College Skills Steering Committee

MINUTES DECEMBER 2, 2009 12-1:30PM PRESIDENT’S CONFERENCE ROOM, FH

MEETING CALLED BY Valerie Fong & Lori Silverman, Co-coordinators

FACILITATOR Valerie Fong & Lori Silverman

NOTE TAKER N/A

TIMEKEEPER N/A


Agenda topics

30 MINUTES

REVIEW AND APPROVE COMMITTEE CHARGE/MISSION V. FONG AND L. SILVERMAN

DISCUSSION

The committee reviewed the draft mission/charge. K. Feig suggested that the language be changed to include other aspects of “basic skills” beyond reading, writing, math, ESL, and learning/study, e.g., tutorial in the widest sense. K. Jordahl supported the idea that the mission and charge should be inclusive. P. Starer expressed a goal that the committee schedule time to discuss how to operationalize the mission and charge. In particular, we will need to decide how to communicate and coordinate to a larger campus community, e.g., through presentations to Academic and Classified Senates.

CONCLUSIONS

The draft mission and charge require further consideration and input from the whole committee. We'll review and approve at first committee meeting of winter quarter. We'll also schedule time to discuss communication/coordination plan to “operationalize” the charge.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send copy of BSI 09-10 Action Plan by email</td>
<td>D. Gilani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send copy of draft mission and charge</td>
<td>V. Fong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review draft mission and charge and be ready to discuss at next mtg.</td>
<td>Committee members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 MINUTES

REVIEW AND APPROVE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR COMMITTEE V. FONG, L. SILVERMAN

DISCUSSION

The committee discussed the desired process for decision-making, focusing on consensus versus majority vote. We reviewed a sample consensus voting process called “Fist to Five.” Points/questions raised included:

- Do we need a quorum present at meetings to move forward with decisions and what an appropriate quorum would be; quorum = 50 + 1
- Consensus-based decision-making is time consuming
- K. Jordahl and P. Starer agreed that once we decide on a process, we need to commit to the process (e.g., we cannot begin with a consensus-based process and then fall back on simple majority voting if we are unable to reach consensus; doing so would undermine the process.) If necessary, if the process does not seem to be working, we can revisit the process.
- K. Feig expressed a desire to “begin with trust” and assume we can reach consensus in a straightforward manner.
- K. Feig suggested that consensus is possible when people have time to think about the decisions.
- V. Fong suggested we utilize technology to extend discussions beyond meeting time. Etudes-ng is an option, as it’s relatively user-friendly and supported by Foothill Global Access. K. Jordahl raised the issue of whether Etudes has a limit on guest access and L. Noone asked if classified staff could be assigned User IDs.

CONCLUSIONS

We will use a consensus-based decision-making process with the understanding that committee co-coordinators will alert committee to major decisions ahead of time. We will use a technology platform to
extend discussion and reach consensus in an online environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check with FGA re Etudes constraints</td>
<td>V. Fong</td>
<td>Done – Etudes project sites do not have maximum guest access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create project site on Etudes-ng</td>
<td>V. Fong</td>
<td>Fri, 01/08/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10 MINUTES

#### SET COMMITTEE MEETING DATES FOR WINTER

**DISCUSSION**
The committee briefly discussed desired dates and times. V. Fong asked if meetings after 4pm are possible in order to accommodate any individuals from Bio Health who might want to join the committee. K. Jordahl suggested that it would be more appropriate to wait for any Bio Health individuals to join and before setting a meeting time that accommodates them. The goal is to schedule 2-3 full committee meetings during the quarter, with workgroups meeting independently either face-to-face or online. The committee discussed conference call options, such as CCC Confer.

**CONCLUSIONS**
V. Fong will use Meeting Maker to find an appropriate meeting time for winter quarter. To do this, all committee members must update their MM with their winter schedule and standing meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update Meeting Maker for winter quarter</td>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td>Wed, 12/9/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send out MM proposals for winter quarter committee meetings</td>
<td>V. Fong</td>
<td>Friday, 12/11/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 30 MINUTES

#### WORKGROUP BREAK-OUTS

**DISCUSSION**
The learning community and tutorial work-groups broke out to discuss the following:
- Review work completed to date or in progress
- Review Action Plan activities for winter quarter
- Identify research needs
- Identify/assign action items/deliverables and calendar milestones
- Establish expectations for communication for workgroup
- Set workgroup meeting dates for winter quarter

**CONCLUSIONS**
See co-coordinators for update on the discussion and outcome of the break-out sessions.

**ACTION ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>