<div align="center">

All College Council
Agenda
November 09, 2023, 9:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.
Virtual Via Google Meet
https://meet.google.com/cdt-rrxy-cei

</div>

1. **Welcome/Introductions,** Sean Mendoza, ACC Chair

2. **Approval of minutes,** All

3. **Committee Goals,** All
   - **A) Review and make recommendations about shared governance and the process of communicating and categorizing decision-making.**

     BP-1-25-draft-10-27-23.pdf**-** Aubrey Conover & Makyla Hays, 9:30 a.m.- 10:00 a.m.

4. **AP 1.06.01 All College Council,** Phil Burdick- Updates

5. **Roundtable**

Attendees: Aubrey Conover, David Donderewicz, Downi Griner, Edgar Soto, Erika Elias, Francine Tupiken Ruelas, James Craig, Makyla Hays, Phil Burdick, Rita Lennon, Sean Mendoza, TT Martinez, Valerie Vidal-King.

1. **Welcome/Introductions,** Sean Mendoza had all members and guests introduce themselves in the chat.

2. **Approval of October 2023 minutes,** Sean Mendoza asked for a motion to approve the October 2023 minutes. Rita Lennon motioned to approve and Jim Craig seconded the motion. All in favor by unanimous vote.

3. **Committee Goal - Review and make recommendations about shared governance and the process of communicating and categorizing decision-making.** Jim brought up that it's important for this committee to do some data collection, such as best practices, policies and procedures, etc. and gather examples of Shared Governance. This will help us develop a baseline of data to discuss and make recommendations. This data will also help with our ongoing work for the HLC accreditation assurance argument. Jim suggested each of the parties represented here go back to their constituent groups and start gathering the data and put it in a shared area, so we can start to discuss offline in Spaces.

   Rita Lennon agreed and said if we all gather the information it would help to better define Shared Governance , which is what the ACC was tasked to do. Makyla Hays provided

some resources. 11/8/23 public comment , Pima Community College Policies/Procedures. The College has employee handbooks and we also have departmental procedures. Who are the groups responsible for that and what is the purpose of the policy? How do we change them? Who are the stakeholders?

Sean Mendoza proposed discussing this in our next meeting in December. Rita Lennon agreed we could discuss this at our next meeting. She also brought up that we have different task forces and different committees, but we rarely have the opportunity to get in front of each other and talk about things and proposed combining AERC and ACC or having those two groups meet on a regular basis. Jim Craig brought up might not be the best approach and that AERC has a narrow scope of work within Meet and Confer. Perhaps have one representative from AERC attend the ACC monthly meetings.

Makyla Hays said you have Faculty Senate, Student Senate, Staff Council that all feed into All College Council. I feel the AERC is just left out on its own and doing its own thing. There should be a link to ACC, so maybe a rep from AERC comes to ACC so there would be more communication between the groups. Student Representative TT Martinez supported including reports from AERC to the ACC to increase transparency. Makyla suggested revising the Administrative Procedures for ACC to include having an AERC representative on the committee.

Sean Mendoza suggested just having the AERC provide reports to ACC is a good way of having discussions. Jim Craig said if AERC could be available to attend ACC meetings to answer questions and that there would be an open invitation for ACC members to attend and observe AERC meetings as well. Downi brought up for Staff Council, it would be nice to hear a report from the AERC along with other reports. Jim Craig suggested that, for now, adding an AERC representative to the meeting as a guest and for information sharing.

4. **BP 1.25-** Aubrey Conover and Makyla Hays presented BP-1-25-draft-10-27-23.pdf, Track Changes AERC Suggestions Draft BP-1-25.pdfBP 1.25 outlines the relationship of employee representative groups with policy and decision making and the role of the Governing Board and the role of the chancellor. Board Chair Riel brought forward a new version that she was recommending to the Board. That version was taken to AERC. The AERC had good conversations about what could be improved to make it more functional. We have worked on about 95% of the different policies. It's been a very collaborative group.

The one disagreement over the revised policy is if there is an issue where AERC does not reach agreement, who is given ultimate authority to decide? The management perspective is that it should stay with the Chancellor. The employee groups would like to see the Board more involved and have the Board be the ultimate decision maker in the end.

This revised policy was presented to the Board of Governors at a study session this past Monday, where we chatted about it quite a bit. We have a presentation that we could

share with everyone with some more details that was presented to the Staff Council and Faculty Senate. The Board last night voted to have both options put forward in a 21-day comment period to get feedback from employees who may not have been part of those conversations and provide comments in writing to the Board, so the Board can make a final decision.

Makyla Hays provided insight into the College's history of Governance, policy, decision making and changes to various employee handbooks between 2013-2017 where the Chancellor and the administration had final decision-making authority. Now, employee leaders are asking for the Board to return to a role where they are the ultimate decision-maker in cases where there is disagreement. Jim Craig asked if there were any concerns from the Board about how much extra time or work it would take them to be a final decision-maker in the event of disagreements. Aubrey said this likely would not be an issue since there is general agreement on most policies and policy revisions. Most of the questions with this proposed revision are about how involved the Board should be in day-to-day operations, and what is the line between larger policy issues and day-to-day operations. Rita brought up that the Board discussed that once policy revisions reached them, they really weren't part of the process, and that this provision would hopefully address that. Makyla urged committee members to provide feedback during the 21-day comment period.

5. **AP 1.06-** Phil Burdick- we will insert language that Sean suggested regarding leveraging synchronous and asynchronous communication technology to encourage greater engagement and inclusion of all College stakeholders. There was further discussion about adding AERC and representatives from employee groups to ACC. Any changes would have to go through the regular A.P. and B.P. revision procedures. This will be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

6. **Roundtable-** Phil Burdick followed up on his to-do list from our previous meeting in October. There was a request for the Chancellor to make a statement on Israel. There were two statements, one was a general statement and then a second statement by the Governing Board Chair. David Donderewicz brought up the upcoming Scholarship Fair on November 14 at the Downtown Campus. Rita Lennon brought up the Faculty Senate will be changing leadership positions and roles in January. Jim Craig said homework for all is to look at the policies and procedures that Makyla shared with the group. Also, look at real examples of Shared Governance. All the information will be shared in spaces.

Meeting Adjourned: Jim Craig asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Erika Elias made the motion to adjourn. Rita Lennon seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 10:11 a.m.