperative basis or produces only sufficient income to be self-sustaining.

It is acceptable to fail to meet one of these, but to consider the entirety of the organization.

One of the primary responsibilities of a 501(c)(6) is to protect against inurement, meaning that no person may profit financially or receive special benefit from the actions of the organization. It does not preclude some benefits to members. So one of our responsibilities is to ensure that no one is personally profiting from the actions of the Senate.

California law requires a nonprofit to have a "Board of Directors" that we would call the Executive Committee. We can delegate authority to manage the affairs of the Senate, but not the authority to govern. We are not obligated to delegate anything, though it would be impossible not to delegate the day-to-day operations and perform all of our duties.

Since the ASCCC is a 501 (c)6 organization, responsibilities of the Executive Committee are sometimes more similar to local boards of trustees than to local academic senates. For example, the Executive Committee is responsible for the following:

1. setting the strategic direction of the organization
2. aligning actions with the ASCCC mission and purpose
3. ensuring effective organizational planning
4. monitoring and ensuring adequate resources
5. managing and allocating resources effectively
6. determining and monitoring the organization's program and services
7. enhancing the organization's public image

8. selecting the executive director and assessing his or her performance²

Roles and Responsibilities

The ASCCC bylaws and policies, including job descriptions, delineate the roles and responsibilities of the various individuals in the organization. However, there are discrepancies in the various documents. For example, our bylaws indicate “[t]he Executive Committee shall consist of the officers and ten representatives. All Executive Committee members must retain their faculty status to continue in office” (Article IV, Section 1). However, the Job Description policy states that the Executive Director will “[s]erve as an ex officio, non-voting member of the Executive, Budget, Standards and Practices, Publications, and Resolutions Committees.” Additionally, the ASCCC bylaws provide the president the opportunity to “authorize expenditures.” It is not clear if the intention of this bylaw is to permit all expenditures under the purview of the president or only those that have already been budgeted and approved by the Executive Committee. Given that the fiduciary responsibility lies with every member of the Executive Committee, this clause must be clarified. The alignment of all bylaws, policies, and practices is critical to ensure the effective governance of the ASCCC.

Governance Issues

Throughout the 2013-2014 academic year, the ASCCC Executive Committee has experienced a wide variety of issues with internal governance. These problems have impeded the work and the effectiveness of the ASCCC as demonstrated by the inability to complete agendas.

The following list, though not exhaustive, identifies some concepts and concerns that may assist in ensuring that each member of the Executive Committee is able to fulfill his/her duties as stated in the Academic Senate constitution, by-law and policies.

1. Executive Committee Meeting Efficiency
2. The Perception of Openness and Transparency
3. Communication
4. Clarification of Roles
5. Conduct of Executive Committee Members

Many of these issues left unresolved, may result over time in fiscal liabilities. These issues may have an impact on the budget and the future direction of the organization. As noted above, members of the Executive Committee have fiduciary and ethical responsibilities. All members of the Executive Committee have a responsibility to ensure and promote the health of the ASCCC.

² Adapted from Ten Basic Responsibilities for Nonprofit Boards located on:
http://www.nami.org/Content/NavigationMenu/NAMI_Center_for_Excellence/Tools_for_Excellence/Governance_Tools.htm

Specific Actions to Improve Executive Committee Meetings for Immediate Implementation

To address meeting efficiency and communication, the following suggestions could be immediately implemented:

1. Amend the Agenda Item form to include a check box indicating whether the item is a priority or may be addressed at subsequent meetings. Items marked "priority" will be placed in descending order of importance (e.g., "Old Business" will list priority action items, move to action items without priority and conclude with information or discussion only items).
2. Reinstate the oral reports of both the President and the Executive Director at the beginning of the agenda to provide context for subsequent agenda items.
3. Include in the President's Report information on issues and concerns brought to Consultation Council and other statewide governing committees.
4. Appoint a timekeeper at every meeting to enforce time constraints.

Specific Actions to Address Roles and Responsibilities

The Executive Committee has struggled for over a year to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the committee and its employees. This year we have found several inconsistencies in our by-laws, policies, and practices that should be reconciled. Some of that work could be given to a committee once specific direction and clarity from the Executive Committee is evident. Without some general understanding among the Executive Committee members, it will be impossible for a committee to be successful with such an assignment. Some of our ultimate recommendations may require a change to the bylaws. That would require action at plenary session by the delegates. It would be prudent to address inconsistencies in our bylaws and policies to ensure the integrity and consistency of the organization.

It is suggested that the Executive Committee hold a special meeting in May, facilitated by an individual well versed in nonprofit organizations, to help the Executive Committee clarify the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the Executive Director, the President, and members. In addition, the Executive Committee should endeavor to provide guidance that will address governance issues to improve the functioning of the organization including a reconciliation of our bylaws, policies, and practices before delegating that work to a committee.

<http://www.asccc.org/about/bylaws>

<http://asccc.org/content/executive-committee-information> (Job Descriptions)

<http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-tege/eotopick03.pdf>

[http://www.adlercolvin.com/pdf/nonprofit_governance/What_Every_Nonprofit_Board_Member_Should_Know...%20\(00304468\).pdf](http://www.adlercolvin.com/pdf/nonprofit_governance/What_Every_Nonprofit_Board_Member_Should_Know...%20(00304468).pdf)



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Budget and Finance Committee Items		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: IV. B.	
		Attachment:	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Wheeler North	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	X
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval recommendations on the 2013 – 2014 Budget.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

The Budget and Finance Committee met on March 20, 2014, and make the following recommendations. Please see attached minutes for more details.

ASCCC Budget and Finance Committee 03.20.14 Recommendations

1. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends the Executive Committee create a new grant reports section for Executive Committee agenda.
2. Executive Committee Orientation
The Budget and Finance Committee recommends the Executive Committee have a high level conversation about the ASCCC's involvement in grant activities. Factoring into this conversation are the following points:
 - what is currently being done through grants to include updates on C-ID and SCP
 - differentiate between term limited grants and ongoing grants such as the ASCCC grant that exists as a line item in the California Budget.
 - other options are there to further the ASCCC's work.
 - ongoing component of defining and updating the ASCCC's priorities.
3. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends that orientation include a full review of all ASCCC policies including expense reimbursement policies.
4. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends several budgetary adjustments to allow authorization of payments.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

- Statewide Careers Pathways 2012/13 funds have been authorized to increase the duration for expenditures to June 2015. These funds should be rolled into the 2013/2014 budget to fund current grant operations and unspent allocations will be rolled into 2014/15. (This will have no net effect on ASCCC operations)
 - Professional Services need to be altered to reflect the following:
 - Move \$50,000 from Salaries to Professional Services to reflect the elimination of the CFO position and the outsourcing these services to the Tax Office, a financial services company.
 - Increase the budget in Professional Services by \$20,000 to cover the currently unallocated costs of legal and mediation fees. (This item will increase the current adjusted budget deficit from \$-36,722 to \$-56,722, which will reflect in a reduction of the year-end reserves by that amount.)
 - Executive Activities needs to be adjusted to accommodate the unallocated costs for regional meetings. This will require moving \$9,500 from Field Activities to the following items within that category: Regional Meetings, \$7,200; Presentations \$300; and Area Meetings \$2,000.
5. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends that a policy and process be established for submitting agenda items or any other actions that encumber expenditures not authorized within the budget.
 6. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends the ASCCC keep in its reserves at least six months prudent operating expenses (amount to be adjusted annually as calculated by staff.) If approved by the Executive Committee, a policy will need to be developed that provides direction about when the Executive Committee can use its reserves.
 7. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends that the ASCCC conduct an audit this year, particularly because of the CFO functions being outsourced. An audit is the best way to ensure that all existing and new processes are functioning properly.
 8. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends providing public agendas and possibly attempting scheduling coordination with Executive Committee meetings to better allow public/member attendance at Budget and Finance Committee meetings.

The Executive Committee request to consider B&F Committee composition did not include specific evidence indicating any problems so the Committee was not entirely clear about goals are being sought. Since the committee already represents 1/3 of the Executive Committee and they only make recommendations to the Executive Committee it was not clear what adding another Executive Committee member would do in terms of transparency or oversight. The only upside is that this might give the person(s) an opportunity to learn, but this opportunity would then really be something that all Executive Committee members should have. Adding members of the faculty or public would have the added burden of a steep learning curve along with additional travel costs and it is not clear what or how this would benefit the process, particularly since anyone can participate at the Executive Committee level. In those instances where specialized expertise is needed beyond the capacity of the Treasurer or Executive Director such expertise can be sought.

Budget Meeting

March 20, 2014 – 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Senate Office

Attendees: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, David Morse, Wheeler North, and Beth Smith.

1. Budget Performance

a. Dues: Dues from all colleges have been received.

b. Events

Staff has done a great job in events—each event has made revenue.

i. Curriculum

1. Total attendees: 329
2. Net revenue: \$72,541

ii. Fall Plenary Session

1. Total attendees: 291
2. Net revenue: \$24,898.41

iii. Accreditation

1. Total attendees: 159
2. Net revenue: \$38,876

c. Grants

i. SCP – Status: Budget approved and reflected in budget

Budget and work plan have been approved and are now extended until 2015. The Officers need to discuss what will happen in 2015 when the funds for SCP are expended. Once these funds are expended, the ASCCC will lose about three staff members.

The Officers discussed the future grants and the need to have a conversation with the Executive Committee about priorities and whether or not grants are the best method to fund our priorities. The committee recommends to Exec that at Orientation there should be a conversation about the role of grants and funding the priorities of the Senate.

Issues for discussion: our role in grants, SCP/C-ID, partnership with other grants, and future funding.

ii. Other Grants

1. The Officers discussed the appointments to grants/task forces/advisory.

Smith provided the following grant partnerships and appointments:

- a. Open Educational Resources, (3) CSU
- b. Common Assessment Initiative, Online Course Exchange, Education Planning – 32 people (CCC)
- c. Natural Governors Association (4) -- No costs
- d. BS Workgroup (3)
- e. Student Success Center – number of faculty unknown

Concerns were raised regarding the possibility of faculty appointees claiming costs from the grantor and ASCCC because this has happened in the past. By consensus, the staff will monitor appointments in an effort to reduce possible duplication of reimbursements.

Reporting back: The question was raised regarding how the Executive Committee will receive updates about the grant activities noted above. B. Smith informed Officers that currently Executive Committee members sit on all the above groups and will provide a written report after each meeting. The committee recommends to Exec that an item will be placed on the Executive Committee agenda for reports from the Exec member leads or other appointees each meeting.

d. North noted that the following are areas where we are currently over budget or no budget exists.

- i. Legal Fees: Currently, there are over \$12,000 for legal fees (as of February and not including mediation). Members discussed adding a budget to the professional services category for attorney fees and determined that \$20,000 might be sufficient.
- ii. Conferences: \$6,000 over budget (This is for our attendance at non-ASCCC conferences as appointed by the President).
- iii. Regional meetings: \$2,600 fall curriculum regionals (spring regional meetings costs unknown as of 2/28 snapshot). The budget performance was discussed per the above and the budget performance summary. Adams recommended several adjustments detailed in the budget summary including updated the SCP, moving CFO funds from salaries to the professional services for the Tax Office funding, correction to the Noncredit Task Force.

2. The Officers discussed fiscal responsibility including reserves, audit, and expense authorization. By consensus, the Officers recommend that the Executive Committee maintain a six-month reserve with the staff calculating each year. The committee also recommends hiring Waddell to perform an audit again this year. North stressed that an audit was important because of the outsourcing of the current accounting processes. The Officers also discussed the need to ensure that any activities being implemented by the Executive Committee or any member need to be accounted for in the current budget or the budget needs to be updated to reflect the additional expenses. The Budget and Finance Committee recommends that a policy and process be established for submitting agenda items or any other actions that encumber expenditures not authorized within the budget.

3. Tax Office Update

Adams shared how the transition from the office to the Tax Office has been working. Since November, she and other office staff worked on the transition and have been pleased with the process. During this process, both the original accounting system and the new system were mirrored to ensure that the process was accurate and transitioned smoothly. The new system has a

number of new features (dashboard, reports, online access, etc.), which improve accounting efficiency and processes. She noted that she has reviewed the Accounting policies to ensure that no policy changes are required. While no policies have been changed because of this process, some language does need to be revised to replace the responsibility of the CFO and add the Tax Office. It is anticipated that the revisions will be brought to the Executive Committee for the discussion and approval at Orientation.

4. Office Search and Location

Adams updated members on the office lease and possible relocation. After reviewing locations and visiting over seven locations, three proposals have been sent to the property managers of three possible locations (Natomas, One Capitol Mall, or current landlord). While these three proposals have been sent to the property managers, the property that is most promising and will result in a significant savings is the Natomas location. This location is smaller and offers a rental rate of \$1.85 per sq ft (current rate is \$2.25 and the space is much larger. In addition, the Natomas location also has free parking. The overall cost savings including moving costs is \$173k. The Officers recommend that this opportunity for cost savings be taken.

5. BCP Update: B. Smith provided the officers with an update on the BCP she and Wheeler have prepared. This BCP requests \$150k for the Senate. A letter will be sent to the Department of Finance with the same request.

6. Committee Composition Item—Members discussed the composition of the B&FC and was reminded that the item was brought forward to the Executive Committee to increase the transparency of the organization's finances. The Executive Committee's request to consider B&F Committee composition did not include specific evidence indicating any problems so the Committee was not entirely clear about goals are being sought. Concern was raised regarding the learning curve associated with bringing in members from the field or Executive Committee members. Adding another Executive Committee might not work either as all Executive Committee members need to be educated about the budget. Alternatively, the Officers felt that calendaring the B&FC meetings and alerting the Executive Committee members when they are held might work to increase transparency and educate Executive Committee members – such as holding the B&FC prior to the Executive Committee meeting.

7. Expense Reimbursement: Three officers (Adams, Morse, and North) discussed the request to allow flexibility for the expense reimbursement as request by Stanskas, particularly the issue related to safety. By consensus, the current expense reimbursement process will be maintained. However, Executive Committee members will be informed that if they feel that their safety will be compromised (e.g., arriving 11:00 p.m. at an airport parking lot), then they should park closer and make a note on their expense form.

Income Statement Budget Comparison

Income Statement

Year Ending June 30, 2014

	Actual 02/28/2014	Approved Budget August 23, 2013	Proposed Budget April 9, 2014
REVENUE			
Membership Dues	289,565.07	296,995.00	296,995.00
<i>Program Fees</i>			
Fall Session	93,295.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Spring Session	12,475.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Accreditation	74,395.00	42,350.00	42,350.00
Curriculum Institute	130,940.00	136,700.00	136,700.00
Leadership Institute	6,525.00	0.00	0.00
Academic Academy	44,758.00	33,000.00	33,000.00
Total Program Fees	362,388.00	362,050.00	362,050.00
<i>Grant Revenue</i>			
<i>Federal Grants</i>			
Vocational Ed	0.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
Total Federal Grants	0.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
<i>State Grants</i>			
Governor's Grant	468,000.00	468,000.00	468,000.00
C-ID	0.00	192,308.00	211,538.00
SB70-SCP	116,183.00	938,738.00	932,736.00
Total State Grants	584,183.00	1,599,046.00	1,612,274.00
<i>District Grants</i>			
Basic Skills	0.00	0.00	0.00
NonCredit Taskforce	0.00	1,997.00	10,000.00
ICAS Competency Statements	0.00	45,000.00	45,000.00
Total District Grants	0.00	46,997.00	55,000.00
Total Grant Revenue	584,183.00	1,746,043.00	1,767,274.00
Donations	0.00	0.00	0.00
<i>Other Income</i>			
In-Kind Income	0.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Other Revenue	0.00	0.00	0.00
Interest Income	241.21	0.00	0.00
Recovery of Bad Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Other Income	241.21	20,000.00	20,000.00
TOTAL REVENUE	1,236,377.28	2,425,088.00	2,446,319.00
EXPENSES			
<i>Executive</i>			
Instructional Salaries			
Reassign Time			

President, Senate	46,223.79	46,224.00	46,224.00
Vice President, Senate		10,580.28	10,580.28
Secretary, Senate	31,395.00	12,558.00	12,558.00
Treasurer, Senate	8,161.13	8,161.08	8,161.08
Faculty Coordinator, C-ID	0.00	13,000.00	13,000.00
Faculty Coordinator, SB70	0.00	104,715.00	104,715.00
Executive Board, Senate	113,990.69	109,418.00	109,418.00
Committees, SB70	0.00	0.00	0.00
Faculty, OER	0.00	0.00	0.00
<i>Total Reassign Time</i>	<i>199,770.61</i>	<i>304,656.36</i>	<i>304,656.36</i>
<i>Stipends</i>			
Stipends, Senate	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stipends, C-ID	84,872.00	69,000.00	89,000.00
Stipends, SB70	24,850.00	21,900.00	121,900.00
<i>Total Stipends</i>	<i>109,722.00</i>	<i>90,900.00</i>	<i>210,900.00</i>
<i>Total Instructional Salaries</i>	<i>309,492.61</i>	<i>395,556.36</i>	<i>515,556.36</i>
<i>Executive Activities</i>			
Exec Meetings	43,186.90	60,000.00	60,000.00
Orientation	7,827.24	0.00	0.00
Technical Assistance	-1,334.70	0.00	0.00
Local Senate Visits	182.98	1,000.00	1,000.00
Field Activities	171.45	10,000.00	500.00
Presentations	136.96	0.00	300.00
Regional Meetings	2,593.36	0.00	7,200.00
Area Meetings	970.25	0.00	2,000.00
Committees	14,731.68	29,000.00	29,000.00
<i>Total Executive Activities</i>	<i>68,466.12</i>	<i>100,000.00</i>	<i>100,000.00</i>
<i>Total Executive</i>	<i>377,958.73</i>	<i>495,556.36</i>	<i>615,556.36</i>
<i>Liasons</i>			
<i>Chancellor's Office</i>			
CO Committees	0.00	0.00	0.00
CO Task Forces	44.00	0.00	0.00
CO Advisory Groups	501.81	0.00	0.00
CO Consultation	13,720.97	30,000.00	30,000.00
CO Board of Governors	5,586.86	5,000.00	5,000.00
<i>Total Chancellor's Office</i>	<i>19,853.64</i>	<i>35,000.00</i>	<i>35,000.00</i>

<i>Groups</i>			
COFO	0.00	0.00	0.00
FACCC	682.36	1,500.00	1,500.00
ICC	0.00	0.00	0.00
ICAS	4,141.55	6,000.00	6,000.00
RP Group	1,680.88	2,500.00	2,500.00
<i>Total Groups</i>	<u>6,504.79</u>	<u>10,000.00</u>	<u>10,000.00</u>
<i>Conferences</i>			
Registration	2,404.01	4,000.00	4,000.00
Hotel	3,331.85	0.00	0.00
Travel	1,919.00	0.00	0.00
SCP Conferences and Presentations	2,433.13	0.00	0.00
<i>Total Conferences</i>	<u>10,087.99</u>	<u>4,000.00</u>	<u>4,000.00</u>
<i>Total Liasons</i>	<u>36,446.42</u>	<u>49,000.00</u>	<u>49,000.00</u>
<i>Programs</i>			
<i>Plenary Session</i>			
Fall Session	68,506.49	60,225.00	60,225.00
Spring Session	0.00	66,540.00	66,540.00
<i>Total Plenary Session</i>	<u>68,506.49</u>	<u>126,765.00</u>	<u>126,765.00</u>
<i>Institutes</i>			
Academic Academy	4,159.38	33,000.00	33,000.00
Accreditation Institute	35,755.37	35,720.00	35,720.00
Curriculum Institute	61,434.95	94,295.00	94,295.00
Faculty Leadership	1,500.00	0.00	0.00
Vocational Leadership	4,937.82	100,000.00	100,000.00
<i>Total Institutes</i>	<u>107,787.52</u>	<u>263,015.00</u>	<u>263,015.00</u>
<i>Grant Meetings</i>			
Grant Meetings, C-ID - 5000	4,493.89	10,708.00	10,708.00
Grant Meetings, SCP - 5000	20,177.59	543,081.00	158,079.00
Grant Meetings, Noncredit TF	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grant Meetings, BSI	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grant Meetings, Competency Statemer	460.18	0.00	0.00
<i>Total Grant Meetings</i>	<u>25,131.66</u>	<u>553,789.00</u>	<u>168,787.00</u>
<i>Advertising & Publications</i>			
Website, Senate	1,527.54	70,000.00	70,000.00
Website, C-ID - 4000	1,887.96	32,000.00	32,000.00
Website, SCP - 4000	29,003.74	0.00	0.00
ICAS Competency Statements		45,000.00	45,000.00
Publications	17,422.81	20,000.00	20,000.00
<i>Total Advertising & Publications</i>	<u>49,842.05</u>	<u>167,000.00</u>	<u>167,000.00</u>
<i>Total Programs</i>	<u>251,267.72</u>	<u>1,110,569.00</u>	<u>725,567.00</u>

Salaries and Benefits

Staff Salaries	117,837.40	248,869.00	198,869.00
Staff Salaries, C-ID - 2000	43,028.36	48,000.00	48,000.00
Staff Salaries, SCP - 2000	229,741.18	55,366.00	280,366.00
Benefits	31,060.09	28,033.00	28,033.00
Benefits, C-ID - 3000	8,776.98	9,200.00	9,200.00
Benefits, SCP - 3000	43,081.14	8,000.00	72,000.00
Benefits - Flex	3,490.10	0.00	0.00
Staff Training/Development	1,086.60	7,000.00	7,000.00
Payroll Processing	503.20	3,144.00	3,144.00
Payroll Taxes - Employer	3,354.08	5,408.00	5,408.00
Total Salaries and Benefits	481,959.13	413,020.00	652,020.00

Nonpersonnel

Equipment

Equipment Lease / Rental	2,358.60	7,860.00	7,860.00
Equipment Purchase	12.18	15,000.00	15,000.00
Maintenance	1,351.59	1,620.00	1,620.00
Repairs	-53.21	0.00	0.00
Parking	3,672.30	4,275.00	4,275.00
IT/Software	48.13	0.00	0.00
Total Equipment	7,389.59	28,755.00	28,755.00

Office

Insurance	218.33	9,210.00	9,210.00
Phones - Office	343.25	1,800.00	1,800.00
Phones - Remote	1,619.71	6,780.00	6,780.00
Internet	68.85	0.00	0.00
Postage / Shipping	310.93	0.00	0.00
Subscriptions	1,357.25	2,000.00	2,000.00
Rent / Lease	21,490.32	87,919.00	87,919.00
Supplies	1,668.80	3,324.00	3,324.00
Supplies, C-ID - 4000	644.84	2,000.00	2,000.00
Supplies, SCP - 4000	3,940.99	5,676.00	45,676.00
Copying	0.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Professional Services	21,026.32	22,800.00	92,800.00
Other Operating, C-ID - 5000	16,517.26	8,400.00	7,630.00
Other Operating, SCP - 5000	93,306.41	200,000.00	150,000.00
Remote Office Space	672.80	564.00	564.00
Total Office	163,186.06	370,473.00	429,703.00

Business Expenses

Bad Debt Expense	355.00	0.00	0.00
Bank / Finance Charges	438.45	240.00	240.00
Depreciation Expense	0.00	2,200.00	2,200.00
Loss on Disposal of Assets	0.00	0.00	0.00
Miscellaneous	0.00	0.00	0.00
Credit Card Processing Fees	4,270.26	0.00	0.00
Uncategorized Expense	1,528.60	0.00	0.00
<i>Total Business Expenses</i>	<u>6,592.31</u>	<u>2,440.00</u>	<u>2,440.00</u>
<i>Total Nonpersonnel</i>	<u>659,127.09</u>	<u>814,688.00</u>	<u>1,112,918.00</u>
TOTAL EXPENSES	<u>1,324,799.96</u>	<u>2,469,813.36</u>	<u>2,503,041.36</u>
Total Income Statement	<u>-88,422.68</u>	<u>-44,725.36</u>	<u>-56,722.36</u>

