Notes of Focus Group on Section 8

In attendance: Julissa Fitts, Ellen Riek, Monica Ketchum, Julia Howe, Angelica Diaz De Leon, Biri Martinez, Nancy Blitz, Steven Moore, Angie Gonzalez, and Nik Byle

1. There was a general concern that the requirements are too draconian or authoritative. It was suggested that these be presented as suggestion or guidelines.
	1. The following requirements were given as an example: “Committees must hold their first planning meeting during start-up week of each semester unless its initial creation occurs in the middle of a semester,” and “Every meeting must have a Zoom invitation sent to members at least a week prior to regularly scheduled meetings.
	2. It was pointed out that these would be rules everyone (particularly cabinet) would be held to. The two above examples, however, could be edited to allow for some exceptions.
	3. It was suggested that phraseology like “it is encouraged to make every effort to follow Robert’s Rules of Order” be included.
2. There was a question of how these rules would be enforced.
	1. I had no good answer other than to say the enforcement could be communal or cultural.
3. To diversify committee involvement, it was suggested that there be more advertisement of committees, what they do, and any openings they might have.
4. Regarding professional development, it was suggested that maybe professional development opportunities be offered regarding the various facets that go into committee participation, particularly running meetings, agendas, minutes, and their posting.
5. There was also a concern about how officers for committees would be selected.
	1. In order to accommodate the different purposes and make-ups of committees it was suggested that that be added as an explicit question to the “committee creation proposal” at the end of the section.
6. There was a suggestion that we explicitly make rules or suggestions regarding a limit on how many committees an individual could be a member of or what committees could actually meeting the faculty’s committee requirement.
	1. I am concerned that that is beyond our authority, but it may work if it takes the form of suggestions rather than rules.
7. There was also a suggestion to include a preamble to this section to frame it and outline the purposes of the section.
8. There was a suggestion to alter the terms of some of committee levels. Ex: standing committee, subcommittee, and taskforce. Standing committees would be permanent, subcommittees would exist for longer periods of time but still require charter renewals, and taskforce would be more issue specific and of even shorter duration.
9. There was some discussion of the best way to post agendas and minutes. As Biri mentioned there is apparently a portal accessible only to those with login credentials that could be used. Steve also mentioned the possibility of an app. We should connect with Steve’s technology committee (SACIT?) to work this out.