

LOS MEDANOS
COLLEGE

Shared Governance Council

MINUTES

May 20, 2020

2:00 - 4:00 p.m., via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nicole Almassey, Josh Bearden, Thyra Cobbs, Robert Delgado, Roseann Erwin, Natalie Hannum, Bob Kratochvil, Carla Molina, Carlos Montoya.

OTHER ATTENDEES: Diane White (presenter); Chialin Hsieh, Krysh Shahin, Jinpa Tharchin, Paul West, Catt Wood (guests); Jennifer Adams (support).

Item #	Topic/Activity	Handouts/ References	Action(s)
STANDING ITEMS:			
1.	Public Comment – N/A		
2.	Welcome President Kratochvil welcomed everyone to the meeting.		
3.	Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda for May 20th SGC approved the agenda. <i>MSC: Almassey/Cobbs.</i> <i>Yeas – Almassey, Bearden, Cobbs, Delgado, Erwin, Hannum, Molina, Montoya; Nays – N/A; Abstentions – N/A.</i> • Minutes (draft) from April 22 & May 13 The minutes from April 22nd and May 13th were deferred to a future meeting. 		Agenda approved
4.	Old Business		
4a.	LMC Mission, Vision & Values Statements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Mission Statement President Kratochvil reminded the SGC members about the Mission Statement process leading up to the meeting and vote last week. After narrowing down the various iterations, SGC voted on March 25 to preliminarily approve a final draft, which was then sent to the three Senates for their review and endorsement: <i>Los Medanos College provides all students with equitable access to educational opportunities and support resources that empower them to achieve their academic and career goals in a diverse and inclusive learning environment.</i> At SGC’s May 13 meeting, Nicole Almassey and Thyra Cobbs reported that their respective Senates had both voted to endorse the draft Mission. Josh Bearden reported that the Academic Senate came up with a revised version of the Mission, which they voted to endorse (instead of voting on SGC’s final draft): <i>Los Medanos College empowers students to achieve their educational and career goals by providing equitable access to educational opportunities in a diverse and inclusive environment.</i> Then, with relatively little discussion, a motion was made and SGC approved the Academic Senate’s revised version. President Kratochvil shared that, since then, he has received feedback from several individuals – including SGC members – with protests about the process. Although SGC did vote to approve the revised version, the Classified and Student Senates were never given an opportunity to review/discuss it (as all three Senates did with SGC’s draft). LMC may have this Mission Statement in place for 10 years, and it doesn’t start off well to have had two of the three Senate presidents abstain from voting in favor of the Mission. In addition to receiving feedback/concerns about the process, President Kratochvil also received offline feedback about the fact that the Academic Senate’s draft used the word “educational” twice and that it omitted the reference to “support resources.” Nicole Almassey commented that her understanding of the process was that SGC’s draft was sent to the three Senates for their review/endorsement, not that it was open to revision. She noted that, during the Classified Senate’s review of SGC’s draft Mission, 	Mission, Vision & Values College Assembly PPT (9/30/19) College Assembly PPT (3/2/20) Draft/Proposed Mission, Values & Vision	

	<p>there were classified professionals who would have suggested minor changes. Their Senate ultimately voted to approve SGC’s version, however, as they agreed they could “live with it” and that it captured the College’s purpose and culture. Jennifer Adams added that, although there wasn’t anything technically or procedurally incorrect about SGC’s vote last week, it was not in keeping with SGC’s practice (at least in the last eight years). As an independent body, SGC is not required to vote in line with the Senates, but SGC has always given the Senates an opportunity to review and provide feedback before SGC takes action – which didn’t occur in this case. In addition, the end result was somewhat disappointing from a content standpoint. After SGC spent several semesters working on this – with thorough dialogue and intentional effort, dissecting every word, and considering feedback from the campus community – the group approves a new version within a matter of minutes, with very little review/dialogue. As Bob mentioned, the removal of “support resources” could leave some employees feeling as though their contributions aren’t reflected in the Mission; plus, it seems like we should be creative enough to avoid using “educational” twice in a single sentence.</p> <p>Thyra Cobbs stated that she agreed with the points made by Nicole and Jennifer, and that she would appreciate LMCAS having an opportunity to review the Academic Senate’s revised draft; she offered to hold a special LMCAS meeting over the Summer. Robert Delgado also expressed his agreement, and felt that the revised Mission should go to the Classified and Student Senates for review. President Kratochvil agreed that this had been a departure from the way in which SGC usually operates. Although he worries about the potential for revisions to go on and on, he feels that the Mission Statement is so important that it warrants an inclusive and thorough review. He appreciates the Academic Senate’s attempt to slightly shorten the draft, but he also has concerns about the removal of “support resources.” Based on all of the input and concerns voiced about the process, President Kratochvil is asking the Classified and Student Senates to review/vote on the revised Mission draft and bring back their feedback to SGC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Values and Vision Statements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vision Statement With six variations of the draft Vision Statement under consideration, President Kratochvil asked Diane White to facilitate SGC’s discussion to narrow down the options. Comments during the dialogue included: wanting to be a leader, rather than lead; #1 seems more collaborative; like #1 and #2, as they reference giving tools to students; like that #1 reflects the need for collaboration and partnership, rather than trying to lead others on our own; like that #1 includes “support services”; like #1, but also like “empowering students to transform our community” in #2; and, if “support services” is in the Vision, then “support resources” should stay in the Mission. President Kratochvil asked the SGC members if they were comfortable sending options #1 and #2 to the Senates for review at their first meetings in the Fall. SGC unanimously approved sending Vision Statement drafts #1 and #2 to the three Senates for review/feedback. <i>MSC: Hannum/Almassey; Yeas – Almassey, Cobbs, Delgado, Erwin, Hannum, Molina, Montoya; Nays – N/A; Abstentions – N/A.</i> ○ Values Statement Diane White displayed a document that outlined the results from her survey of SGC regarding the prospective Values: Excellence, Integrity, Respect, Responsiveness, and Collaboration. She shared that there had been strong support for Respect, and consistent support for Excellence, Integrity, and Responsiveness. She felt that further SGC dialogue was needed regarding Collaboration, as there wasn’t as much consensus around it. Diane offered to synthesize/refine these results into more of a narrative version that could be shared with the Senates in the Fall. When asked by President Kratochvil if they were comfortable moving forward with these draft Values, reps from each of the constituency groups agreed. President Kratochvil thanked Diane White for her assistance with the process. 		
4b.	<p>COVID-19 Public Health Emergency President Kratochvil shared that CCCCCO and CCCAA will come out with recommendations/guidelines for re-opening, resuming operations, and resuming athletics. He reminded the group that remote instruction and support services will continue in Summer. For the Fall, there will be a combination of instructional delivery methods, but classes will be predominantly online. Vice President Montoya is working with District Office on putting together a back-to-campus procedures manual. It is likely that some of the protocols and practices being development may have costs associated with them. Discussions about these procedures are ongoing, and further details will be forthcoming.</p>		

5.	New Business		
	5a. General Education Reforms by Academic Senate Roseann Erwin shared that, because Josh Bearden had to leave SGC early to join the Curriculum Committee meeting, he asked that the General Education item be moved to and SGC agenda in the Fall.		
6.	Budget Update (<i>standing item</i>) President Kratochvil stated that, by all indications, the State budget is going to be bad. Local revenues and property taxes are down, as those funding sources have been negatively impacted by the public health emergency and its economic impact. VP Montoya explained that, over multiple years, there will be an expected State deficit of \$54B. Community colleges have been told to expect a 10-15% reduction in budget, so our District is looking at various strategies that could include the use of reserves. As best they can, President Kratochvil and VP Montoya will share information with SGC and the campus community; at this point, however, they don't have many specifics – but they recognize that there is angst about the budget. If our District is impacted with \$50M budget reduction, the worst-case scenario for LMC would be an \$11M reduction; with the May Revise figures, we would be looking at something in the neighborhood of \$6-8M (before the CARES Act and reserves). With that in mind, and given the potential magnitude of the situation, it is important for us to be strategic and smart about College expenditures.		
7.	Accreditation (<i>standing item</i>) President Kratochvil thanked everyone for their efforts on the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, particularly: Chialin Hsieh, BethAnn Stone, Scott Warfe, and the members of the Accreditation Steering Committee; Jennifer Adams for editing the ISER; and all of the classified professionals, faculty, managers/supervisors, and students who contributed to the document and the process. The ISER has been approved by SGC and all three Senates, with the Office of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness is gathering the necessary signatures, and it will then be submitted for Governing Board approval in June.		
8.	Curriculum (<i>standing item</i>) – N/A		
9.	Updates & Announcements/Constituency Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Kratochvil thanked everyone – managers, faculty, classified professionals, and students – for their tremendous efforts throughout year, but particularly over the last several months. He reminded everyone to watch the virtual Graduation ceremony, which will debut this Friday at 3:00 p.m. • Academic Senate: Roseann Erwin didn't have any additional updates beyond what was shared earlier during the meeting. • Classified Senate: Nicole Almassey reported that the Classified Senate is looking to host a professional development activity in June for LMC classified professionals. She will also be working on the College's launch of the Caring Campus initiative this Summer. • Student Senate: Thyra Cobbs stated that there wasn't an LMCAS report, other than everyone is working on finals. • Management Team: Natalie Hannum reported that the management team has also been engaging in the review and dialogue around the Mission, Values, and Vision Statements. • Curriculum: no representative present. • Other: Natalie Hannum shared that the new issue of Career Focus is going out, and an e-version is available on our website. 		
10	Community College Items of Interest: Legislation, Research & Best Practices – N/A		
11	Campus Communication: Actions & Notable Items to Report from SGC Work continues on the Mission Statement, with further review/input needed by the Classified and Student Senates. SGC also has draft Vision and Values Statements that it will send to all three Senates for review in the Fall.		
12	Adjournment – President Kratochvil thanked the members for their work, including their work on SGC. He closed the meeting by telling everyone to stay healthy and be safe. The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m. <i>MSC: Erwin/Cobbs. Yeas – Almassey, Cobbs, Delgado, Erwin, Hannum, Molina, Montoya; Nays – N/A; Abstentions – N/A.</i>		