**College Council Recharge (CCR) Meeting**

**May 18, 2015**

**8:30-10:00am / RR117**

Present: Kate Gray, Tara Sprehe, Johnney (ASG), Cody (ASG), John Phelps, Amanda Coffey, Nora Brodnicki, Janelle Vader, Phillip King, Patty DeTurk, and Tami Strawn (recorder)

Phillip did a Presidents’ Council presentation a week ago. Showed the Council the recommendation table. Talked about the website – what’s on it, way to be structured. Today we need to get the remainder of things categorized. Phillip did not contact the Cultural Arts Committee to ask the question of what do they think they are / how do they feel about being a committee?

**Assessment Committee** - Matthew Altman is not faculty but listed as such in the membership. As Kate departs, student learning assessment coordinator should be present. Will the chair be a rotating faculty member? If the innovation fund comes through there would be a coordinator and then coaches. Coordinator would be half time and a faculty member. Coaches would receive 1 release per term. Would they rotate – maybe an appointment like the chairs? If there is a new chair every year does that become problematic? Our recommendations could include term lengths. The A-team steering committee is giving input on this. Recommendation of who is included (on form). Is this a committee? Yes.

**ARC** – Restarted from SEM. Went from SEM to FOE then to ARC. Jil Freeman and David Miller are both faculty on the committee. One faculty from each division is the goal. Don’t have that quite yet. College wide representation. Looking at buckets of students – community ed thru degree / certificate seeking students. Advisory groups might report to ARC?

**ASC –** The accreditation cycle is different now. It’s about continuous improvement. Activity and representation cuts across college. They could meet frequently then take a hiatus, since they are working around a specific thing (accreditation timelines).

Need consistency – minimum criteria for representation – membership requirements – set minimums.

Currently the faculty contract says they need to participate on a committee but if we are moving things and they may not be called a committee anymore, the language in the contract will need to be changed.

Johnney thought that to have overall shared governance for it to be a committee it had to have student representation? Possibility of having a student on ASC. College-wide representation and not having a student on it does not mean it’s not a committee. Is there a reason why a student shouldn’t be on a committee?

Doesn’t slide over into committee – work group? Goes across the college – essential to what we do. Need this committee to keep the college going. Not temporary. Makes recommendations. Brings recommendations to College Council and final recommendations to Presidents’ Council.

**CUDC** – on original website CUDC has 4 subcommittees: **Grounds, Signage, Food Service and Safety**.

Nora thinks all are separate but they all go through Bob’s area. Bob is chair of CUDC. Something could come up at CUDC and then sent to one of the subcommittees. Maybe a need for Bob to know because it’s his crew and staff. Grounds committee makes decisions that never go to CUDC.

On the current website it says that CUDC reports to Presidents’ Council not College Council. Bob said he makes reports to College Council which is a different statement than what is currently on the website. CUDC does not meet regularly. They tend to schedule meetings over breaks.

Grounds committee looks at overall college activities – Brian Rose wants to put in a sign for instrument parking or turning on irrigation this week. Grounds committee has rules for taking trees down. Grounds works closely with athletics and horticulture. The college has had a sustainability group in the past. There is college wide interest in grounds.

Signage – have to fit in context of the college. Should have consistency.

Food service – college wide representation.

Safety – cutting across the college. Doesn’t look at Harmony campus. Harmony has a homeless camp on other side of the parking lot. No one on safety committee from Harmony.

Should all signs around campus be approved/reviewed at a committee level? The blue signs that are in Roger Rook and Community Center should carry through new buildings.

Should each report to College Council? Maybe just work with CUDC if necessary? If each is separate, why do we have CUDC? They are all separate. Each committee looks at things with a different hat. Sub committees should report to a committee. CUDC is needed. 5 separate committees or CUDC as main with the others a subs? There is clear overlap when something comes up. The committees collaborate when projects come up. They could have a relation with each other without having redundancy. Relativity between all of these. Could have a student representative if it is of interest to student.

A clear organizing structure is what people are looking for. Needs to make sense as an organizing structure. Recommendation back to Presidents’ Council seems like they each do their own work and don’t need to funnel into CUDC. Every subcommittee is represented CUDC. Each subcommittee can make decisions without consulting CUDC.

Grounds committee can make the decision but Jim Huckestein still has to sign any contracts. The decisions happen within the committee, then go to Jim. Doesn’t have to pass through Bob.

We are stuck on this one. We can make comments back to Presidents’ Council that this doesn’t quite fit our structure.

Not all signs go through signage committee. Signage could meet more but we don’t want it to be so multi-layered that we can’t get anything done.

College Council could be alternating weeks of the non-instructional pieces presented. Other weeks for instructional pieces. ISP one week, then A-Team then Curriculum Committee then College Council. Or maybe College Council every other week? We need a structure to ensure conversations. We can give this feedback to Presidents’ Council.

Johnney likes the alternating week’s idea. In their ASG meetings people just report and there is not time to discuss. See it as a good collaborative problem solving situation.

**ITC –** Amanda asked for 2 or 3 additional areas of representation. Divisions are big and have both instructional and student needs. Whoever needs to be in the room, needs to be in the room. As programs develop, will need to add them too. Very narrowly focused mission.

19 classrooms getting upgraded. Who made the decision of what was going to be done? Maybe there is a pilot of faculty to test the upgrades? ITC’s charge should be broader or more clearly defined. Bullets make it too specific. Making decisions about educational technology – instructional technology. Relates to everyday work in the classroom to students. It’s technology specific and how it would impact your working life.

This one is charged. Make very strong recommendations for language and structure to Presidents’ Council. Use examples we have where no one is hearing it. Identify another way they take place. Activities are missing from our list. What Dion presented at the Vice President’s meeting should have been presented at College Council. There is no structure for communication. Charged because we are here to serve students and the technology in the classroom has to be what’s’ best for instructors for their discipline and their students. We will give more feedback. Bill Waters is consulting with Dion regularly.

Janelle thinks presenting ITC at College Council would be a great idea as it’s a forum where more faculty are present. The information presented at the ITC meetings is more at a technical level. Faculty don’t speak up at those meeting. Their membership list needs to be updated. There isn’t a forum for them to give feedback.

Kate suggested we do a vote on-line for the groups we didn’t get to today. That way when we come to the next meeting we only have to discuss the ones that didn’t have consensus or the ones that people had questions about.

Nora listed the four things the group needs to do: Categorize, communicate, web updates, and definitions.

Phillip has started pulling all the definitions together. He will send out what he has so far to the group.

Nora thought that at the end of the year the Visions to Reality document should be updated – a visions refresh. After the accreditation visit in October, we will begin updating those things.

A concern shared was that after we have done all of this work, it doesn’t trickle down to all. If trickle down doesn’t work, we can create whole structure but if it’s not communicated correctly, we have wasted our time. Maybe we build templates for communication? Or notes? The recommendations need to include both presentation time and discussion time. Need to start modeling what we want to do. John si willing to help with that. Maybe a presentation during inservice week with the changes. It also needs to be presented to new staff & faculty every year. The Wednesday morning of inservice, they should give us the important info that includes changes to the college. All PT Faculty should get invited and paid to come to hear the information. All FT should already be there.