

## **Evaluation Workgroup Recommendations May 23, 2011**

**Members Present on April 1st:** Sheri Berger, Michelle Fowles, Annie Reed, LaVergne Rosow, Rebecca Stein, Roana Thornock. The recommendations were also reviewed by Cyndi Maddren and Dorothy Bates for their input before circulation.

**Members Present on April 15<sup>th</sup>:** Dorothy Bates, Sheri Berger, Michelle Fowles, Cyndi Maddren, LaVergne Rosow, Rebecca Stein and Roana Thornock.

**Members Present on May 23<sup>rd</sup>:** Dorothy Bates, Sheri Berger, Michelle Fowles, Cyndi Maddren, Annie Reed, LaVergne Rosow, Rebecca Stein and Roana Thornock.

**Process:** The workgroup initially met and reviewed the evaluation data including survey responses, committee self-evaluations, original big picture documentation on intent for new structure, and information from the troubleshooting workgroup. Also available for review were the committee websites, minutes, agendas and the chair self-evaluations. The workgroup focused on issues with structure and process, as opposed to personnel. After writing an initial set of recommendations, the committee invited comments. The draft report was sent to all Tier 1 and 2 committee members and was discussed at the April IEC meeting. All comments received were reviewed at a follow-up meeting and were considered before the workgroup drafted a final set of recommendations.

### **Recommendations**

The Evaluation Workgroup makes the following recommendations:

- 1) **Changes to the Structure** – one council with FPC moved to a Tier 3 committee under WEC . Since much of the WEC committee structure and function is contractual, it needs to be confirmed that moving the facilities planning function under WEC does not violate any contract language.

The membership would be the same as the current IEC membership with the following changes in several of the faculty seats – replace COAC and FPC chairs with the chairs of WEC, SSC, and TC. If COAC is eliminated and FPC is no longer a Tier 2 committee, those seats are removed. WEC, SSC and TC which previously reported to and sat on COAC would now be on IEC.


The Dean of Research and Planning, who is currently co-chair by position should remain on the committee as a member, but not be designated co-chair. IEC had a specified faculty co-chair and the COAC chair was undesignated. The workgroup recommends that any faculty, staff or administrative council member be eligible


to run for council chair. If the new plan is adopted, chair elections for the Council should be held at the June Retreat for a one-year term.

# Council Membership

- **Administration**
  - *Dean, Research & Planning*
  - *VP Admin Services*
  - *VP Student Services*
  - *VP Academic Affairs*
  - *Rep, Teamsters 911*
- **Faculty Members**
  - *Chair, PEPC*
  - *Chair, EPC*
  - *Chair, HPC*
  - *Chair, WEC*
  - *Chair, TPPC*
  - *Chair, SSC*
  - *Senate President or designee*
  - *AFT President or designee*
- **Staff Members**
  - *AFT 1521A*
  - *SEIU 721*
  - *Bldg&Trades/SEIU 99*
- **Student Members**
  - *ASU Representative*
  - *ASU Representative*
- **Ex Officio**
  - *Sue Carleo, LAVC President*
- Total = 18 voting members (does not include ex officio or resource members)

## How Things Get to the President





Rationale – The evaluations and minutes of COAC and FPC showed that little to no substantive actions had been taken by those groups and that both groups felt unclear on their role in the new structure. What items were owned by which council was also seen as an issue. While Facilities planning needs to be done, that workgroup felt that it should be done under the Work Environment Committee that already examines space and facilities issues. The workload of FPC seemed less than that of other Tier 2 committees.

HPC remains a Tier 2 committee, however the workgroup had serious concerns about the functioning and deliverables from this committee. There needs to be a procedure for faculty hiring and a procedure for administrative and classified hiring that is approved by the Council, including appropriate forms and a Hiring Handbook. Minimum staffing levels need to be reviewed and recommended for all areas.

- 2) **Eliminate the FAW.** The Budget Office, as a resource to the council, will attach dollars to motions, make regular budget presentations, and answer requests for information. IEC should work with the Budget Office on how fiscal information is presented (e.g., consistency in reporting format and timeliness).

Rationale – The purpose of the FAW was to attach costs to motions being brought to the Councils. This can and in reality largely has been done solely by the Budget Office. The job of prioritizing and further analyzing is to be done by the Council, with the help of the Fiscal Review and Oversight Group (see below). To ensure that IEC operates truly as a planning and budget council, continuing training needs to happen. To make the information presented by the Budget Office as useful and understandable as possible, a consistent format for reports should be established and reports should be circulated with the agenda whenever possible.

- 3) **Form a Fiscal Review and Oversight Group** of the Council to propose general campus policies and procedures.

Membership – 1 representative from Budget Office, 1 administrative representative (all dean levels), 2 faculty representatives, 2 staff representatives, 1 student representative

Rationale – while IEC needs to be a planning and budget council, certain specific fiscal oversight tasks can best be carried out by a workgroup. This workgroup can work with the Budget Office to develop standard formats for presentation of budget information, look in more depth at fiscal reports, in essence performing a technical review of monthly budget reports, examine trends, and propose overall campus fiscal policies (e.g., about overspent accounts). The Chair of FROG should attend all District Budget Committee meetings for additional informational (but would not be a DBC member).

- 4) **Reassigned Time** – The overall reassigned time for shared governance committees would remain unchanged. 0.2 would be removed from FPC and the FAW but would go to IEC and the FROG. Our reassigned time priorities are:
  - a. WEC – contractual
  - b. Top priority - EPC and PEPC
  - c. Second priority – IEC, HPC, FROG
  - d. Third Priority – SSC and TC

The evaluation workgroup had concerns about the workloads of EPC and PEPC and recommends the reassigned time for these committees be reevaluated next year.

Rationale – While the original assignment of reassigned time within the structure was based simply on giving all Tier 2 chairs 0.2, the workgroup felt that the division of reassigned time needs to reflect both actual workload and campus priorities. EPC and

PEPC have both the highest workload and are central to accreditation and planning. In addition, 0.2 is recommended for the IEC chair to compensate for the workload there.

- 5) **Setting Priorities** – Refocus the council on the primary issue of setting campus priorities and to generally focus on planning and budgeting to those plans.

Rationale – While this was the original intent of the new structure, it has not been addressed and needs to be the main focus moving forward. Work should start on prioritization immediately and also be the focus of the June Retreat.

- 6) **Ongoing training for chairs and committees** – training is needed in general, but should focus on the following issues:
  - a. Project management
  - b. Constituency communication (bringing back information to and soliciting information from constituencies)
  - c. How workgroups are formed and function
  - d. Plans for how to train new chairs and members who take their position mid-year
  - e. Succession planning for chairs – making sure there are others who know the work of the committee

Rationale – the need for training was mentioned in a few of the committee evaluations and several of the other issues that were raised seemed best addressed by training. The training needs to be institutionalized and ongoing.

- 7) **Chair Accountability** – The issue of how to hold chairs accountable for doing their job needs to be further addressed. Additional chair training should be done as outlined above. Evaluation procedures specified in the Handbook need to be followed and additional clarification, such as triggers for an evaluation or recall, should be explored where necessary.

Rationale – it was clear in the evaluation process that some chairs had not fulfilled their obligations (e.g., posting minutes and agendas; delivering processes and handbooks). This is a potential point of failure in the structure and needs to be addressed.

- 8) **Missing Deliverables** – Committees that have not yet fulfilled their first year objectives of bringing forward policies, procedures, and/or Handbooks need to do so no later than the date of the June Retreat.

Rationale – These policies and procedures were meant to be the major focus of this first year of transition and are needed for us to move forward. We cannot move forward without them.

- 9) **Research Support** – The issue of the increasing need for research support is critical, especially to PEPC and EPC. This is an accreditation issue as well. We need to build a sustainable culture of inquiry and increase the availability and use of data for decision making and evaluation efforts.

Rationale – Data gathering and generation is critical to the annual plan, program review, and SLO assessment processes and will be an integral part of the EMP process. The Research Office at its current staffing levels is unable to meet these demands. All of these processes are critical for accreditation.

- 10) **Administrative Co-Chairs:** While we recognize the importance of these individuals being members of the appropriate committees, the evaluation workgroup recommends that senior staff not be eligible to chair or co-chair committees or be on workgroups.

Rationale: Senior staff give input to the college president frequently and directly and have job duties that overlap significantly with those of some committees. This would remove any perception that senior administrators may be unduly influencing the decision-making process.

11) **Further issues that need addressing:**

- a. Clarifying Valley representatives on District Committees – who they are, how they are appointed, and how they report back
- b. Calendar issues – BWG needs to pick standing meeting dates (e.g., 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> rather than every other week). We need to make sure the conflict with the Senate meetings does not occur next year.
- c. BWG reporting through the committee structure in light of FPC being moved to Tier 3 (BWG still makes recommendations directly to the president, but needs to make reports to WEC); reevaluating placement of FPC once the bond program has ended
- d. Recruiting members of committees and workgroups –another interest survey will be conducted and should include questions on why people do or do not want to serve.
- e. A completed Decision Making Handbook is needed by the time of the June Retreat.