

**Keystone
Meeting Minutes
November 17, 2004**

Attendance: Peggy Scott, Diane Walker, Jerry Christensen, Barbara Bills, Diane Walker, Paul Baker, Lester Hampton, Karen Potter, Janeice Ives, Brian Conant

Agenda

Informational Items

1. Subcommittee reports
2. Principal Search Committee update

Action Items

1. Shared Governance Subcommittee proposal
2. School Development Subcommittee proposal
3. Faculty focus groups for December faculty meeting
4. Keystone Archive

Informational Items

1. Subcommittee Reports

Reports were submitted from all subcommittees (attached as appendixes). In addition Janeice Ives said that the Parent Teacher subcommittee had collected surveys after fall parent teacher conferences (and had put the feedback from these surveys in Keystone member mailboxes). If there was time she would make a full report, but she very quickly summarized that the conferences had gone well and that the committee would be documenting the changes they made to the process and the changes they are making in the spring for future reference.

2. Principal Search Committee update

Jerry Christensen reported that the position of principal had been advertised on the ISU comptroller's webpage (<http://www.cop.ilstu.edu/eo/labVac.taf>). The principal search committee has not met.

Action Items

1. Shared Governance Subcommittee proposal

Paul Baker explained that the shared governance committee wanted to recommend ratifying the changes to the subcommittee structure and make up that were recommended in the subcommittee's most recent minutes:

2. Recommendation for selecting committee chair and members to the four standing committees of Keystone Council:

- a) The chair of Keystone Council will be responsible to extend an open invitation to the entire faculty and staff to join a standing committee.
- b) On the basis of faculty interest and willingness to serve, the Keystone Council chair will be responsible for selecting members for the standing committee and designating a committee chair.
- c) The chair of Keystone Council will present a roster of members and chairs for all standing committees to the Keystone Council for their vote of consent.

Diane Walker asked if this proposal gave the Keystone Chair too much responsibility.

Paul Baker explained that the reason for the proposal of these changes was to create a clearer accountability for the Keystone subcommittees. Keystone has failed in the past because there was no clear responsibility. He also said that by creating a structure like this the faculty would be more able to determine Keystone Council has the real authority in matters of school policy.

Paul Baker also clarified some characteristics of the proposal: first, that authority of the Keystone chair was only over the four standing committees – so there are some limits to the power of the chair.

Janeice Ives added that the chair could use a variety of means to appoint members to each committee.

Diane Walker said that she was still concerned that this could give the Keystone chair too much power.

Paul Baker pointed out parts of the language of the proposal that were relevant to this issue. First, the chair would make a “open invitation to all faculty” and second, the chair’s subcommittee appointments would be based on a willingness to serve and a vote of consent. This process would not, then, give the chair unilateral consent. It would work to make the process of appointing faculty to subcommittees more transparent and upfront.

Peggy Scott asked if the “vote of consent” could also become a vote of dissent. Or if there could be discussion about the chair’s appointments.

Paul Baker said that is what the shared governance subcommittee hopes will happen. There needs to be conversation.

Brian Conant asked if there should be language about the time frame – about when this would get done.

Paul Baker said that this had been assumed but probably needed to be talked about. He suggested it would be one of the first items of business for each new chair, but there might be some reasons to select new subcommittees before the summer.

Dixie Lewis suggested that the subcommittees could be presented at the first meeting.

Diane Walker said that it would make more sense to have the subcommittee selection sometime in the beginning of the year because people are tired at the end of the year, and if asked, they might not be willing to serve. It is also possible that some subcommittees may need to do work over the summer months.

Paul Baker said that determining subcommittee make-up in the beginning of the year might also allow new faculty to serve on subcommittees.

Peggy Scott said that she wondered if this would look fair to faculty outside of the Council – and asked if there should be elections.

Paul Baker said that elections do not always strengthen the process – and that part of the work of the Council will always be to generate interest and volunteer service. Things will have to stay broad. The chair should have the discretion – but by making up subcommittees through appointments then it allows for greater flexibility and a more common sense approach. What the shared governance subcommittee had in mind is based on what Peggy Scott did in the fall of this year: she got right down to business. They were pleased by this example and this is how things should work in the future.

Diane Walker moved to accept the proposal after an amendment which would clarify the time of this process. The amended proposal is as follows:

2. Recommendation for selecting committee chair and members to the four standing committees of Keystone Council:
 - a) **In September** the chair of Keystone Council will be responsible to extend an open invitation to the entire faculty and staff to join a standing committee.
 - b) On the basis of faculty interest and willingness to serve, the Keystone Council chair will be responsible for selecting members for the standing committee and designating a committee chair.
 - c) The chair of Keystone Council will present a roster of members and chairs for all standing committees to the Keystone Council for their vote of consent at **the September meeting of the Keystone Council.**

Jim Allen seconded the motion. The motion was called to a vote and passed unanimously.

ACTION: The Council passed the shared governance committee proposal regarding subcommittee appointments with amendments.

Paul Baker then said that the second recommendation of the shared governance committee is an information item that will be proposed as an action item for the next meeting:

3. Timelines
The Shared Governance committee may recommend due dates for final reports from each of the standing committees, eg one per quarter, appropriate to the content of the committee's work.

By way of explaining the implications of this recommendation for final reports Janiece Ives presented a sample report for the Parent Teacher Committee that could be used as a template for the final reports (attached).

Janeice Ives pointed out how the first part of the document was designed to be anchored in the Keystone bylaws and appendix.

2. School Development Subcommittee proposal

Brian then made the following proposals to the committee regarding the structure of the school improvement subcommittee.

1. Revise the terms subcommittee members; we propose that terms on the subcommittee be longstanding, or at least until a school improvement cycle is complete (each cycle should result in the creation of a school improvement plan)
2. Revise the make-up of the committee to include the stipulation that the standing committee must always include at least one department chair. This member of the committee should be appointed by the administration.

Brian explained that the subcommittee felt it would be necessary to have consistent long-term membership because the work of the committee would be a school improvement plan, and this is a process that can take a number of years.

Dixie Lewis agree that a longstanding membership would probably be necessary.

Peggy Scott said she thought the committee could have longstanding membership without locking members into indefinite terms. She described the way the C&I subcommittee has had a history of consistent membership with some shifting but a steady core – but the way the committee was structured would allow for members to leave when they lost interest and would allow to the group to expand its perspective when it needed to.

Diane Walker said that it would be important to have some way to make sure the membership of the committee could be held accountable – meaning the committee was not doing work there needed to be a way to remove people from the committee and assign people who could do the work.

Paul Baker added that the biggest problem will always be finding capable and interested volunteers. Continuity is important – but there must also be some way to retain flexibility and energy within groups.

Diane Walker moved to accept an amended proposal:

1. At the beginning of the school calendar year the school improvement subcommittee will submit a list of committee members who remain willing to serve to the new Keystone Chair which will be subject to the Keystone subcommittee review process.

3. Faculty focus groups for December faculty meeting

Peggy Scott introduced the idea of a faculty focus group that the Keystone Executive Council is proposing to take place during the next faculty meeting. The idea would be to give faculty a forum to share their views of some unresolved issues such as response to the Keystone Dr. Dean questions and issues such as course scheduling.

Peggy Scott proposed that the Keystone Executive Council would develop a list of four to six questions for the faculty meeting and Keystone members would facilitate small group discussions on these topics. The results of these discussions would be used to shape policies regarding these issues.

Dixie Lewis said that this has happened in the past and it has been very productive.

Paul Baker said that Keystone needed to make sure the results were carefully recorded and brought back to the council.

There were no objections to Peggy Scotts proposal for a faculty focus group.