



GROSSMONT COLLEGE
Staffing Committee

February 18, 2021 | 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

[Zoom Meeting](#)

MINUTES

Purpose: The Staffing Committee is responsible for drafting Grossmont College’s multi-year Staffing Plan based on Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan goals, and for monitoring the implementation of Staffing Plan to promote employment equity and diversity consistent with the college’s mission, vision and values. The Grossmont College Staffing Committee is responsible for prioritization of faculty and classified staffing requests from annual unit plans.

CO-CHAIRS	ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE	ADVISORY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aaron Starck	<input type="checkbox"/> Enya Castañeda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan Ahrens
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Lam	<input type="checkbox"/> King Wong	<input type="checkbox"/> Lida Rafia
	<input type="checkbox"/> Diego Osuna (Proxy)	

ACADEMIC SENATE	CLASSIFIED SENATE	ADMINISTRATORS’ ASSOCIATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janette Diaz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Bryan Lam</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Barbara Gallego
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evan Wirig	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nadia Almaguer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Varghese
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marion de Koning	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Vacant</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shawn Hicks

EX OFFICIO	RECORDER	MEMBERS from CSPC and/or FSPC
<input type="checkbox"/> Bill McGreevy (VPAS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Graylin Clavell	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marshall Fulbright (FSPC & CSPC)	GUESTS	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brodney (John) Fitzgerald (FSPC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Victoria Rodriguez, CPIE	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Luma Shamon (CSPC)		<input type="checkbox"/>

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome and Introductions	The meeting began at 3:10pm.
2. Establish Quorum (50% + 1)	Quorum was not reached.
3. Public Comments	N/A
4. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	N/A
5. Approve Meeting Summary & Follow-up	11.19.20 Meeting Minutes
6. President Update	N/A

ROUTINE BUSINESS

1. Recap 2020 Work

a. New aligned process/timeline

- i. **AUP Feedback on process and timeline:** Bryan reiterated how Covid-19 affected the new process and timeline of the new AUP and staffing requests. Joan added that the process should be better this year around as the AUP templates will be distributed at the beginning of March to the department/division Deans and will ultimately be returned to Deans by October 1st. This timeline of the application will coincide with state hiring timelines. Joan added that she is asking the Deans to confer with their chairs/supervisors to see if they will be applying for a position by June 1st so that the College of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness can start the work.

It was asked if resource requests should also be due by June 1st which the response was resource requests won't be for the following year whereas the hiring requests have a sooner deadline. That said, feasibility reports need to be completed on facility requests by June 1st to allow Loren Holmquist, Director of Facilities, the ability to have the summer to review those requests and check the feasibility of those requests.

b. FSPC & CSPC Lists

- a. Status of Lists – Approved for recommendation at College Council, the recommended staffing lists are awaiting response from President. The budget is not solidified and once the budget is clarified those recommendations will be re-examined by the President processed further accordingly based off of funds available.

- c. **Chair/Co-Chair Term Limits:** The terms for the prioritization committees do not seem to be defined. The terms for the chairs/co-chairs for the Staffing Committee is one year. Bryan wanted to make sure that Brodney and Luma, who have been serving as co-chairs of their respected Staffing Prioritization Committees for at least the past two years were still ok to serve in that capacity. Term limits for these Prioritization Committees went unanswered, but the belief is that they are determined by their respective Senates.

- d. **Rebuttals on ranking lists and recommendation lists:** Bryan suggested a way to allow for rebuttals to proposed positions based on a committee's decision on the ranking of the positions. The response was that the rubric for the position requests clearly defines the ranking process and was discussed and scrutinized in great detail. To open up for rebuttals and revisions on proposal decisions would damage the integrity of the process.

<p>2. November Survey Data Presentation (Dr. Joan Ahrens & Dr. Victoria Rodriguez)</p>	<p>Victoria Rodriguez joined the committee meeting to discuss a governance survey given last fall that reviewed the quality of communication and information as well as the access to this information.</p> <p>Information that was provided by the survey include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 4 out of 7 “sometimes communicate information from the committee to their constituency group” while there was 1 vote for “rarely communicate information from the committee to constituency group”;- Overall “quality of communication within the committee” is good or very good with 1 vote believing it is poor.- 4 out of 7 believe the “access to information for committee deliberation” is good while 3 believe it is poor;- “Quality of communication with the campus community as a whole” received 2 votes for good, 1 vote each for poor or very poor, and 3 votes for don’t know;- With regards to receiving committee reports 5 voted that they receive them at Senate meetings or division council meetings while 4 voted that they receive the reports at department/program meetings. There was 1 vote for “never receiving committee reports”;- With regards to service on the committee 5 voted that they agree or strongly agree that “their ideas were treated with respect, whether or not others agreed with them” while there was 1 vote that strongly disagreed with this statement; <p>Graylin will include the survey results along with the meeting minutes.</p> <p>Aaron mentioned that we need to be mindful of the comment that an individual did not feel heard in the Staffing Committee.</p> <p>Bryan added that there is evidence of confusion of the process on how the Staffing Committee works and the charge, but also not having a Staffing plan limits our charge and adds to the confusion. Is it the purview to change our own charge or powers above to make the charge as to what/how we should be following?</p> <p>The concern is completing all of this hard work only to see that the President holds the veto power on any recommendation.</p>
<p>3. Staffing Plan Recap</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Drafting a Staffing Plan Resource- Barstow Community College Staffing Plan- Berkeley City College Staffing Plan- Compton College Staffing Plan- Mt. San Jacinto College Staffing Plan- Riverside City College Staffing Plan <p>At the last meeting in November of 2020 individuals gave briefings of the specific school staffing plans listed above which they reviewed. Starting a draft based on those findings for a Grossmont College Staffing Plan is the next step.</p>

NEW BUSINESS	
4. Review Staffing Committee Canvas Container	Bryan suggested utilizing our Canvas Container to utilize our committee time better to communicate with each other and be a repository of our hard work. It allows us to be transparent and continue work, whether it be on drafting the staffing plan draft or something else, outside of meeting hours.
5. Staffing Plan Draft	<p>Bryan recommended looking at our Strategic Plan which does not expire until 2022 to guide our work on a staffing plan in place of a Master Educational Plan. Bryan also suggested formulating a timeline on this work.</p> <p>Marion suggested retirement announcements without fear and allow those that are planning to retire to announce that as soon as possible to allow for the hiring process to take it into consideration. Aaron asked if this belongs in a staffing plan or our staffing processes. It was suggested to institutionalized the second/higher and broader level processes.</p> <p>It was also suggested to create a template for the committee to work on for the draft of the plan.</p>

DISCUSSION ON PREVIOUS AGENDA ITEMS <i>(Time Permitting)</i>	
1.	

REPORTS	
Classified Staffing Prioritization Comm. (CSPC)	N/A
Faculty Staffing Prioritization Comm. (FSPC)	N/A

FOR CONSENSUS *	
<small>* Consensus is reached when at least 75% of voting members present are in agreement on a decision (Gov. Handbook pg. 10).</small>	

FOLLOW-UP		
Who	Item	Timeline
	Co-Chair Term Limits for Prioritization Committees	TBD

WORK AHEAD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Staffing Plan

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: Meetings are every third Thursday from 3:00-4:30pm. Next Meeting on <u>March 18, 2021</u> .

CONCLUSION
Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Committees are to establish norms

In order to create valued outcomes, a commitment to participation, dialogue, and the pursuit of value in the form of useful output by all is necessary. It is acknowledged that there are power dynamics in a room. Work must be done to create the equitable and inclusive environment sought for effective and active participation. To do so, council/committee members will establish behavioral norms that include the following meeting rules of engagement, make use of meeting tools, and respect the roles of each member.

Rules of Engagement

In participatory government, a high level of collegiality, respect, and civility is expected. Those expectations include the following rules:

- There is no rank in the room when at the committee table. All participants are treated as peers, both between constituencies and within constituencies.
- Speakers will be heard one at a time and without interruption. Participants will allow for moments of silence for thought and other viewpoints. In consideration of hearing all feedback, members should be mindful of how often and how long they speak. Equity in consensus building means including diverse perspectives at all levels of the organization.
- Members will be engaged and contribute, and challenge ideas, not people. All meeting attendees will be respectful/civil in their comments, responses, and body language.
- Members will listen to others, and seek to focus on the merits of what is being said, while making a good faith effort to understand the concerns of others. Council/committee members are encouraged to ask questions of clarification.
- Each person reserves the right to disagree with any proposal and accepts responsibility for offering alternatives that accommodate individual interests and the interests of others.
- All members should be mindful of the language used in discussions, including use of "I" statements instead of "they" attributions to relate anecdotal evidence or experiences. Members

are encouraged to use an asset-minded approach that focuses on what works and how something can be done. This is in contrast to a deficit-minded approach that focuses on the negative and why an initiative, idea, or project can't get done.

- All council/committee members will be aware of the purpose and responsibility of their committees. When issues arise in discussion that are not supported by the committee's charge, the chair will identify the proper council, committee, or constituency group leadership for review, and forward the issue for consideration.
- Once consensus is reached after deliberation, council/committee members will support the group's recommendation.

Virtual Meeting Norms

At the meeting held virtually on April 16, 2020, virtual norms were discussed and established.

- Use the "raise hand" feature in Zoom participant window to avoid talking over each other.
- Mute microphone unless talking.
- For consensus items, the Recorder will type the consensus item in the chat window and voting members will enter:
 - "thumbs up" or "approve" for yes votes,
 - "thumbs down" or "do not approve" for no votes, or
 - "thumbs sideways" or "neutral".