



GROSSMONT COLLEGE
Staffing Committee
17 October 2019 | 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
DISTANCE LEARNING ROOM (DLR) / 70-066

MEETING SUMMARY

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"/> Mike Reese	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tasha Courtney	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Catherine Webb</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marion de Koning, Faculty Co-Chair	<input type="checkbox"/> Peniel Shebi	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Lida Rafia</i>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Shults	

ACADEMIC SENATE	CLASSIFIED SENATE	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janette Diaz	<input type="checkbox"/> Caroline Althaus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Gallego
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Academic Faculty Vacancy</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Lam	<input type="checkbox"/> Sara Varghese
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Marion de Koning</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Lee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cary Willard

EX OFFICIO	RECORDER	MEMBERS from CSPC and/or FSPC
<input type="checkbox"/> Bill McGreevy (VPAS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Krista Ames-Cook</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Marsha Gable (VPSS)	PROXIES (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brodney (John) Fitzgerald (FSPC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Courtney Williams (for Sara Varghese)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Luma Shamon (CSPC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome and Introductions	Convened at 3:05 PM
2. Public Comments	None
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	Move “Staffing Plan” to item #1 in New Business Move “Staffing 101: FON” to item #2 in New Business Move “Staffing 101: FTES, FTEF, & WSCH” to item #3 in New Business
4. Approve Meeting Summary & Follow-up	<u>September 19, 2019 Meeting Summary:</u> Approved as presented

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Faculty Staffing Prioritization Comm. (FSPC) (Brodney)

FSPC Staffing Process Update from Brodney:

- New process was discussed at Academic Senate on 7 Oct. 2019.
 - Faculty have concerns about no advance notice about the changes to the process and the breakdown in communication from committee to faculty/departments.
 - Questions #8 and #9 on the application (re: counseling and library only) are perceived to provide an “extra advantage” because these areas have additional space to explain their rationale.
 - Annual Unit Plan (AUP) concerns and having solid data for summary score benchmarks.
 - Disadvantages for departments based on reassigned time.
 - Inquiry about the equity question and how it should be answered.
 - Who prepared this form and how was it vetted?
- Revised date for submitting applications is 25 Nov. and presentations would be on 6 Dec. (possibly – TBD).
- The new FSPC process is currently on hold until Academic Senate meets on 21 Oct. 2019.
- Council of Chairs/Coordinators (CCC) discussed the new process at the meeting on 14 Oct. 2019. The CCC minutes will have more information.
- Comment from Mike: When you have criteria, some people will be happy and others will not. Hope to have a document that most people can get behind.
- Comment from Cary: One department chair feels this document was created by one person rather than the FSPC committee. Would it be helpful to have the FSPC make a statement about the process?
 - Clarifying question from Barbara: What is meant by “the process”? What the FSPC shared to the Staffing Committee (at the 19 Sept. meeting or the process that FSPC went through to develop the document?
 - Cary’s concern is that misinformation is out there.
- At the last Staffing Comm. meeting (on 19 Sept.), the FSPC committee presented its plan/process to the Staffing Committee.
 - Mike shared some background on the staffing committee process. Last year, Mike was the co-chair and they on made some small changes and moved forward. In spring 2019, the staffing committee and FSPC were asked to do some research to see what other colleges do related to (faculty) hiring. There is a tight timeline in fall 2019 to develop a document to be ready for mid-November.
 - FSPC met in Sept. 2019 and developed a process/document that was shared to Staffing Comm. on 19 Sept. 2019.
- Cary has concerns about how we’ve worked so hard to develop participatory governance and yet some of these governance committees do not have the authority to do their work because some of it is not getting through Senates (Academic, Classified) or Admin. Assoc. How are we actually going to accomplish anything in a timely fashion if everything is required to go in front of the Senates before decisions can be made?
 - Marion commented that we’re (the college) still in a growing/ learning process for participatory governance. For example, the Governance Handbook needs to be reviewed – Staffing Committee’s Responsibilities #3 needs clarification and possible revisions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Barbara commented about the “growing pains” from the Admin. Association perspective – we’re making sure the members who are actually on the committees are the ones making the presentations. ○ Catherine commented that we’re in the process of teaching ourselves this new process and we’ll make improvements; as we learn, we’ll make changes to do better next time. ○ Comment from Mike – Point in fact, the FSPC and CSPC received clarification just two weeks ago that these are in fact “governance” committees and now the agendas and meeting summaries are posted online. ○ Follow up from Catherine that we’re learning and making improvements. ○ Cary’s concern is that some people are/were getting “beat up” about this with people getting on their war horses rather than remaining diplomatic and understanding about the process that is under development. ● Academic Senate on 21 Oct. 2019 has an agenda item about “Constituency Communications” piece. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Barbara commented that the Administrative Assoc. meetings should get updates from the committees, with updates even if no decisions/recommendations are made. ○ Comment from Cary that the members of constituencies should feel comfortable doing the work and making recommendations. Attitude that everyone is doing the best they can. ● Review of Governance Handbook – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marion mentioned that page 35 of the handbook may need further revisions so Staffing Committee is in alignment with FSPC and CSPC. ○ Catherine mentioned that an evaluation of the process and the handbook will occur in 2020 spring after there’s been a full year of participatory governance. There will be opportunities for feedback via a survey. Comments/feedback can also be sent to Lorena Ruggero or Cabinet members. ● Mike will be sending out some examples of how quantitative data can be used to determine faculty staffing needs.
Classified Staffing Prioritization Comm. (CSPC)	No update
Other:	N/A

DISCUSSION ON PREVIOUS AGENDA ITEMS	

NEW BUSINESS

1. Staffing Plan (Catherine)
(Committee Purpose)

Annual Unit Plan (AUP) Update from Catherine:

- We've been working on an AUP template for several months and we're at a place now where PIEC (Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee) is ready to finalize its recommendation to College Council.
 - The template has received a lot of input from the groups that are most connected to program review and the people who represent the end users of the forms/templates.
 - The idea is that the AUP can be used by any department to document any changes/updates since the last annual cycle. The AUP would be used as some of the data for resource requests.
 - Outcomes assessment data and student achievement data (if applicable) and other information would be outlined/explained. AUP is the "first step" in the resource requesting process.
- AUP could be used as some of the Qualitative Data for the Staffing Committee (FSPC and CSPC) to weigh as the committees are doing their prioritizations.
- Goal is to align the deadlines for the various requests – technology, facilities, staffing, etc.
 - All of the requests would start with the same "story" because the AUP is the qualitative data for each of these.
 - There would be additional quantitative data for the specific request forms.
 - If in your annual cycle, you do not need an area (e.g., facilities) then you leave that section blank for that year's cycle.
- Questions (on template) are broad, however the examples are specific and contextualized based on the specific units (groups). Everyone is answering the same type of question.
- Questions from group:
 - Mike asked about plans for an "Innovation Grant" that may be used in the future, related to AUP. Also, what about emergency and ad-hoc requests? Per Catherine, Innovation Grant requests are being considered for future implementation and the "off cycle budget request form" should be used for emergency/ad-hoc requests.
 - Janette asked about when is the AUP form completed? Per Catherine, this document should be seen as a "bridge" between annual reviews and the program review cycle (every 6 years). The idea is you (a department) would fill one out every year, whether you have a need or not, so that the program review process will not be as arduous when the time comes because you've written and documented about it along the way, in essence.
- The AUP process may also serve as a place to document the goals and changes for your department/division. They serve as a history/narrative of the progress and goals. It can serve as a running list of updates and improvements.

Continued on next page

<p><i>(Continued)</i> Staffing Plan (Catherine) (Committee Purpose)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine is envisioning the Staffing Plan as a plan that connects to the other plans that the college and district uses for information [i.e. Ed Master Plan (District); Strategic Plan (College); Technology & Facilities (College); Staffing (College)]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Looking at labor trends, demographics of current workforce (at GC) in respect to retirements, developing opportunities/programs. How do we think about equity as part of staffing and diversification of people to reflect the demographics of our students and region? ○ Marion reminded the group of the list that was made in 2019 spring of everything this group needs to know; we need to start somewhere so we can develop the 5-year staffing plan; we need data, etc. to formulate this. ○ Catherine proposes making a provisional plan (i.e. 2 years) and look at the landscape and data points. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Example: Dual Enrollment is underway and could increase both enrollment and staffing needs (e.g., for Admissions & Records) ▪ Suggested future recommendation from Staffing: If/when Dual Enrollment takes off, recommendation to hire a person dedicated to Dual Enrollment.
<p>2. Staffing 101: FON (Marion)</p>	<p><u>FON (Faculty Obligation Number) Presentation from Marion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FON is an annual district compliance item. It is how many full-time faculty we have compared to part-time faculty. • The 2018 FON was reported at 307.5 (district wide) and it should have been reported as 304.7 FT equivalent faculty. • Our 2019 FON is 298.5 (district wide) and we will report around 313 FT equivalent faculty. • Our 2020 FON will likely be lower than the 2019 FON due to dropping enrollment. • We will most likely not be hiring too many new faculty, unless there are retirements or catastrophic events. • You may have heard that the district was fined a large amount because they did not report the FON accurately (due to retirements) and we (GCCCD) were short 2.8 FT people and the new hires arrived after the deadline. GCCCD has to pay a large fine because of not having the minimum number of FON by the deadline. • What we're looking for in the next cycle, is being above the FON number and replacing retirees in a timely fashion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns were raised about the timing of announcing retirements related to HR incentives and how can the process be improved so faculty do not wait until the last minute to announce their retirements or the practice of hiring 2 PT faculty for 1 FT faculty that retires for one year. ○ Similar concerns for classified staff who retire, but not as problematic since there isn't a similar number for classified professionals. • Faculty staffing and enrollment are tightly related and inter-connected. This also is related to Guided Pathways and the long-range education plans for year-round registration. • Marion has additional background on the FON fine – ask her if you'd like to see it. • Questions/Comments from the group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From Cary: It seems like the district was trying to do the right thing, is there any "grace period" at the state level? Or level of understanding that some processes take longer to hire faculty and have them in place. ○ Per Mike, the district is being fined based on staffing, which shows evidence that this committee is important. The timing of retirement announcements can work to a faculty's detriment related to HR incentives.
<p>3. Staffing 101: FTES, FTEF, & WSCH (Mike)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions of terms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FTES = Full-Time Equivalent Student ○ FTEF = Full-Time Equivalent Faculty ○ WSCH = Weekly Student Contact Hours ("wish") • 82% of the budget goes to staffing • Rest of FTES, FTEF, and WSCH presentation tabled.

FOR CONSENSUS	
Update on Cardiovascular Tech (CVT) position – Request for Staffing Committee to make recommendation to College Council	<p>Allied Health & Nursing (AHN) is requesting that the Staffing Committee make a recommendation to College Council to remove the CVT position from the list. From there, the recommendation would then go to the President for final approval. Inquiry from Catherine about the process and the prioritization list.</p> <p>Recommendation: Remove the CVT position from the list. Agreement shown by majority with thumbs up vote.</p>

ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR	
Suggestion from Barbara	<p>Request to have an all-day Staffing Committee Retreat to develop and hash out these ideas and to begin drafting the Staffing Plan.</p> <p>Action Item: Krista to follow up with committee with possible dates for an all-day retreat during spring 2020 semester.</p>

FOLLOW-UP		
Who	Item	Timeline
Mike & Krista	Select possible dates for an all-day Staffing Committee Retreat, held during the spring 2020 semester, to develop Staffing Plan.	Select dates for spring 2020 retreat and share with committee at or before the next meeting on 21 November 2019.

WORK AHEAD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcements • Preparations for future meetings

NEXT MEETING: Thursday November 21, 2019 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. Location: Distance Learning Room (DLR) (70-066) * NOTE: New location for rest of 2019 and 2020.

CONCLUSION
Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

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.