Summary:

The group set a deadline of **Friday, June 8th** for submitting writing assignments and document collection to Brenda. All elements will be compiled into a rough draft for review by the group. Next meeting is **Tuesday, June 12th at 3:00**.

The group corrected and revised the recommended membership of College Council to remove the CMC representative (LTAC will represent management) and to add one ASMJC student rep and recommend that one of the three CSEA reps represent CSAC. Committee members will contact representatives from each of the groups listed below to request the following information (minimum info):

- Charge
- Membership
- Where authority is derived from
- Communication and reporting procedure

Academic Senate has a draft that includes mission, core values, charge, structure, participation in other committees, role, and products that may be used as a model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent Groups</th>
<th>Councils</th>
<th>College Committees</th>
<th>Academic Senate Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Instructional Administrator's Council (IAC) Lorena</td>
<td>Staff Resource Advisory Council (SRAC) Lorena/Allan</td>
<td>Faculty Professional Development Committee (not represented on College Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan (electronic copy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEA Received</td>
<td>Student Services Council (SSC) Martha</td>
<td>College Technology Committee (CTC) Jenni</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee (not represented on College Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YFA Brenda</td>
<td>College Management Council (CMC) LTAC will represent management</td>
<td>Distance Ed Advisory Committee (DEAC) Jenni</td>
<td>Accreditation &amp; Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) Rob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMJC Senate Received</td>
<td>Classified Staff Advisory Council (CSAC) Nora</td>
<td>Facilities Committee/CDAC Nora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Team Advisory Council (LTAC) Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity &amp; Community Committee Martha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Allocation Committee (Planning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ongoing writing assignments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine what data are consistently used</td>
<td>Cece, Nora, Debi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear description of what is communicated and to whom</td>
<td>Brenda, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process (ombudsperson) to address unresolved concerns</td>
<td>Martha, Maurice, Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine how master plans are used in process</td>
<td>Martha, Maurice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft effective practices of Committee Chairs</td>
<td>Cece, Debi, Allan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft a narrative addressing “Good Faith” in the MJC Decision-Making Process</td>
<td>Brenda, Jenni, Flerida, John, Allan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft a narrative outline of the participatory Governance model</td>
<td>Cece, Kevin, John or Allan (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outline of the “good faith” discussion is included again for the writing group to refine:

Language from the University of Detroit, Mercy Shared Governance site, was recorded as a model for the MJC process:

“Even the best of structures cannot replace the need for good faith, good will, and the hard work that is part of listening, communicating, and sharing.”

The group discussed further investigation of the shared governance document developed by the University of Detroit, Mercy:

http://www.udmercy.edu/governance/structure/documents/sharedgovernancefinalproposal.pdf

*(NOTE: UDM identified eleven “underlying principles” as foundational to their shared governance process. This format may be a possible way to shape the elements the workgroup identified below. UDM’s 11 principles: 1) thinking outside of the box; 2) common commitment to teaching and learning; 3) a new more stimulating environment as part of a new culture; 4) mission as a Catholic/urban university; 5) autonomy/don’t fix what ain’t broke; 6) communication is key; 7) encouragement of entrepreneurship; 8) assessment and accountability; 9) rights and responsibilities; 10) taking advantage of expertise; 11) involvement of all elements of the community.)*
These attributes were identified by the group as fundamental in “good faith” decision-making:
1) Based in fact – everyone gets access to the same data and reports
2) Includes stakeholders affected by decision
3) Grounded in the good of the institution and student success

Decision-Making Processes that are based on “good faith” communication include these elements:
- Decisions are made within the appropriate, established process
- Due process and sufficient time for review and recommendation are included
- Good faith should be part of the college mission:
  - An honest attempt to come to agreement with no hidden agenda
- Meetings are publicized (website and email), documented (minutes), public (open to all stakeholders), and easily accessible
  - Discussions and recommendations are visible, transparent, and widely publicized (digital documents with opportunity for feedback)
- Models such as “Interest-based Bargaining” should be integrated

Behaviors related to specific issues were identified:
**Emergent Issues**
Develop and communicate a process to deal with emergent issues (e.g. open forums, extra meetings)
- Open Forums called when helpful. Can be called by the College Council or the Chief Executive
- Open Forums appropriate for issues such as budget or Accreditation
(Question: who should develop and communicate an “emergent situation process”?)

**In cases of disagreement**
- “Win-win” solutions should be prioritized
- Compromises should be prioritized when complete agreement is not possible
- These two approaches are minimum standards for all “good faith” efforts at collegial decision-making

**Conflict Resolution**
Deal with conflict in a collegial, respectful, honest way. This includes open, frank discussion without fear of retaliation. It includes fully valuing YCCD Board Policy 7717/4217, adopted February 11, 2009.

“Members of the Yosemite Community College District embrace the value of civility, which promotes mutual respect, fairness, concern for the common good, and politeness. The diversity of thought and ideas, on which an academic community thrives, is best maintained by a policy of respect and civility.”

- Adopt an approach of extending the “benefit of the doubt” to all participants.
There is a special responsibility of the Chair of any group and the right and responsibility of every member of the committee to ensure “safe conversation”

**Assurance and Communication of “good faith” Decision-Making**

- Regular professional development related to committee behavior
  - Link to contract language regarding consequences
- Discuss the “rules of engagement” at meetings
  - (LORENA AND CECE TO DRAFT A “MEETING CODE OF CONDUCT”)
- Focus on relationships
  - Seek out colleagues with which a person disagrees and take time to come to an understanding outside of the specific committee

This section needs to be replaced with original language from YCCD Board Policy 4103:

Language was revised related to the 10+1 purview of faculty to include the definitions of “primarily rely” and “mutually agree”:

“Academic and professional matters means the following policy development and implementation matters:

**Primarily Rely:**

(d)(1) Governing board action: Rely Primarily

- Recommendations of the senate will normally be accepted
- Only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons will the recommendations not be accepted
- If not accepted, board/designee communicate its reasons in writing, if requested
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These five areas fall are deemed “primarily rely” issues as agreed upon by the MJC Academic Senate and YCCD Board of Trustees:

- Degree and certificate requirements
- Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
- Grading policies
- Educational program development
- Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success

**Reach Mutual Agreement:**

(d)(2) Governing board action: Mutual Agreement

- If agreement not reached, existing policy remains in effect unless
  - Exposure to legal liability
  - Or substantial fiscal hardship
- If no policy or existing policy creates exposure to legal liability or substantial fiscal hardship
  - Board may act if agreement not reached
• If good faith effort first
• Only for compelling legal, fiscal, or organizational reasons

❖ District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
❖ Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
❖ Policies for faculty professional development activities
❖ Processes for program review
❖ Processes for institutional planning and budget development and
❖ Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate