



## COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING

### MINUTES

APRIL 15, 2021

3:15 - 5:00 PM

<https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/96521857959>

---

#### COMMITTEE FUNCTION:

The College Council is the highest policy recommending body in the District. The Council must involve and utilize the opinion of all constituent groups. Given the Council's position in the governance structure, the specific areas of responsibility can be delineated as follows:

1. College Council is responsible for the review and supervision of all District committee systems.
2. The Council serves as the final "review" body for all policy recommendations emanating from District committees.
3. The Council remains the highest policy articulation group for the District, and therefore must insure that all District constituencies have had adequate participation in the formation of policy issues.
4. College Council will review District plans with an eye to identifying aspects of the plans that have implications for policy, procedures and/or committee charges. The purpose of this review will be to ensure that appropriate conversations have taken place between initiators/authors of the plans and the constituent group(s) or District personnel responsible for the policy, procedure and/or committee charges.

Ad hoc study groups or task forces, with appropriate constituent participation, may be formed by College Council when topics fall outside the range of the existing committee structure or involve multiple constituent groups.

**Present:** Pedro Avila, Maria Banachowicz as proxy for Sandy Sigala, K. Frindell-Teuscher as proxy for Anne Donegan, Sarah Hopkins, Kate Jolley, Sean Martin, Anetra McCartney, Jane Saldaña-Talley, Julie Thompson, Carlos Valencia, Debbie Weatherly, Karolina Nazario (as recorder)

**Absent:** Evelyn Navarro

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Sandy Sigala and Debbie Weatherly reported that they had sent information from CCCCS and SEIU, regarding upcoming purview trainings, to Jane. Jane and Karolina will work on scheduling the training.

Julie stated that she had reached out to ASCCC asking for a representative; once Jane and Karolina have identified the date, ASCCC can provide a name for the particular date.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The April 1, 2021 Meeting Minutes will be included in the next meeting packet.

#### INFORMATION

#### DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

1. Creation of the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) and elimination of Institutional Planning Council (IPC) and Budget Advisory Council (BAC) –

Jane Saldaña-Talley and Julie Thompson reported that they, Kate Jolley and Jeremy Smotherman had met with various members of the Institutional Planning Council (IPC) and the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) on April 12<sup>th</sup>. During the joint meeting, they discussed what they hope the new Council will accomplish by combining the planning work of IPC and the budget work of BAC.

Jane reminded College Council of the process of eliminating/combining/creating new committees and councils, giving the example of the Integrated Student Success Committee (ISSC), which was created in 2018. Kate Jolley, Julie Thompson and Jeremy Smotherman are the proposed tri-chairs of the new PBC. The chairs have received input from current members of IPC and BAC and, with additional input from constituent group leaders, will decide on the new function and structure of PBC.

Carlos Valencia reported that he was a part of the ISSC creation process and shared with the Council his memory of the process of bringing that proposal to College Council.

Debbie Weatherly asked for the process of addressing the new tri-chairs regarding classified representation on PBC. Julie reassured Debbie that the tri-chairs are welcoming emails with concerns and suggestions. The tri-chairs will have a meeting soon to discuss various questions and suggestions that have been brought up.

Sean Martin pointed out that the make-up of the Council should be largely reliant on the charge of the Council. So once the charge is specified, the committee/council makeup would be clearer. Sean also pointed out that the Council should reflect the respective constituent groups' input. It is not necessarily the case that the new Council is made up of IPC and BAC members.

Kate Jolley pointed out that IPC and BAC will have to meet one more time before the PBC proposal will be brought back for final review at College Council.

Jane acknowledged that Debbie's point was both reflected in the meeting notes as well as additional messages from Sandy Sigala. Their feedback, along with others', has been conveyed to the tri-chairs. Dr. Smotherman has provided a summary of everyone's comments during the April 12 joint IPC/BAC meeting to Jane, Julie and Kate to ensure everyone's voice has been heard.

Carlos reminded College Council that there are various forces that drive committee creation/elimination/combination. In the case of ISSC, it was driven by the Chancellor's Office requirement for a single report that would be created by the two committees (BSI and Student Success and Equity). It is important to outline the "why" for the changes being brought forward. Carlos reported that ISSC did a lot of background work before bringing the proposal to College Council.

Julie stated that IPC and BAC have been working separately but that Accreditation Standards require that their work be integrated.

Kate suggested that IPC and BAC should be eliminated and a new PBC should be created, as opposed to combining IPC and BAC into PBC, because the work is beyond what IPC and BAC were doing separately.

Jane stated that integrity is very important in the work and it's crucial to not just step in and dissolve a committee without the input of the current members. Both IPC and BAC members agreed by consensus that the creation of PBC was a good idea for the College, but there were concerns about the new Council's proposed makeup and ensuring that everyone is represented.

Sean suggested that instead of getting IPC's and BAC's members together again, the members should be asked to go back to the constituent groups, discuss the proposed PBC with their respective groups, and give feedback to the tri-chairs to ensure the constituent groups are heard.

K. Frindell-Teuscher talked about eliminating the Calendar Committee through the process of negotiations and noted that the process was very simple. K. asked if there is a way to simplify the

committee elimination process, making sure that the constituent groups are represented in that process.

Debbie circled back to the conversation about classified representation in terms of the number of representatives.

Jane reminded the Council that the College Council members as constituent leaders are responsible for the appointments to this critical planning and budget work for the College. The constituent leaders need to have a say when something so important to the work of the College is being created.

Sean clarified that his comments are in line with Jane's and Debbie's comments. The law, purview, and committee charge have to be considered in the process.

## 2. CCLC policy templates

Jane Saldaña-Talley, Julie Thompson, Kate Jolley, Anne Donegan and Sarah Hopkins met on Monday, April 6<sup>th</sup> to discuss the process. The implementation process will include communication and logistics.

Julie and Anne have been tasked with a communication plan to update the College community, and Jane met with Karolina Nazario and Zehra Sonkaynar to begin the logistics planning.

Julie discussed the first piece of communication: an email to the College community on the scope of the issue as well as an invitation to an upcoming presentation outlining the scope of the work, the process for completing it, and the ongoing, long-term process for policy/procedure review. This presentation will also introduce the College community to the Community College League of California (CCLC) policy and procedure templates. The second piece of the communication would be a town hall, as planned during the PRT process, that includes experts representing areas of purview and responsibility.

Jane shared a PowerPoint presentation that included:

1. The benefits of CCLC templates
2. A comparison of current numbers of SRJC policies/procedures and CCLC templates for Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs)
3. Definitions of Board Policy and Administrative Procedure
4. Template outline and examples for both BPs and APs
5. Classification of levels, i.e. legally required by law or regulation, legally advised, suggested as good practice
6. Ways that SRJC can use the templates
7. An outline of the implementation plan—both short term, for expediting urgent work, and long term, for a regular cycle of ongoing review and revision of BP and AP
8. Next steps for implementation of the templates, including review of the current 2.1/P
9. Priorities for review of all templates, including identifying BPs and APs whose review and revision are a priority for accreditation
10. SRJC's current BP and AP review process
11. Interim review process and timeline for creating or revising all BPs and APs related to accreditation
12. Timeline for the full review of all BPs and APs, and integration of CCLC templates, to be completed by Fall 2024

13. Recommended ongoing review process of BPs and APs and timeline for annual review process
14. Comprehensive 6-year cycle of review, starting in Fall 2024 and completing by Fall 2029  
(following accreditation cycles)

Jane also mentioned that the transition work will be distributed among the cabinet administrators and everyone they will be collaborating with. The suggestion has been made to hire a consultant to assist with the process.

Julie suggested that chapters should not be reviewed in their totality within one year as this increases the workload of one particular group in a way that may be impossible to manage. Jane stated cabinet administrators responsible for each chapter would be able to distribute the BPs and APs they're responsible for over the six-year cycle and that the year specified for that chapter's revision is the deadline by which the work must be completed.

Julie also suggested that anyone collaborating on BPs and APs, as well as constituent leaders, should attend the upcoming purview training.

Jane asked if there was anything in her presentation that might be concerning to various college constituencies and asked the Council to alert members of their constituencies.

Julie suggested that the title "CCLC Implementation Plan" may not be the best way to begin the presentation. She suggested that, instead, the presentation might first describe the District's current policy situation and then propose CCLC as a solution. Julie asked whether procedures are legally binding in the same way that policies were noted to be legally binding, as noted in Jane's presentation. Jane agreed to get an answer to that question.

Sarah Hopkins mentioned that the volume of the upcoming work may be alarming to the College community so it would be helpful to focus first on the more manageable work that needs to be done that relates to accreditation.

Julie suggested that the College Council review the list of urgent BP and AP revisions to figure out how many policies and procedures each constituent group will be involved in, and that this information could be included in the upcoming presentation.

Meeting adjourned at 4:48

**BOARD POLICY/ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION REVISIONS – [MS Teams](#)**