

Proposal for Revising ROC, FSPC, and CTC Using a Workgroup Model (aka Mega ROC)

In envisioning a streamlined request application process, it has been challenging to envision the “choreography” across the three related committees (ROC, FSPC, and CTC). The current structure builds in a need for a lot of back-and-forth across multiple spaces thereby prolonging the search for answers and guidance and adding additional burden to authors and committee members. There can be one application, but it will still be difficult to connect the three spaces in a productive way. A possible solution is to create a structure where we have all needed folks in one room to problem solve together and reduce the need for things to leave their respective committees.

Goals (Problems we are trying to solve and solutions)

- Streamline the process by reducing the number of meetings needed and the amount of follow up needed
- Facilitate cohesive and holistic conversations
- Facilitate a more effective governance review and communication process so there is enough time for work and constituency review and feedback (thereby increasing engagement and reducing committee service-related burnout)
- Provide a kinder and more effective process for committee members as well as request authors
- Produce aligned priorities across all 5 areas (ROC, FSPC, CTC, FHPC, and CHPC)

Proposal

ROC, FSPC, and CTC merge into one space (herein referred to as “M-ROC” for merged ROC). M-ROC would then include “workgroups” for technology, facilities, and resources/supplies.

The representation would be enough to cover all areas but move the work more efficiently by reducing the amount of follow up needed. In addition, it would facilitate more holistic conversations and more deliberate alignment. The intention is to keep FHPC and CHPC as close as possible to how they are now, but both would connect to M-ROC more deliberately.

The current model makes it difficult to get work through the governance process since there is a lot of back-and-forth needed to produce the lists. A merged space would also simplify the governance process and allow more time for holistic conversations. A merged space would also reduce meetings and the need to “staff” committees since engagement is a challenge due to overall staffing shortages across the campus. In addition, it takes advantage of the overlap already built in the three committees and makes sure they are connected in a productive way. Overall, we’d be designing one space for questions, answers, and planning for all related to resource prioritization.

In addition, the current model creates a total of 27 seats that need to be filled: 8 seats for ROC, 6 seats for FSPC, and 13 seats for CTC for faculty, classified, student, and admin reps. The proposed model would turn that into 13 open representative spots thereby lessening the burden on constituencies to staff three important ranking spaces.

M-ROC Structure

M-ROC would meet twice a month for 2 hours, but there would no longer be separate FSPC and CTC meetings. Hours dedicated a month to ranking for the three areas would go from 4.5 across three spaces to 4 in one space.

Current Model (4 monthly meetings; 6 hours)

- ROC meets twice a month for 1.5 hours each time
- FSPC meets once a month for 1.5 hours
- CTC meets once a month for 1.5 hours

Note: Should CTC and FSPC need to meet twice a month, the total meeting hours would go up to 9.

Proposed model (2 monthly meetings; 4 hours)

- M-ROC (with ROC, CTC, and FSPC workgroups): meet twice a month for 2 hours each time.

Work Flow

M-ROC Meeting Structure (2 Hours)

Basic Agenda Set-Up

- **30 minutes joint planning (including sharing feedback from constituents)**
 - Alignment of priorities
 - Workgroup check in and collaboration
- **45 minutes-1 hour workgroup activities**
 - Includes proactively reaching out to author to authors to provide tracking updates and include a liaison model approach
 - Liaisons gather needed information and amend requests as possible.
- **30 minutes reports and joint outlining of next steps**–including reaching out to constituents (using the directory and email templates, folks can report out right then in there)

Spring Semester

- Authors submit 1 form for technology, facilities, and resources/supplies areas; staffing committees (FHPC and CHPC) each have their own separate forms as they do now.
- M-ROC would need to make sure there are established workgroups for each area: supplies/resources, technology, and facilities (breakdown proposed below under “[Proposed Representation](#)”).
- At the start of the Spring semester, the joint forms go to M-ROC.
 - **Note:** Reduces processing work for IESE Office and admin assistants.
- **Efficient Yet Cohesive Division of Labor:** The whole of M-ROC reviews requests and divides them amongst the workgroups (three “piles” of requests: facilities, tech, and supplies/resources).
 - **Note:** Reduces the amount of follow up needed between ranking areas. There would no longer be a need for authors to resubmit requests if they have to move from one area to another. That could be done within M-ROC.

- **Streamlined Review of Requests:** In the scheduled meetings, the workgroups review their assigned requests. The review process would include annotation and amendments (with author communications and approval facilitated by the workgroup leads) to the requests so the request can reflect the full reality of possible implementation. The workgroup can identify additional needs and consultants and then themselves organize needed communications. Then, the workgroup can themselves add those considerations as annotations to the requests. **For example, if a tech request will also need furniture and the author didn't know, that can be noted and considered within the current cycle and the committee itself can add the amendment and include the furniture request to send to ROC.**
 - **Note:** This will require less follow up since area experts will be in the room and can address concerns in real time. The workgroups are able to use the built-in meeting time to better support author requests as well as identify additional considerations so requests are more complete/accurate.
- **Pro-Active Author Support and Problem Solving:** Workgroups rank “perfected” requests. This means that the requests would be amended to reflect the reality of implementation within the ranking process so that on-time author support is built in and requests present a more complete picture of what is actually being asked.
 - **Note:** This will allow authors to receive in-time support thereby reducing the amount of work in the long run.
 - FSPC Idea (Bob): Point person in the committee proactively reaches out to author to offer support and get a fuller understanding of the request and basically be an in-committee advocate.
- **Streamlined Collective Holistic Conversations:** M-ROC considers the three ranked lists together WITH the TWO lists from the staffing committees that at that point would have been approved by FHPC and CHPC respectively; this means the chairs of FHPC and CHPC need to join the same meeting (other members of the staffing priorities committees invited, but obviously not required if scheduling doesn't permit).
 - **Note:** Collaborative and holistic ranking process will produce aligned priorities from all ranking areas.

- **Aligning Priorities:** During the joint conversation, the groups (M-ROC, FHPC, and CHPS) look at the 5 lists side by side and analyze if there are things that are related and should be connected to facilitate effective alignment of priorities. If there are, those should be noted in the lists—there may be cases where a group wants to re-rank based on fuller context. The committees can work together to envision how implementation of requests can work together or if there are things that need to be communicated ahead of time.
 - For example, if there is a faculty position that is connected to a tech request the lists can reflect that and that can be explicitly noted. This can help with conversations about feasibility and onboarding. If a faculty is hired but will need to wait for a related facilities request to move through the process, they should know that ahead of time.
 - Impact: Collaboration, proactive problem identification and even solving. Transparency and honesty. Will help with retention efforts.
- **Author Support and Feedback:** All the the ranking groups (M-ROC workgroups, FHPC, and CHPS) draft author feedback that supports existing requests (eg. “this is what would need to happen for implementation”) AND advice for future requests.
- **Streamlined Governance Review:** The lists are approved by M-ROC and move together to the governance spaces; the goal is for them to arrive at CCC together so that they can be discussed together.
 - FHPC list (1 list): needs approval from Academic Senate (2 reads) and CCC (2 reads)
 - CHPC list (1 list): needs approval from Classified Senate (1 read) and CCC (2 reads)
 - M-ROC (a packet of 3 lists with one list for each of the following: tech, facilities, supplies):
 - needs endorsement from Academic Senate (2 reads),
 - needs endorsement from Classified Senate (1 read), and
 - needs approval from CCC (2 reads).
- **Empowered Governance Conversations:** CCC discusses the 5 lists together and envisions best implementation approaches.

- **Aligned Recommendations:** From CCC, the College President receives 5 lists that reflect recommendations coming from a collective aligned vision.

Fall Semester

- Workgroups revise request materials (form and rubrics) and design more author supports and trainings for next cycle.
 - They work together with ILAT to support built-in author activities.

Proposed Representation (20 members)

Note: The current structure has ROC with 12 members (8 appointed), FSPC with 8 members (6 appointed), and CTC with 16 members (13 appointed).

- Vice President of Administrative Services (Co-Chair)
- Faculty Co-Chair (Co-Chair) – elected by Faculty committee membership
- Dean, Learning & Technology Resources
- Director, Campus Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations
- Student Services Dean
- Instructional Dean
- Faculty (7)
 - 1-AHSS
 - 1-AKHE
 - 1-CE
 - 1-LTR
 - 1-MSE
 - 1-SS
 - 1-At-large Faculty
- Design Technology Specialist
- Supervisor, Instructional Computer Facilities Instructional Media Services, Lead or Representative
- 3 At-Large Classified Reps
- 3 Associated Student Government Representatives

Workgroup breakdown

M-ROC (7 members)

- Vice President of Administrative Services (Co-Chair)
- M-ROC Faculty Co-Chair
- 1 Dean (Instructional or Student Services)
- 2 Faculty
- 1 Classified Rep
- 1 student

Tech Workgroup (7 members)

- Lead: Dean, Learning & Technology Resources
 - With Faculty Lead
- Design Technology Specialist
- Supervisor, Instructional Computer Facilities Instructional Media Services, Lead or Representative
- 2 Faculty
- 1 student
- 1 Classified Rep

Facilities and Sustainability Workgroup (6 members)

- Director, Campus Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations
 - With Faculty Lead
- 1 Dean (Instructional or Student Services)
- 2 Faculty
- 1 Classified Rep
- 1 student

Current Compositions of ROC, FSPC, and CTC

ROC (12 members)	FSPC (8 members)	CTC (16 members)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vice President of Administrative Services (Co-Chair)• Faculty Co-Chair (Co-Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Administrative Co-Chair: Director, Campus Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dean, Learning & Technology Resources• Faculty Representative: Selected from and

ROC (12 members)	FSPC (8 members)	CTC (16 members)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Co-Chair: Selected from and elected by faculty committee membership 	<p>elected by Faculty committee membership</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Faculty Career Education Faculty Math, Science, and Engineering Faculty Athletics, Kinesiology and Health Ed Faculty Student Services Faculty Classified Rep Classified Rep Dean of Learning Resources and Technology Student Services Dean Director of Facilities Associated Student Government Representative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vice President, Administrative Services At-Large Faculty Members (3) At-Large Classified Staff Members (2) • Associated Student Government Representative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admin rep from Administrative Services Classified rep from Administrative Services Admin Representative from Student Services Classified Representative from Student Services Online Teaching & Learning Committee Faculty Representative from Math, Science & Engineering Faculty Representative from Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences Faculty Representative

ROC (12 members)	FSPC (8 members)	CTC (16 members)
		<p>from Career Technical Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty Representative from Athletics, Kinesiology and Health Education ● Counselor ● Librarian ● DSPS Representative (Faculty or Classified) ● Instructional Design Technology Specialist ● Supervisor, Instructional Computer Facilities Instructional Media Services, Lead or Representative ● Associated Students Representative