



Notations from *Collaborative Governance at Compton College*

Document Meeting

Friday, May 24, 2019

9:00am-12:00pm

Staff Lounge

Review of ground rules/meeting norms.

Review of Table of Contents. Call for questions, comments, and concerns. None noted at this time.

Discussions of each section/content area ensued.

Guiding Principles:

- Holly Schumacher provided an overview of the document section and how it was written. Minor revision to the wording under the “Principles of Community” section to include the words “students” and “[the community] we serve.” Final reading to reflect the following: “Through Collaborative Governance, all constituent groups work together, in good faith, to make decisions related to policies, procedures, and practices for the benefit of the students and community that we serve.”
- Parking lot: definitions of “community.”

Organizational Chart:

- We still need to work on the Organizational Chart and include the BP as well as write an AR that identifies all of the areas and describes their roles.

Discussion of Decisions-Making Flow Chart:

- Lauren Sosenko and Dr. Flor provided an overview of their section, reflecting on the difficulty of creating a flowchart that fully encompassed the constituent groups and committees on campus. We looked for ways to show relationships between the stakeholders/constituent groups. We need to be defining the process but this doesn't exactly identify the direction or where in the process decisions are made. Discussion ensued. Citlali Gonzales: Perhaps we need to create buckets or areas that showcase decisions process. Dr. Curry: We will take the Departments and Operations and create separate flow charts for each of these areas, six in total. Standing committees, Academic Senate, Guided Pathways, Departmental, Board of Trustees and Consultative Council.
- This committee was asked to work on new flowcharts and definitions, reflecting each of the areas.

Key Stakeholders

- Dr. A: We need to flush out the educational administrators/managers, community, and the academic senate areas.
- Recommend to use the language from Gavilan College regarding rejections by the CEO.
- The recommendation should be attached to be attached to an institutional goal. This would help stakeholders understand that recommendations and requests should be connected to the college and would strengthen recommendation requests.

- Should we create a document/form that helps committees make recommendations and move them forward to the district? Part of this form that should be included is a meeting with the CEO to discuss the rejection of the recommendation.
- Tom Norton: Should there be a rubric used by the District when making a decision about accepting or rejecting a recommendation. Dr. Curry: Professor Norton please write down some ideas for a rubric.

Institutional Standing Committees

- Amber Gillis, Citlali Gonzales, and David Turcotte presented their section and discussed presented definitions and organizational problems with committees.
- Goals for this section were to define committee types, establish a section of operational guidelines/best practices for committees, and to highlight the communication trail/relationships so that information is disseminated effectively.
- Discussion of “rogue” workgroups/committees established with specific purposed discussed. It was agreed upon by the group that the term “workgroup” would be used over “taskforce,” and all agreed that certain committees may need to undergo some name changes to better reflect a cleaner, simpler committee structure.
- It was agreed upon by the group that campus-wide committees would be categorized to reflect the organizational areas mentioned in the Decisions-Making Flow Chart.
- This committee to work and send their section to Lauren Sosenko and Dr. Flor to inform the Flow Chart section.

Parking Lot

Definition of “community.”

For Next Time:

June 27th for our next meeting. Committee workgroup to put out their section ASAP for the flow chart group.

Table of Contents Subcommittee Writing Groups:

1. Guiding Principles – **Holly Schumacher** and **Dr. Curry**: Tom Norton, Nikki Williams, Roza Ekimyan, Kendahl Radcliffe, Amber Gillis, Steven Haigler
2. Organizational Chart – **Rachelle Sasser** (to add information/definitions to roles)
3. Decision Making Flow Chart – **Lauren Sosenko** and **Paul Flor**: Gerson Valle
4. Key Stakeholders – **Ekko Blake**, **Dr. Preston**, and **Dr. A**: Kristen Johnson, Teresa Barragan, Roberto Campos
5. Institutional Standing Committees – **Heather Parnock**, **Citlali Gonzales**, and **Amber Gillis**: Juan Tavarez, Axa Maradiaga, Aurora Cortez-Perez, Sylvia Barakat, Domenic Cappozolo, David Turcotte
6. Planning and Budget – **Steve Haigler** and **Dr. Lewis**: Rashid, Diane Collins, Gwen Johnson, Keith Cobb, David McPatchell
7. Appendix – **Amber** and **Consultative Council**: Travis Martin

Co-Chair responsibilities – writing the narrative, drafting ideas for subheadings