Cuyamaca College Classified Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: **March 24, 2025**
Time: **1:30-3:30pm**
Location: **E-106 and Zoom (https://gcccd-edu.zoom.us/j/87059984099)**

Name	Role	Attendance
Rana Al-Shaikh	President	☑
Stephanie Gutierrez	Vice President	☑
Taylor Fiehler	Treasurer	☑
Katie Cabral	Executive Board Assistant	☑
Michael Allen	Senator	☑
Salma Apple	Senator	☑
Belle Ayala	Senator	☑
Martha Galvan	Senator	☑
Anmar Kakos	Senator	☑
Dalea Kanno	Senator	☑
Veronica Nieves	Senator	☑
Amber Toland Perry	Senator	☑
Vacant	Senator	*Vacant*

Quorum: 9/13
Decisions: 2/3 of officers present
A quorum for purposes of voting during regular Classified Senate meetings shall consist of 66% of those regularly attending Classified Senate members. Decisions will require a two thirds (2/3) majority vote for those Classified Senate members present. (Article 5.1.4)

Guests: Jane Kennington & Heather Allen from the Personnel Commission (2:30pm), Julie Bennett, Rebecca Emadian
Note-Taker: Katie Cabral

Call to Order: *Meeting called to order at 1:34pm*

1. **Roll call -** Welcome our newest Senator, Salma Apple! - *Rana welcomed Stephanie back to Classified Senate, and she welcomed Salma to Classified Senate*
2. **Additions/deletions/revisions to the agenda** - *Katie corrected the agenda to include updated information about the Community Care Workgroup's Spring 2025 employee recognition efforts*
3. **Approval of February minutes** (link): *M/S: Anmar/Stephanie; approved by consensus*
4. **Call for Recommended Action**
    a. None

Participatory Governance

1. **Classified Senate President for 2025-2027 Term** (Rana)
    a. We had 12 nominees for Classified Senate President; *Rana noted we are waiting to see who will accept the nomination*
2. **Classified Senate Senator Vacancies** (Rana)
    a. We currently have one Senator vacancy to fill
3. **Classified Senate T-Shirts (Rana)**
    a. Finalized Classified Senate logos/graphics (link)

   b. Using funds raised to purchase $15-20 t-shirts for Classified Senate members to increase visibility of Classified Senate (purchase previously approved via email)
   c. *Classified Senate members discussed their preferences for t-shirts and/or polos with embroidered logos; Michael suggested having the Cuyamaca College logo on the front of a polo, with the Classified Senate logo embroidered on the arm–similar to what the Categorical programs created; Stephanie mentioned she would prefer a "more breathable" fabric*
   d. *Classified Senate will send a form to collect t-shirt/polo sizes; once we have these details, Rana and Stephanie can help identify a vendor (silkscreen versus embroidery); we will send mock-ups*
   e. *Katie will send a follow-up email asking Classified Senate members shirt sizes*
   f. *Stephanie asked to amend the amount beyond $15-20 per shirt; once we get the actual cost estimates from vendors, Classified Senate will need to vote on this;*
4. **Classified Senate workgroups** (all workgroup members)
   a. Classified Community Care Workgroup (Anmar, Dalea, Katie, Taylor & Stephanie): Still have a few "You're Pawsome" pins available for distribution (link to form); offering spring-themed Cuyamaca College employee recognition in April and May 2025 - *Katie encouraged Classified Senate members to recognize a colleague through the existing "You're Pawsome" effort; she also explained the Spring 2025 all-employee recognition effort that the Community Care Workgroup is coordinating to launch starting in April 2025; she shared a preview of the paw print keychains that we are purchasing for this effort; Katie encouraged Classified Senate members to recognize colleagues and other employees once this is launched so we can raise more money for t-shirts/polos and professional development*
5. **Roundtable: Participatory Governance council and committee updates** (all)
   a. Reminder: notes form (link); notes submitted (link) - *Rana reminded Classified Senate members about the link to submit their committee and council meeting notes, and the link to see the submitted notes*
   b. CCC: Facilities update/space utilization study (link) (Rana, Stephanie, & Michael) - *Rana noted the consultants missed a few areas to include (e.g., Duplicating), but these were noted during the CCC meeting; there will be changes to the plan since the last CCC meeting to ensure they incorporate anything that was previously missing; the consultants are trying to identify the best option to relocate classrooms, departments, offices, etc. from the old F Building to the new F Building and additional locations (A Building, B Building, H Building, etc.); we want to ensure we are using the rooms appropriately (classroom spaces, lab spaces, etc.); Stephanie noted multiple proposals (option A, B, etc.) that included more locations than just the A Building and new F Building; these are just proposals, not a formal action/implementation plan; Rana noted there are some classes that are currently offered online, but might need a classroom for in-person offerings in the future, so there are placeholders for these classes; Stephanie mentioned there were suggestions regarding electronic grid and technology needs for HyFlex and other needs in offices and classrooms; Rana noted there were reservations about the size of CADD, Engineering technology/equipment that is too large to move through a single door;*
   c. Teaching & Learning Committee: Local Onboarding Process input requested (link) (Veronica, Amber, & Katie) - *Katie shared the compiled suggestions about onboarding that the Teaching & Learning Committee drafted and asked for additional input*
6. **Committee and council vacancies, term renewals, and appointments** (link) (Rana) - *Rana reviewed recent appointments and the need for a proxy on April 16th*
   a. ROC: Alexandra (Allie) Neri was appointed as a classified representative for a two-year term
   b. IEC: Amber Toland Perry was appointed as the classified representative in Spring 2025, filling Dana's vacancy

c. Teaching & Learning Committee: Veronica Nieves-Cortez needs a proxy for the April 16th meeting; she serves as one of the quad-chairs on this committee; Amber and Katie also serve as classified reps on this committee

7. **Current GCCCD Personnel Commission Updates** (Rana, Jane, & Heather)
   a. Eligibility list (link) - *Rana reviewed the eligibility list from the PC's February meeting as an informational item*
   b. Recruitments (link) - *Rana reviewed the recruitments list from the PC's February meeting as an informational item*
   c. Cuyamaca College classified professionals' questions and concerns about the Personnel Commission (PC) recruitment, testing, and interview process
      i. *Rana invited Jane and Heather to the Classified Senate meeting because many classified professionals have questions about the process in general, as well as specific questions*
      ii. *Rana noted there are reservations about people working in a position as interim and then not being selected; there are also concerns that the multiple choice questions on the test are not necessarily aligned with the daily operations of the role*
      iii. *Julie clarified that the manager/supervisor selects the multiple choice questions on the test; the PC does not pick those questions; they are always picked by the hiring manager, who refers to the job description when selecting questions*
      iv. *Stephanie asked if the hiring manager would be able to customize or alter a question from the test bank if there are concerns about the questions not being relevant to the actual role's responsibilities*
      v. *Rana noted that some of the questions are in more "advanced" English, which makes it challenging for non-native English users to complete the test questions in the standard time given*
      vi. *Julie mentioned applicants can request accommodations like more time to take the test; Katie asked if that is only available from individuals who request ADA-related accommodations, and Julie was not sure; we will ask Jane and Heather when they join the meeting*
      vii. *Jane and Heather joined our meeting; Rana noted classified professionals had questions and concerns about the Personnel Commission hiring process*
      viii. *Rana asked about the process from A-Z for new employees and internal candidates*
         1. *Jane noted all applicants are screened for minimum qualifications from job description; all who meet MQs are passed onto the next step*
         2. *The majority have a written examination component (multiple choice test coupled with performance exam: Excel, Word, Outlook, proofreading, etc.)*
         3. *Qualifying exam is an oral technical exam; most of the time, we do not have enough space to invite everyone who passed the test to the oral technical exam because we rely on volunteer reviewers/ratings;*
         4. *We do not screen out candidates who lack the "preferred" experience on the job description, but we do give preference to individuals who have the preferred experience, additional years of experience, etc., which may impact who moves onto the second-level interviews*
         5. *The eligibility lists are based on those that pass the examination process*
         6. *Once someone makes it to the eligibility list, current GCCCD employees get 0.25 extra point for each year of experience (based on the date of permanent employment, including years working out-of-class or as an interim permanent), up to 5 points, to be*

added onto their score, which is then rounded to a full score; verified Veterans on the eligibility list get a 5-point bonus added to their scores;

7. *The PC is the body that screens applications to determine whether each applicant meets MQs*
8. *If someone requests accommodations, require that they submit qualifying documentation (IEP from previous institution/high school, doctor's note explaining what accommodations they would need)*
9. *Rana asked if an applicant needed support with English because English is not their primary language, would there be support provided? Jane noted that the general rule of thumb for multiple choice exam building theory is that the amount of time per question should be between 40 seconds to 1-minute, 20-seconds; and most tests the PC uses provide 60 seconds per question; if the multiple choice questions are more complex, we err on the side of 1-minute, 20-seconds; to prevent adverse impact to non-native English speakers, we give more time so that everybody has more time to review the exam; any accommodations would be in addition to this standard time (e.g., time and a half as an ADA accommodation)*
10. *Stephanie asked for clarification about the process for selecting test content; Jane noted that we ensure test content is validated by using consortium Cooperative Org for the Development of Employee Selection (CODES) Procedures (in California); questions from this consortium are based on test competencies that it is intended to assess; PC receives a multiple-choice test packet from CODES that includes; the PC sits down with the hiring manager (and possibly other people) to select the test questions from this packet; the PC generally includes hiring managers from both campuses to ensure it is applicable to both; the PC does not ask things that are vague or would require explanations afterwards; we are not generally going to ask questions about customer service, interpersonal relationships; these types of questions are better asked when applicants have a chance to explain their reasons; multiple choice are better used for objective rather than subjective questions; valid content that CODES determined meets the job description for the classification; it is great when it has face-validity, but not all test content is great with face-validity; as long as it is assessing the competency, that is what we need; if the competency is that you are able to calculate percentages for sales tax, it might give you things that are based on calculating sales tax–but for a Benefits role, that might not have face-validity because the content deals with tax instead of calculating another percentage–but the underlying competency being assessed is the same (e.g., calculating percentages);*
11. *Anmar asked: Most of our job descriptions are outdated–when will these be updated? Jane said her wish was to divide all jobs into job families, and then look at a 4-6 year cycle–looking at job families once every 4-6 years to keep everything fresh and appropriate at that pace/interval; however, that is still on the horizon about 6 months or so; the reclassification cycle had to be prioritized; the PC has been busy with reclass and interviews; the bulk of the PC's class. and comp. work is to update job descriptions*
12. *Anmar asked if phase 2 of the salary equity study is planned; Julie noted this was not the Union or the PC–it was the District who put forward phase 1;*
13. *Rebecca asked about the Educational Support Services (ESS) team who has been working with A&R and other teams which has led to changes in systems being used, employees*

taking on additional responsibilities–but there have not been integrations with HR, PC regarding new job descriptions, compensation, etc.; when new duties are added, it is expected that employees just take on these duties without additional compensation, changes in titles, etc.; Rebecca suggested the PC collaborate more with what is happening across the District to ensure we are being paid for the new tasks we are asked to accomplish; there is no discussion about the impact on the staff member when duties change; Jane appreciates this input; the District determines what duties need to be done and in which job classification they want those duties to live; then the PC is responsible for creating the job description and compensation; Jane acknowledges everyone would like to be paid appropriately for the work they do; unfortunately, this work cannot be done until the classification side is completed first; the classification work needs to be done by job family to ensure a progression of responsibilities, ensure internal alignment within the District; Jane's idea is to make sure that the job classifications themselves are correct, by meeting 1:1 with individuals and in focus groups; this would give us the most accurate information to base the salary studies on; Jane has to manage expectations that it is up to the District to determine what their pay philosophy is for these salary studies across the board–it is up to the District to decide if they will pay at the median, at 40%, etc.--and to negotiate with the Union; the PC's class. & comp. job is to ensure the information this is based on is the most accurate and updated;

14. *Rebecca asked if job descriptions will only be looked at by the PC if requested; Jane said no, they will review all job descriptions and hope to get started within the next 6-9 months by first determining job families, sending out surveys to the incumbents; the most valuable process is to have focus groups that represent the incumbents and those above in the hierarchical promotion progression to supervisory roles; the PC wants to ensure the jobs are being looked at together so the progression within a job family is clear, the KSAs are uniform and overlap where necessary across job classifications in a progressive job family (e.g., Lab Tech I, II, III)*
15. *Michael asked about one of the recent job postings that Debera Nix sent out (Financial Aid Advisor) that say it is a District-wide role instead of site-specific; Jane clarified that a recruitment is building an eligibility list that is eligible for 6 months; if we only recruit for Cuyamaca College, we will get applicants who are only interested in that site, but we might have a future opening within the 6-month window at Grossmont or District Services, so advertising this as District-wide enables placement at any of these sites; the eligibility list is not just for one campus or the other because we do not want applicants to self-select out from one campus; the application asks which worksites the applicant is interested in;*
16. *Stephanie asked if the job announcement could say the current opening is at Cuyamaca College; Jane noted they had been doing that but it was creating problems because previously people did <u>not</u> apply because Grossmont College was not listed and they did not realize the eligibility lists are District-wide; Jane noted the PC could clarify that this position could be at either campus;*
17. *Stephanie asked about the test questions and how the supervisors review–would they have the ability to customize the question? Jane noted that we cannot customize the questions themselves on the MC exam, but we can customize the oral technical exam questions and we do customize those frequently;*

18. *Stephanie also asked about the actual number of applicants versus pulling from a pool: Would the applicants being pulled from a pool be very specific to the role they had already applied for? Example: I applied to be CDC Technician and made it to eligibility list but was not hired–would they pull from the CDC Technician list for a similar but different position? Jane clarified no, each eligibility list is specific to a position; other colleges do what is called "multi-certing" (multiple certification)*
19. *Rana asked if there are any penalties if they do not get hired; Jane said there are no penalties and encouraged people to apply again; individuals are ineligible to re-assess within a 60- or 90-day window, but could apply again once that window passes;*
20. *Dalea asked for clarification about the 6-month timeline; Jane noted the eligibility lists are valid for 6-months; candidates on the eligibility list specify which worksite(s) they are interested in, so a candidate could be skipped if a position is only open at Grossmont and the candidate is only interested in working at Cuyamaca;*
21. *Rebecca asked when the 6-month clock starts: when the job is posted/advertised? Jane clarified the eligibility list matriculates when all the components are done (the oral technical examination is the last piece before the list is created with internal and veterans points included); once the list is created by the PC and the names on the list are certified to the hiring manager, the 6-month clock starts*
22. *Julie asked if somebody passes the oral examination but are not notified, does the 6-month clock start when notified? Jane noted the PC generally notifies individuals on the eligibility list once the list is certified*
23. *Dalea asked about interim roles; Jane noted interim is just a fancy term for substitute and could include out-of-class; interim roles could be filled internally or externally through provisional appointments; HR provides approval for supervisor request for substitute, and the PC does not have to advertise externally but typically likes to do that; need to meet MQs to be considered; the PC sends the names and applications to the supervisor to review, they can interview who they want to or just select from the list; or if they know of an external person to appoint, that external person's resume is provided to the PC so they can review for MQs; at a minimum, anyone in that provisional role needs to meet MQs because they might be interested in filling the permanent role if/when it is available; the supervisor can move forward from anyone on the list of applicants provided;*
24. *Stephanie asked how the PC performs self-evaluations on complains, appeals, etc. on recruitment, transfers, etc.; Jane noted we had few people with concerns about the test content; we always double check the questions if someone brings forward concerns; we do an item analysis to ensure no question was wrong, or if <25-30% of exam-takers got the question right, our item analysis indicates whether the top or bottom 27% got it correct–if the top 27% got that component right, then it is considered a valid question; if necessary, they remove the item entirely and adjust scores accordingly; we have had people come back and say a certain question did not look right, we let them know it was reviewed/validated; Jane has had very few items come to her about this; if a test-taker has questions, Jane encourages them to come to her; Stephanie asked how this would work for a transfer on the eligibility list who was not hired for that position–how would they share their experience with the PC? Jane noted that if they were not hired but the process was administered appropriately, then that is the District's choice to hire off of the*

certified list the PC provides; Katie asked if this would be more of an EEO complaint/concern, like if there were concerns about ageism in the process; Jane said yes, that might be appropriate; Jane noted the PC could certify names off of the reinstatement list, individuals who applied for a voluntary demotion, etc.; individuals requesting reinstatement can bypass parts of the recruitment because they previously achieved permanency in that role; reinstatement requests could also be to a lower-level position than the position in which they achieved permanency (e.g., Lab Tech I for an individual who was previously permanent as a Lab Tech III); individuals can request reinstatement within 39 months;

25. *Dalea asked if individuals can email Jane with more questions; Jane encouraged Dalea to email her and Heather*
26. *Julie asked if there are practice tests for Excel, Word, Outlook. etc.; Jane noted there are some available online that could be helpful*

8. **Search and Interview Committee Appointments** (Rana)
    a. None
9. **Updates from Classified Senate President's meetings with District and Campus Leaders (Chancellor, President, VPs)** (Rana)
    a. Rana and Michele Martens met with the Chancellor and College Presidents on February 28th
    b. *There was a discussion regarding Classified Senate's 9+1, noting that the CC and GC Classified Senates met with Chapter 707 CSEA leadership and received their approval of the 9+1 wording; there will be a meeting with Classified Senates Presidents, CSEA President, Chancellor, and College Presidents to ensure the 9+1 proposal is endorsed by all and ensure the 9+1 is focused on governance issues and not operational issues; this meeting has not been scheduled yet*
    c. *Rana and Michele noted there is a lot of interest to participate in CLI this year*
    d. *The Chancellor and College Presidents recognize that a past Classified Senate President received release time, but they are not sure how to backfill if an employee is in a specialized role; Stephanie mentioned the Personnel Commission could help hire a temporary substitute to backfill; Rana noted that Michele Martens suggested stipends and comp time in the short-term if release time is not available; Stephanie noted there might be concerns about receiving stipends or comp time instead of release time since CSEA leadership receives release time; Stephanie suggested inviting the CSEA President to these conversations; Julie noted that receiving stipends or comp time are against our existing MOU;*

Professional Development

1. **2025 Classified Leadership Institute (CLI) June 25-27 in Sacramento** (Rana)
    a. Funding from President Robinson to send up to three (3) Cuyamaca classified professionals to attend; Veronica Nieves, Anmar Kakos, and Dalea Kanno are attending; *Rana and Albina are planning to attend, Zefora and Belle considering; Sara declined; Lekaa and Hiam are also planning to attend; Maico from DSPS might also attend*
2. **2025 Classified Professionals Day Planning on June 12 at Cuyamaca** (Rana)
    a. Updates about CPD/events planned - *Human Resources met with Michele and Rana and discussed the survey results from 2024; they acknowledged HR did a great job coordinating CPD last year; since 2025 CPD will be at Cuyamaca College, HR asked for programs/areas to highlight; Rana shared that OH and AUTO programs, the museum, the Water Conservation Garden, etc. should be highlighted; VEBA will likely offer some sessions during 2025 CPD in June, as well as 2025 CSEW in May*
3. **Professional Development for Classified** (Rana)

a. During our October Classified Senate meeting, members voted to prioritize training to help classified employees respond to hate crimes on campus; De-Escalation training was offered in January 2025 at Grossmont College
b. Other Classified Senate members would like a workshop focused on updating their resumes and cover letters
c. *Rana notified our E-Board about a recent meeting she had with the VEBA Center about self-care, wellness, etc. workshop/event offerings; Rana invited members of the E-Board to join her at this meeting; Rana wants to promote existing VEBA workshop offerings and hopefully offer one session per month in the future; the E-Board discussed potentially attending a workshop at the VEBA Center and/or holding a Classified Senate retreat at that center; in the chat, Julie suggested a therapy/wellness session with miniature horses and/or dogs to help with employee/student anxiety; Rana noted we could work with Cuyamaca's Health & Wellness Center because they usually coordinate the therapy dogs on campus*

4. **Upcoming events** (link) (Rana)
    a. CSEA events/trainings:
        i. 2025 CSEA Chapter 707 meetings (link)
        ii. CSEA Chapter 707 Open Office Hours (link): In person at Cuyamaca (F-615) every other month on the third Thursday and on Zoom every month on the third Thursday from 11am to 1pm.
    b. Spring 2025 THRIVE Events (link):
        i. Burnout & "Laziness" on 3/21 from 9-11am
        ii. Welcoming Wellness on 4/17 from 4-5pm
        iii. Game Night on 5/8 from 4-6pm
    c. CCCCO System webinars (typically held the first Wednesday of the month from 9:00-10:00am; link)
    d. Black Student Success Week April 21-25 (link)
    e. Equity Starts Today webinar series on advancing racial equity from 11:00am-1:00pm on select Wednesdays (3/19, 5/14, 6/11; link)
    f. CCCCO 3-part series: "From Insight to Impact: Strengthening DEIA for Classified Professionals"
        i. 12-1pm on select Thursdays/Fridays (3/20, 4/17) (registration link)
    g. LIFT Webinars
        i. 12-1pm on select Fridays (3/14, 4/18, 5/16) (see VRC)
    h. Upcoming conferences:
        i. 2025 CCC LGBTQ+ Summit, April 15-16 via Zoom (link)
        ii. 2025 National Conference on Race & Ethnicity (NCORE), May 27-31 in New York, NY (link)
        iii. 2025 Inaugural Caring Campus Conference, November 12-14 in San Diego (link)
5. **Classified Senate's calendar of events** (link)
    a. Submit events to add to calendar (link)

Classified Employee Recognition

1. **Classified School Employee Week (CSEW) May 18-24** (Rana) - *Tabled*
    a. Events at Cuyamaca
    b. Preview: Planter activity (3:00-3:30pm)
2. **Chancellor & Classified Senate Award** (Rana) - *Tabled*
    a. Theme: "Leaders without Limits: Thinking Outside the Box"
    b. Classified Senate members will rate the Cuyamaca College nominees in March/April 2025
    c. Award will be presented at the May 20, 2025 Governing Board meeting
3. **CCCCO Board of Governors Classified Employee of the Year Award** (link) (Rana) - *Tabled*

a. Nominees were from Grossmont College in 2023 and District Services in 2024; this year, there should be a nominee from Cuyamaca College
b. Nominations need to be endorsed by the Governing Board and submitted to the CCCCO by April 11, 2025
c. Rana clarified that an individual from Cuyamaca College will be nominated this year

4. **Above & Beyond Departmental Award** (Rana) - *Tabled*
    a. President Robinson will explore integrating departmental recognition via our THRIVE initiatives
5. **Cuyamaca Employee Recognition Messages in Spring 2025** (Community Care Workgroup Members) - *Tabled*
    a. Community Care Workgroup members (Dalea, Taylor, Katie, and Anmar) are coordinating a spring-themed employee recognition effort to launch in April 2025
6. **Classified "You're Pawsome" Messages** (Community Care Workgroup Members) (link) - *Tabled*
    a. This effort is ongoing to celebrate/recognize/thank classified professionals and help Classified Senate continue to raise funds; we have a few pins left to distribute

Parking Lot/Tabled Items:

1. **Classified Senate Group Photo** - *tabled; pending Classified Senate t-shirt purchase*
2. **Accreditation** (Rana) - *tabled; Kim Dudzik and Bri Hays to potentially join a future meeting*
3. **Caring Campus** - *tabled*
    a. Vision for Success (link)
    b. Behavioral Commitments (link)
    c. Student Engagement Campaign draft presentation (link)
    d. How have you supported student success this semester? (link)
4. **Classified Orientation** (link) - *tabled until we receive an update from the Teaching & Learning Team*
5. **Recognizing Classified Employees' Birthdays and Service Anniversaries** (Katie) - *tabled*
    a. Form for classified employees to opt into being recognized
6. **CCCCO 2018-19 Professional Development for Classified Community College Employees Funds** (Stephanie, Katie, & Taylor) - *Tabled; discussion with CSEA on hiatus*
    a. CCCCO Guidance Memorandum
    b. Professional Development MOU Between the District and CSEA - not fully executed in 2019; working on updating the MOU language
7. **Classified Senate workgroups** (all workgroup members)
    a. 9+1 (Rana): Both Classified Senates approved adding the statewide 9+1 to BP/AP 2510; redlined version of AP 2510; presentation to Academic Senates and ASGs; awaiting clarification of "operational" and "governance" matters from Chancellor/Barbara/Kerry; *No update*
    b. Constitution and Bylaws update (Michael, Katie, & Rana): *No update*

Next Meeting

1. **Regular meeting**: April 29th from 1:30-3:30pm, HyFlex in E-106

Adjournment: *Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm*

Classified Senate 9+1

The role of classified staff members in making decisions at the District level is to participate in the development of recommendations to the Chancellor on issues that have or will have a significant effect on staff (California Code of Regulations and BP 2510 Participation in Local Decision-Making).

The following specific matters are identified as having a significant effect on staff and calling for staff contributions to decision-making:

1. Standards or policies regarding student support and success;
2. Districtwide governance structures, as related to classified roles;
3. Classified roles and involvement in accreditation process, including self-study and annual reports;
4. Policies for classified professional development activities;
5. Processes for program review, including area and unit reviews;
6. Processes for institutional planning and budget development;
7. Curriculum systems integrations and implementation;
8. Processes related to awarding degrees and certificates;
9. Institutional program development and implementation, as related to classified roles; and

+1 Any other district policy, procedure, or related matters that will have a significant effect on Classified Professionals