

CE Committee Meeting

Date: Tuesday, October 22, 2019

Time: 12 p.m. to 1:00 p.m., Room 455

Person/Time	What?	Notes/ Action Items
	Norms	<p>Norms-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be present in the moment Start on time\ end on time 12:05-12:55 Make meetings productive Respect and Transparency No objections to these norms. <p>The minutes were reviewed. Suggested changes: The next meeting date should corrected to 10/22. Correct Brittney Harrison's spelling should be corrected. Motion to approve minutes- Kevin Kramer Second- Chris March Abstain- Rachael Tupper-Eoff Opposed- Brittney Harrison</p>
	<p>Action Items: Review of Shared Governance Document -Request for Approval Presentations regarding status of all funded projects Timeline</p>	<p>Review of Shared Governance Document: Added all recommendations, this is what was sent out to the academic senate and classified senate presidents.</p> <p>Nancy Cheung has been appointed as the faculty tri-chair by faculty senate.</p> <p>Main discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the tri-chairs from different divisions • Membership • Project proposal <p>1. Discussion regarding if other committees define the divisions that the tri-chairs are from. Is it standard that the tri-chairs cannot be from the same division? Various comments:</p>

- We want a broad opportunity for voting, which is the whole reason we are going into shared governance, to break this up.
- Why is this rule specific to this committee? It was said in faculty senate that the tri-chair must be from different divisions than the CE Dean.
- The document says that it is recommended.
- It is problematic that people of the same division cannot apply, they can vote to not elect people from the same division. The Faculty Senate sent out information that the tri-chairs cannot be from our (ATB) division. Qualified people were told that they cannot apply.
- If the faculty has a problem with the tri-chair being in the same division as the dean, then that should be worked out with the voting. It is an overreaction to the view of domination of CE in one division.
- In the interest of time we could scratch that line, move on, and allow academic senate to appoint based off of their own guidelines moving forward.
- It is a faculty issue right now. It needs to be taken to faculty senate.
- There were concerns that rose from that about transparency and fairness. This has been a conversation that has come from this group as a whole, as we have tried to create the shared governance process.
- That is why the word recommend was put in there. It used to be “should.”
- No other committee has that in their documents.
- Some of it is just trusting that we are moving forward and making progress, like having the meeting during college hour. I think that no one should be told they cannot apply. People were made to feel like they couldn’t participate.
- A straw poll was conducted to determine to remove “recommended to be from different divisions”:
 - In Favor-9
 - Opposed- 4
 - Abstention- 2

2. Representation on this document is copied from SASE and FIT based on how they are represented. The only thing that is different is in the numbers.

		<p>Discussion of recommending 10 Faculty and 10 Administrators moving the VP of Student Services and VP of Administrative Services as ex officio non-voting members.</p> <p>3. It was asked if we can change voting process to “proposal process”. Everyone agrees that this is Ok.</p> <p>Other notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will finalize all of these changes. We will track changes as a google document going forward. • We will do a Google vote to ensure that everyone agrees on this document and your vote will be recorded. • Presentations for funded projects will be at the next meeting, Nov. 21st. • If you have a project, please make sure you keep a shadow budget of what was allocated. None of the projects have been funded yet for anything that has been approved in 18-19. We are hoping for the contract to be on the November Board Agenda. It hasn't been set up because there hasn't been a contract of how much it is. The amount keeps changing as we are going in and out of SWF projects. • At the beginning of every semester, part of it is to evaluate our process, we do that every year with all shared governance committees.
	<p>Discussion/ Information Review requirements for SWP More, better, aligned Goals</p>	<p>The Strong Workforce and Perkins websites were put up on the projection screen</p> <p>https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/Workforce-and-Economic-Development/Strong-Workforce-Program/CTE-Faculty-Resource-Hub---Career-Technical-Education-Information/What-is-Strong-Workforce</p> <p>https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/Workforce-and-Economic-Development/Career-Education-Practices/Perkins-IV</p> <p>We went over the more, better aligned definition. That is the fundamental thing that we have to keep working on.</p> <p>Motion to adjourn</p>

	Review of Perkins Copy of application	Next meeting
	Status of SWP Shadow budgets Regional status Positions	Next meeting
	Next Steps	
	Attendees	Claire Bailey, Brittney Harrison, Kathleen Stanley, Nancy Cheung, Chris March, Victoria Ugaki, Connie Telles, Frank Ko, Adam Hathaway, Tom Lothian, Rachael Tupper-Eoff, Eric Shultz, Jim Baum, Hilal Ozdemir, Dale Wagoner, Kevin Kramer, Christina Read, Mumtaj Ismail, Matt Kritscher, Deone Kunkel-Wu, Kristin Lima

Key Dates: December 2, 2019, Monday 1:00pm-2:30pm