IRES Subcommittee

February 23, 2021

via Zoom

**Present:**

Jennifer Eggers – Co-chair

Kelly Dunn– Faculty

Amber Gavriluk - Staff

Susan Makee - Staff

Jessana Palm – Faculty

Kate Marcouillier – Faculty

Gary Gonthier – Staff

Karen Schaefer – Staff/Scribe

**Absent:**

Melanie Kirby – Co-chair

Rachel Pitt - Student

Jen expressed her concerns that we would not have a quorum based on the number of subcommittee members present to vote on the minutes. She then asked if we should wait to vote on the minutes until our next meeting. She then called the meeting to order at 9:03am.

Today’s meeting is considered an ad hoc meeting to give us the opportunity to discuss the rubric. Jen then asked for a motion to accept the minutes from our February 9th meeting.

 ***Motion – Susan motioned to accept the minutes. Jessana second the motion. Jen asked for any discussion. Motion did not pass because there were some changes needed to the minutes for clarification.***

Jen stated on the second page Heidi was talking and I started talking about distributing the minutes. She felt we kind of were combining what Heidi was saying and what she was saying in that one sentence. She does not believe she said “bringing people to the meeting,” she just talked about sending the document out. She felt Heidi was the one who was talking about people could attend the meeting. Since Heidi is not here, I recommend we remove that sentence, would that be appropriate?

Kelly stated you can make any changes that are errors of fact. There was a mistake or typo, or the intention was different then the way the person who said it remembered it. Things like that. As long as we don’t change what happened at the meeting we can make adjustments to the minutes. Jen stated she is not sure how to fix this because we are combining two people’s words here. Jen stated she would like it to say, “Jen stated she would like to send this document out to the NHTI community in less than a month.” is adequate.

Kelly stated the intention of what Heidi said was because people are invited to the meeting, if they want to give input, they should come to the meeting, if they don’t come they miss that opportunity. Jen said perhaps can we put “ask” above the sentence, “Jen stated” and it will be more associated with the conversation about coming to meetings from Heidi’s perspective and not associated with me distributing the document. If we make that correction, can we approve those minutes as corrected? Assuming the minutes are corrected as such.

***Motion - Susan made the motion or a follow up to my motion to amend the minutes for discussion. Jessana second the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed.***

**Rubric:** Jen stated she wanted this part of the meeting to be kind of a working group function. We’re not going to approve or vote on this rubric today, hoping we could approach it from a working group perspective, so we don’t have to work within Roberts Rules.

***Format*** –

* First talk about the document as a whole. If we think the document as a whole is valid.
* Then move forward to the section of roman numerals.
* Then we can make sure everyone is comfortable with each section. We don’t want to remove an entire section. If we think all the sections should stay in the document.
* Than we can work through those subsections and make edits within those.

Amber went in the document to do copy editing and visual organization to the document. No significant content changes were done.

The issue was raised on how to get it out to the campus. Kelly stated the subgroup who worked on this document thought possibly Gary. We would ask him to put it into some sort of a survey so, people could choose Meet, Does Not Meet, or Exceeds or have a small place to give an example. Gary will put this into a survey monkey so we can gather the data from that to shed light on each of these categories.

Susan stated she wasn’t quite sure who this was assessing, the committee itself, the members, others of the college, shared governance as a whole? Jen stated it depends on what section you are in. Document section, it’s assessing the documents of shared governance. There are some parts where I think we need to add in the staff’s role where it doesn’t say shared governance and I think we want to focus it back into shared governance. This document is ONLY supposed to assess shared governance. We are not doing any assessment of Student Senate, or any other body, other than shared governance, so there are some things we need to fix as I was reading this. Be specific on what we are trying to assess.

Kelly stated a rubric is to help inform. I think it will be helpful to people who don’t know about shared governance. It’s very specific, not ideological.

Jen stated this is the rubric and we alter the rubic to fit a survey tool that has these same categories. People will say, the way I understand the model to be functioning right now, in terms of staff participation it either Does Not Meet, Meets or Exceeds the expectations of what a shared governance model ideally should look like. Yes, not only does it define the ideal shared governance, actually ideal sets too high of an expectation, or what a plausible shared governance should be. Also, this is meant as a working tool.

Jessana stated when she does rubrics for students to keep it from being overwhelming, my thought is to break up the individual sentences into bullets. They can go through each one and think about each one, especially someone who doesn’t have any experience in using a rubic. Under Documents of Shared Governance (page 2) there is a separate paragraph at the bottom of the Exceeds column. Maybe now its combined as one solid paragraph. Bullets might be helpful to distinguish individual features they are trying to assess. **So, break out sentences into bullet points so the pieces are easier to identify within the document.**

***The following sections will stay in the rubric:***

***Rationale***; ***Structure and Processes; Climate for Shared Governance***; ***Joint Decision-Making*** ***The******Staff’s Role in Shared Governance; The******President’s Role in Shared Governance***; ***The Faculty’s Role in Shared Governance***; ***The Student’s Role in Shared Governance***.

***Sub Categories within each major one:*** ***Rationale -***Susan expressed her thought process on how the presidents focus is on tying everything back to the Strategic Plan. That’s how our committees are structured. Kelly read, the alignment of the rubric to the college’s current Strategic Plan was considered. The Student Success, Workforce Development, Institutional Effectiveness – does that say it Susan or should we make it more intentional there? Susan said it would be nice to see it in the Rationale but it is definitely captured in the introduction. Kelly commented maybe that piece should go under Rationale as well or instead of in the introduction. Susan thought so as well.

Jen stated, we received the shared governance from Gretchen. She has said we are going to use the shared governance model so that I am going to give you some decision-making authority to you through the shared governance model. Ultimately it gets back to her and she decides ultimately. The shared governance model allows us to participate in the decision-making process of this community. What if Gretchen were to leave or if the next president that comes in has a whole different structure for shared governance. We can still use shared governance but we don’t have the four committees. We don’t have Student Success, we don’t have Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, we don’t have those four exact pillars. So, I am a little hesitate to put the exact model into the rubric because what if that changes? I would want this rubric to stay independent of any single person. I know Gretchen is giving us shared governance, it is felt the rubric should be independent of any one person. Susan stated regardless of who the president is or what the Strategic Plan is, but shared governance would always support NHTI. Jen commented, yes, the subcommittees right now are organized around those Strategic Plans and what we are saying is the Strategic Plan is independent of the president. Susan responded, no, it’s her plan. If the president left tomorrow and a new president came in, that president would continue to fulfill that Strategic Plan or come up with one of their own.

We should really be moving the community towards our Strategic Plan with shared governance. Regardless of who the president is, there always has to be a Strategic Plan and we always have to be making plans to support that or else what is the point of having the plan. Jen stated, maybe the alignment of the rubric instead of just considering it that we are going to use shared governance and move towards our Strategic Plan? Susan do you think we could put that in Rationale? Susan replied that is where it would make the most sense.

***Structure and Processes – Documents of Shared Governance* -** “Within the clearly defined structures and processes allowing for shared governance are guidelines for committee collaborations, ad hoc committees, and the development of processes and procedures to respond to arising mandates, initiatives, and needs from local, state and national agencies.” Jessana responded yes, I wasn’t sure why it was separated out as a different paragraph. That is what really got me thinking about bullets. It makes it easier when you have those individualized sections. Each sentence seems to have its own purpose. It happens again in the Joint Decision-Making section. I just didn’t know why it was separated. That one paragraph versus others.

Jen stated bullets to separate bullets in this document. Jen stated it was separated because it brings up a point about this document. We may not be doing things exactly the way this document says we should, and one of the things that isn’t suggested with our current model of shared governance, is that an ad hoc committee of shared governance could be brought up. Ad hoc committees for shared governance might be a viable option in the future to manage certain business that the community has to take care of. Leave it for now.

***Orientation and Participation of Shared Governance*** - Jen stated she did have one she thought we needed to add here. One of our goals as a community is Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. While we do speak to representatives of faculty, staff and students, we don’t speak about diversity within that. I came up with a diverse representation which says “representatives reflect the diversity within the institution as a whole, and no one constituency group or member has over representation on committees.” I think we want to say that shared governance should represent the diversity of the community.

We can’t have unrealistic expectations for what diversity we can have on shared governance, it has to reflect the diversity of our community. I also feel one group, student/staff/faculty shouldn’t have over representation and one person shouldn’t have over representation. I think that all speaks to diversity. Jen stated in the Orientation and Participation of Shared Governance. Kate asked if Jen thought that would be the Exceeds model? It should go into Exceeds, 100%.

Kelly asked about not being over represented and how it is defined? Jen was thinking you don’t want to have one person on more than one of these committees. Jen stated we do want a diverse representation, I’m just not sure on the language. So, I don’t know if we can think of wording outside of this meeting, so it is clear we are expecting diverse representation, whatever that means. Kelly replied, I think if we use that, that means lots of things and they are all important. It also means representation across the college in terms of one person not being over represented. It has lots of important meanings, so I think it has the potential to include both of what you are saying. Jen asked if in Exceeds it could say, “representatives reflect the diversity within the institution as a whole.” That reflects what we expect, we expect diversity and we don’t expect over representation. Kelly agreed. Jen stated that would go in Exceeds.

Jessana asked if she could make another comment about the Exceeds paragraph? It starts off with, through proper orientation and exposure to a well-functioning shared governance model, she felt this was a little redundant. She feels it should start with, all NHTI community members realize the potential…..If we want to keep that first part, it should come after shared governance model. Its about the order in which you read that. You wouldn’t need the comma that way. Kate stated was it our intention to make this all into bullet points? Members responded yes.

Jessana stated what she is trying to get to is reduce wordiness and redundancy. If we are going to keep it, then I recommend putting it at the end of the sentence. That first half at the end of the sentence. So it reads, All NHTI community members realize the potential impact of a successful shared governance model through proper orientation and exposure to a well-functioning shared governance model.

***Meetings* -** Melanie felt we need to define academic year. Jessana stated, I think we should say throughout the academic year and in parenthesis say fall and spring semesters. I think then people will realize we mean September through May. That was Melanie’s suggestion was to define the academic year as fall and spring semesters. We have another mention later on in the document for non-academic periods of the year which would imply the summer session.

***Representative Selection*** – Melanie and Rachel both had comments on this section. Staff right now are appointed by Gretchen and Rachel said she was picked by faculty to be on our committee. For now Gretchen decides on what staff is going to be on these committees. Jen stated the way she reads this, it does not meet, but I think everyone that reads this is going to have their way of interpreting it. So, Representative Selection is fine the way it is. Kelly stated somebody else might bring that up when they give us feedback and we can just look at it again.

***Efficiency and Effectiveness*** – Jessana can send her comments to Jen. It was more about making the reading and understanding simpler. Jessana asked for a more updated version of the document so she is not redundant on any changes she makes. Kate stated another one can be sent out at the end of the meeting.

***Efficiency and Effectiveness*** – Jen stated, she really feels as information moves through shared governance, it should always be linked to the originator of the proposal. She will be talking more about that. She doesn’t think there should be any communication about a proposal that doesn’t include the people that wrote the proposal. This is business and we should be able to include the people that wrote the proposal and any communications about the proposals.

Under the end of the first paragraph where it says Does Not Meet, where it says…..are not followed up on or communicated back to committees. I feel it should say communicated back to the originator or the group that wrote the proposal. I think we are reaching stumbling blocks where we are not closing the loop. Where it says….. The results of forwarded recommendations, proposals, or other committee work are not followed up on or communicated back to committees **and originator of proposals**. Jen asked should we use originator or authors? Everyone liked authors.

***Decision-Making Timeline*** – At the end of the paragraph where it says Does Not Meet and where it says Meet, there is a sentence that begins with Communication among constituent groups is not merely an information update…I think Communication it doesn’t belong in Decision-Making Timeline. I looked at the paragraphs above and the paragraphs below. I think both of those sentences should go at the end of Collaboration in the same category. I think that has more with Collaboration than Decision-Making Timeline.

***Collaboration*** – No changes.

***Climate for Shared Governance –*** No changes.

***Long-Range Planning*** – Jen stated its grammar and I am happy to work with Kate to fix it or fix it myself if everyone is okay with that. The second paragraph in Exceeds says….Search committees for the selection of a college president and senior administrators include member(s) of the faculty/staff and student governance leadership….I feel it should be faculty, staff/student body shared governance leadership…..I am happy to have someone look at those paragraphs again just so they read right. Let’s leave it as it is and I will just read it one more time.

Jessana asked, what is major constituencies defined as? Faculty/staff and student or all the committees? Jen commented, I do think for now it is faculty/staff and student. Jessana stated unless we put additional people other than just the leaders it is redundant. Jen stated the only thing which I have seen recently is a distinction between administration and staff. I don’t know if we need to add representation for administration or not. The major constituencies this document started with was faculty/staff/student. I think we could take that second part out if we wanted to.

***Physical Resources*** – I think we should say long range planning, physical resourcing and budgeting, I don’t think are currently meant to be in shared governance. Susan commented, I was actually thinking about it too. We have a group that meets that does long term planning that has a student and staff, but its not part of shared governance, per say. Budgeting definitely isn’t. I don’t know if these three sections actually belong in this rubric because they aren’t part of the process currently. Jessana asked if there was a way to take these out but also make it so some of these things are still communicated to all the major constituencies? I know we don’t need to be making decisions on these things but, it is nice to hear about what is happening. Kelly stated the reason they are in here to begin with is because when you do the literature review they are in every shared governance document and process and college that exists pretty much. So obviously there is a reason for that, that input is important and necessary that its not part of our process is because we have a different model. For example, some of these things, like the master plan, things staff and faculty need to be aware of or maybe even give input on because it effects instruction, students and offices and things like that. Definitely kept current on these things. I think there has to be a good way that’s consistent, that communicates this information to the people on campus. So maybe we need to rework this?

Jen stated if you go to the physical resources and read the middle one, in the middle where it says Meets, it doesn’t say you have to use shared governance, it’s in collaboration with. Jen proceeded to read the whole paragraph…. Master plans for physical resources, facilities, infrastructure and equipment are developed through a mutually agreed upon formal process **and in collaboration with shared governance**……So the ideal thing, if you read…. Ideal master plans for physical resources, facilities, infrastructure, and equipment are developed **through** the process of shared governance…..With a little bit of collaboration and information sharing we could be in Meets.

I spoke with Melanie about this because we spent a lot of time talking about budgeting, was to make the middle paragraph about budgeting read like that middle paragraph about physical resources. Budgeting will Meets as long as you are doing it in collaboration with shared governance but not through shared governance. Kelly commented maybe the word development is going to have to be changed. The way it reads is we are expecting shared governance to help develop these things and maybe they have to be more about…Jen interrupted and said she would like to have some recognition that there is potential for some of this to be done through shared governance but we are not demanding it, right, this rubric doesn’t demand that?

Kelly stated she likes the word collaboration, but once we put development in, it sounds like we are expecting a rule in doing it. If that is not the process the way it says then this will never get the Meet on that section. Jen asked if Kelly would mind retackling the Long-Range Planning, Physical Resources and Budgeting to see if we can put it in a framework where Exceeds would be going through shared governance, Meets would be in collaboration with and Does Not Meet would be no one is asking – only Administration is taking care of the major decisions. Kelly stated she guesses she would be confused with even Exceeds going through because that is not the way it is designed to happen now. We’d be asking for something that the college is never going to do. Kate asked, ideally, we would love to have a say, even though that is not the structure now? There are other models of shared governance that do use shared governance for the budgeting process and long-range planning. I don’t think its unreasonable to have this document just start with the suggestion that, budgeting, long-range planning, and resources can go through shared governance. If Meets kind of melds with what we currently are doing I think that would be sufficient.

Gary agrees with Kelly, we should be focusing on what we have not what we want or what you want. Jen stated its not what we want, its what organizations who have looked into successful shared governance models. So should we just take those three sections out? Kelly stated she didn’t feel we should take them out. I think we should try to rework them because they are important. We could look at it two ways, we could leave it as is and when it goes to the Cabinet they can decide what to do with those sections or we can adapt it a little bit so we could still get feedback on those sections but not have it you know, I’m concerned it would be doomed to fail if we don’t adapt it now, then those sections could end up going out completely.

Jen stated maybe Exceeds is In Collaboration With. Maybe the Exceeds category is In Collaboration With? Which does not suggest that shared governance is doing it but In Collaboration With. Kelly and Gary both agreed. Jen stated we always have these originals we can go back to. Does anyone have anything major that needs to go in this document before it needs to be fixed before it goes to the entire community?

Melanie was concerned that the process for budgeting right now will fail this rubric. So, she picked up exactly on what you guys were speaking to. I can kind of go through the edits at a later time. Gary or Kelly or you guys want to work on this middle section, I can relay to you what Melanie’s concerns were. She just said she gets input on the first paragraph that says, “Budget prioritization is determined with little to no input from faculty and staff.” She just wanted to say, with no input from department representatives. She does go to department chairs and asks them what are your requests. She at least wants to be in the Meets category. Kelly stated anyone that has a department, not just an academic department.

The next thing we should do is the middle section that needs the most work, Kelly do you have time to rework that or Gary or the two of you? Kelly stated I don’t think its going to take a long time. Kate stated you can just get into it Kelly from original and you will always be seeing the most recent document. Kelly stated she will just make changes in there as comments. Then Jen if you and Kate and maybe Gary want to look at it and accept them or not.

We really want to move this forward to other groups. Susan are you aware of a list that can be shared with us about the current committees that are meeting on campus? If there is a list, would you mind sharing that with us? Then we can just send an email around to start to highlight what groups.

When we send this out, I would like to have this sent from the group. It might have to come from one person’s email, I would also like for all of us to save it and I would also like to say, please offer feedback to any one of the IRES members you feel comfortable offering feedback to. Susan stated, we are going to target the groups that are most appropriate and the members of those groups. Send it to the chair and say when you gather your feedback from your team, please send it back to any member of IRES.

* wait for Kelly and Gary to rework that middle section so its more appropriate for what we are doing now. Then we will make some other minor edits.
* Then this document will go to a list as a team decide via email who it will go to.
* We send it out, we will offer a period of time for people to offer feedback and they are more than welcome to send it to any one member of our group.

Do we have a motion to adjourn?

***Motion - Kelly moved to adjourn the meeting. Susan second the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed***

Jen stated we will plan to see everyone again at our March 9th meeting.