# Shared Governance Council (SGC)

## September 28, 2022, at 12:15 pm (College Hour)

## Meeting Minutes

**In Attendance:** President Cook (Ex Officio), Andrea Nathanson (Cabinet), Darcey Kemp (Cabinet), Geraldine de Berly (Cabinet), Mary Kaselouskas (Cabinet), Shai Butler (Cabinet), Christina Atwater (AUC Faculty Co-Chair), Amanda Dufault (AUC Interim Staff Co-Chair), Kim Noel (AFSCME), Linda Prystupa (MCCC), and Nanette Flores (minutes)

**Unable to Attend:** Gladys Franco (Cabinet), and Drew Torres (Student Government)

### Review of Trustee Endorsement/Frame (Motion)

A copy of STCC Board of Trustee Motion (2022-14 – Endorsement of STCC Shared Governance Model), was referenced, including its unanimous approval by the Board at the June 27, 2022 meeting. Noted as well was the process by which that motion/policy was adopted, including efforts by an external consultant as well as six meetings by a working group comprised of stakeholder representatives.

### Review of DRAFT Recommendation Form

A draft recommendation form was shared with the SGC in advance of the first meeting. SGC members were invited to share and otherwise seek feedback from their constituents, with the ability to provide that feedback at the next SGC meeting.

As noted, proposals come to the SGC via a governance group (i.e. AUC, MCCC, AFSCME, Cabinet, Student Government), and a written proposal/recommendation format with a number of prompts have been included in the draft. Key points discussed:

Under D – (page 2 of the form) calls for a description of how the rationale was built in regards to recommendations requested. There is a piece in the form in referencing policy but for practices/protocols, there is also the request for a narrative/rationale.

There was a question about what consensus by the SGC means, including whether a "block" can occur. As part of the discussion, first, the point was made that each body might have a different operational definition of consensus, and will be for that body to navigate as they draft and otherwise develop recommendations. Regarding the SGC itself, the goal is to not be overly prescriptive. In other words, consensus may mean not all representatives support a recommendation, but that disagreement is not a block, and proposals can move forward for consideration. President Cook also utilized the list of examples included on the agenda to help clarify and discuss what pertains to a Trustee-approved policy, what would be a change in an operational practice/protocol, and how some the SGC is a forum to ensure clarity on what happens with a recommendation. Some of the examples included tenure (an operational policy outlined in MCCC contract); personnel (not subject to governance; operational via Trustees delegation to the STCC President); curriculum (curriculum committee codified under the AUC with NECHE clarity on Chief Academic Officer role); student fees (purview of Trustees via vote)

Also discussed was the contractual element of "management rights" and needing to be mindful of that particular element in the two collective bargaining agreements, and how STCC cannot establish policies/protocols that alter that element of each contract. There was also a clarification regarding process, and how after an action/decision by administrators, engaging a given union in "impact bargaining" would then occur, which can be frustrating for some in terms of order of operations. An

example was the decision to move into Building 19, notification of the unions, and impact bargaining that followed. Also discussed as part of this item, was decision-making such as what was done during the COVID pandemic, and the need for administration to at times address exigent circumstances (i.e. in March of 2020, when the college extended Spring Break, and then had to adjust to an executive/Stay at Home order).

Again, the discussion regarding the Shared Governance Council, was the development of consensus regarding recommendations that are proposed to the body. The example of STCC moving to become a smoke-free campus was again revisited, including the comment from President Cook, that he would ultimately bring that decision before the Board of Trustees for a vote (but not recommendation has been generated to date), and could be the type of example where without consensus (either by a governance body, students, or the SGC itself), the president would move forward noting the lack of consensus but that a case would be made for why. Yet another example was the budget/fiscal aspect of a particular recommendation, and how that would necessarily be a point of consideration.

Also included as an agenda item was a prompted list of other forums where STCC employees in particular, can ask/hear/learn about decision making, and those include School/Dean meetings.

**Two recommendations submitted for SGC consideration:**

1) **Course Overload** (by Vice President de Berly)

2) **Incompletes** (by Vice President de Berly)


SGC representatives were asked to take the drafts and vet with their constituents. Intended as a helpful set of examples for how a recommendation can be developed and proposed, these two recommendations were developed by Academic Affairs with substantial involvement by School Deans. Each recommendation provides an enhanced level of clarification, both for students, but also for faculty.

The next meeting will be scheduled in November (Date TBD)

Meeting ended at 1:25.

Respectfully submitted by Nanette Flores