Name of Council/Team: Executive Leadership Team	

Date: May 14, 2018 **Time:** 3:00-5:00 pm	Location/Room #: Aquarium CR Call-In Number: N/A Call-In Code: N/A

Facilitator(s): Thomas Greene

Timekeeper: TBD

Note Taker: Sue McCoy

Attendees:
Thomas Greene, College President
Lisa Aguilera Lawrenson, Vice President of Instruction
Robin Neal, Vice President of Student Services
Kuldeep Kaur, Vice President, Administration
Adam Karp, Dean, Planning, Research, & Technology
Gary Aguilar, Academic Senate President
~~Tony Giusti, Academic Senate Past President~~
Alisa, Shubb, Academic Senate Vice President
Janay Lovering, Academic Senate Secretary
Olga Prizhbilov, Classified Senate President
~~Tamara Floyd, Classified Senate Past President~~
~~Nicole Williams, Classified Senate Vice President~~
Deborah Hernandez, Associated Student Body President
~~Earl Crouchley, Associated Student Body Vice President~~
Scott Crow, Public Information Officer

Objective of meeting:
To receive and discuss the recommendations of the Institutional Effectiveness Council related to the Integrated Planning Improvement project team. To present for discussion and input the project initiation of four new and three renewed project teams for the 2018-19 academic year. To consider the recommendations of the Student Success Council related to the IPaSS, Start Right, and Clarify Program Paths project team reports.

Supporting Resources:
• Meeting Minutes from May 7, 2018
• Student Success Council-Project Team Recommendation
• Project Initiation Documents for four new and three renewed project teams

REPORT ON ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING:

Topic/Question	Person Responsible	Status/Contextual Notes
N/A		

DECISIONS ON ACTION ITEMS: Outcomes and notes about decisions made and next steps required on items that had been previously discussed.

Topic/Question	Consensus Outcome & Decision	Contextual Notes/Next Steps

Approval of May 7, 2018 Notes	Thumbs up	

Student Success Council recommendation related to Clarify Program Paths, IPaSS and Start Right Project Teams	Consensus Reached w/three sideways thumbs	**T. Greene**
		- Any concerns expressed prior to meeting to be addressed
		- Concerns centered around letter from student services administration
		- Discussed at monthly meeting with administrators and academic senate officers
		- Unintended concerns – are we really committed to doing the work?
		- Concern over specificity in reports
		- Review of redacted passages
		- Concerns related to resource allocation need to be addressed but not needed in SSC recommendation
		- We've committed ourselves to the work involved in improving our students' experience
		- It's a risk – risk requires trust
		- SSC will need guidance from ELT on overseeing work/recommendations
		- Following redaction, faculty still expressed concerns
		  - Did council veer from recommendations?
		  - Are we really serious about making the changes
		- Will the administration make arbitrary decisions moving us away from report recommendations
		- Need language to ensure that doesn't happen
		- Everyone agrees with intent and work of reports
		- But decisions about how to move resources around require flexibility
		
		G. Aguilar
		- Spoke to faculty leads regarding SS admin letter brought forward
		- That process weakened the trust
		- Now reading with distrusting eyes
		- Need acknowledgement first of how quickly trust was lost
		- Leads given the opportunity to debrief and provide improvement for subsequent years
		- Truly surprised at emotional response
		
		L. Lawrenson

		▪ Need further discussion on process concerns ▪ Lack of training G. Aguilar ▪ Concerns related to formal document being brought forward ▪ Perhaps second meeting or elongated meeting to provide opportunity to understand/digest ▪ First attempt at new governance process involved most important work of college T. Greene ▪ Thought about concerns over week / weekend ▪ How do we make decisions – they're made all the time ▪ Made where it makes the most sense ▪ Council & ELT would monitor ▪ Have history of addressing concerns as brought forward ▪ Take responsibility that letter wasn't helpful ▪ Learn from it and recognize it moving forward ▪ Intent was never to jeopardize trust and hurt people G. Aguilar ▪ Goals of governance process was to eliminate silos ▪ Some never felt the divide more than now – instruction vs. student services; faculty vs. administrators T. Greene ▪ Only three months into new governance process ▪ We're still building and refining R. Neal ▪ Analogy – think about what a child looks like at 3 months - totally dependent ▪ That's where we are with this process ▪ Still need dependence on one another ▪ No intention of harm or hurt ▪ Felt we needed to feed the baby an extra bottle and caused upset ▪ We'll learn from this

		▪ Not trying to make light of situation but we're nurturing a life A. Shubb ▪ Baby was premature ▪ We had timing issues R. Neal ▪ With new process, we're not going to do everything right the first time G. Aguilar ▪ Doing a thumbs sideways just to reflect some concerns expressed by faculty but ready to move forward A. Shubb ▪ In consensus, you don't all have to agree; just agree enough to support moving forward ▪ Can move forward with sideways thumb D. Hernandez ▪ Need clarification on recommendations and redacted letter ▪ Recommendations taken seriously and concerns expressed/handled by administrators or ELT? ▪ Clarification on process T. Greene ▪ Concerns are moved up the chain ▪ No prescribed formula on resolving every concern D. Hernandez ▪ Recommendations can be modified as they implemented? T. Greene ▪ Recommendations can be modified ▪ Current systems may not support all recommendations *Consensus vote taken* T Greene ▪ We're committing ourselves to redesigning the student's experience ▪ Appreciate leadership and work that got us here

DISCUSSION ITEMS: Notes about new items that had not been previously discussed. Discussion of items may relate to information sharing or items upon which action may need to be taken at a future meeting.		
Topic	**Person Responsible**	**Contextual Notes/Next Steps**
What are the recommendations of the Institutional Effectiveness Council's Integrated Planning Improvement project team?	Kuldeep Kaur & Alisa Shubb (15 min)	▪ Reviewed IPI team's model – consensus moving forward to build system as mocked up ▪ Parts still need refinement and improvement ▪ Council also approved continuation of team's work in 18-19 ▪ Presentation in ELT in early fall ▪ Beta testing first two weeks of September ▪ Program review and annual unit planning ▪ Approved by academic senate ▪ Council will more broadly vet the system across the college ▪ Appreciation for the work produced by the team and council
What input does the ELT have in the membership of the four new and three renewed project teams for 2018-19?	Thomas Greene (30 min)	<u>Integrated Planning Improvement (IPI)</u> ▪ Kuldeep/Alisa to provide specifics ▪ Also need to provide any recommendations to membership <u>Clarify Program Paths</u> ▪ Lead is Bill Simpson ▪ Tony Giusti as team member ▪ Team recommendations from Bill Simpson ▪ Streamlined team for doing the actual work ▪ List Bill Simpsonas Project Steward ▪ Career Center rep to be classified employee ▪ *Action Required: Send team list to Bill Simpson for his confirmation* <u>Enterprise Level Scheduling Solution (ELSS)</u> ▪ District process driving implementation ▪ Kale provided list of team membership ▪ Kale and Dyne reps to District team ▪ Renewal is indicated on form as team been informally meeting but were never officially chartered ▪ Taskforce through PCC ▪ Will now be considered new team <u>ARC Online 2.0</u>

		- Recommended Marsha Reske as Chair - Still needing faculty chair - Possible district-wide coordinated effort - Team composition based on district action - Online college trailer bill came out w/May revise - BOG will act as board of trustees - Chancellor has authority to contract (w/o biding process) w/community college district for collective bargaining contracts - BOG will hire CEO; CEO hires admin team and faculty (based on collective bargaining) - Removed that college can award certificates/degrees; now credentials - Perception by faculty: all working moving forward with a tremendous load - Questioning already have steward assigned; thought process was to identify lead/co-lead and then determine if steward is necessary - Cheri Jones already asked preliminary perform work that will influence work of several different items Facilities Master Plan - Second district-wide process - They'll dictate tempo of team - Cheryl Sears identified as team lead; could also shift to instructional dean - Having wide variety of instructional faculty helpful - Kuldeep to discuss w/Pablo regarding process - Strong interest in sciences having a voice; tech ed as well - Look at building age; maintenance requests - Does uncompleted work of the previous plan fall off 2003 team membership: PES, rep from each instructional area, IT, IMS, research, DSPS, 2 from buildings/grounds; 3 from LPA - Side Note: T. Greene experienced virtual reality tour of new STEM building on Friday - Will take to potential donors after rendering in some potential naming

		Wellness Center ▪ District-wide effort ▪ Second reading for student health fee in June (BOT) ▪ No identified leads yet Institutional Equity Plan ▪ Joshua Moon Johnson as lead ▪ In conversations regarding faculty lead Miscellaneous ▪ Is the notetaker tied to administrator on team? Nothing in initiation request to specify notetaker ▪ Thomas and Kuldeep following up on process of paying students
Should the Council Charters be reviewed and potentially revised based upon an informal assessment of their effectiveness over the last several months? If so, who should conduct this assessment?	Thomas Greene (15 min)	L. Lawrenson ▪ Imperative to clarify to SSC, what does it mean to coordinate A. Shubb ▪ Need greater detail regarding coordinating; checking in on teams ▪ Council check in on teams to make certain they're staying on track ▪ Decision making – does it need broader input ▪ Address general concerns L. Lawrenson ▪ SSC met w/project leads routinely; worked well ▪ Certain items brought forward to leads not best handled by the entire council A. Karp ▪ Project team provide monthly update to council A. Shubb ▪ When teams use standardized agendas/notes; notes can be given directly to council ▪ Notes can include areas where decisions need to be made or help provided ▪ Doesn't address personnel/personality issues ▪ Need some training on facilitative leadership and consensus model

		▪ Some elements already in place for check in /monitoring A. Karp ▪ What type of training do we provide to leads/co-leads who may be new to leadership T. Greene ▪ Council co-chairs facilitate meetings w/leads/co-leads as part of schedule ▪ Perhaps formalize L. Lawrenson ▪ What is the role of the council in coordinating K. Kaur ▪ Timeline of deliverable ▪ Timeline of vetting w/council ▪ Institution familiar with first reading, second reading, vote/approval T. Greene ▪ Built into process ▪ Actual time to conduct work is reduced A. Shubb ▪ Team process seems further along than council's process ▪ Role of council has not been explored as deeply as necessary ▪ Council sponsoring/assisting teams but not weighing in the team's decision T. Greene ▪ Responsibility of the council to monitor the implementation once the team recommendation is done ▪ Perhaps ELT has study session around the council roles (early August)? ▪ ELT will review council charters with input from others ▪ ELT and council co-chairs not in the room G. Aguilar ▪ Consider adding all chairs / co-chairs to ELT membership T. Greene ▪ Will look at that and ELT charter as well

FUTURE/NEW AGENDA ITEMS AND OTHER ITEMS FOR FOLLOW-UP: Identify items that, based on the proceedings of the meeting, are requested to be placed as a discussion item at a future meeting and/or requests for action by the chair and or team members prior to the next meeting. to be discussed at a future meeting.		
Topic	**Person Responsible**	**Notes/Due Date**
N/A		