



**All College Council  
Minutes  
December 12, 2025, 9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.  
In-Person  
Automotive Innovation and Technology Center**

## **1. Call to Order and Welcome**

Chair Jim Craig called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

### **Attendance**

Present:

- Jim Craig (Chair)
- Denise Riley (Vice Chair, Faculty Senate President)
- Kelly O'Keefe (Faculty Senate President-Elect)
- Phil Burdick (Vice Chancellor, Marketing, Communications & Strategic Outreach)
- Cody Watts (Regular Staff Governing Board Representative)
- Edgar Soto (Vice President, Desert Vista Campus – via Zoom)
- Don Harp (Staff Council)
- Suzanne Desjardin (Student Affairs representative supporting Student Senate)
- Chancellor Jeffrey Nasse
- Francine Tupiken Ruelas (Committee support)
- Miguel Angel Sepulveda de Saracho, (Student Representative)

A quorum was confirmed.

## **2. Approval of Minutes**

### **November 2025 Minutes**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the November minutes.

Vote: Approved unanimously.

## **October 2025 Minutes**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the October minutes with minor spelling corrections (including correction of names).

Vote: Approved unanimously as amended.

### **3. Purpose of All College Council (BP 1.06 / AP 1.06.01)**

The primary discussion focused on the continued purpose, structure, and effectiveness of the All College Council within PCC's current shared governance framework.

#### **A. Role and Relevance of ACC**

Members discussed whether ACC:

- Continues to serve a unique and necessary role.
- Duplicates work of other groups (Faculty Senate, Staff Council, Student Senate, AERC, CLC).
- Should be dissolved, restructured, or reinvigorated.

#### **Consensus:**

There was broad agreement that dissolution is not the preferred path. Instead, members expressed support for clarifying and strengthening ACC's purpose.

#### **B. Distinction Between Governance and Representative Groups**

Discussion centered on clarifying:

- The distinction between shared governance and employee representative groups.
- The evolving roles of Faculty Senate, Staff Council, AERC, and other governance-related entities.
- Overlapping membership and blurred functional boundaries.

**Members noted that:**

- ACC is codified in Board Policy, while some other governance groups are not clearly codified.
- Clear delineation of responsibilities across governance bodies is needed.
- A college-wide “map” of governance roles may be beneficial.

### **C. Student Voice and Representation**

Discussion emphasized the importance of maintaining student representation within governance processes.

Points raised:

- Student Senate meets regularly and reports to the Governing Board.
- Student senators face participation challenges due to academic/work obligations and lack of compensation.
- Historical examples (e.g., textbook affordability and OER expansion) demonstrated the powerful impact of student participation in ACC.
- Consideration of mechanisms to support student participation (e.g., scholarships, stipends, alternative representation models) was discussed.

There was agreement that the student voice must remain central to any ACC restructuring.

### **D. Attendance and Accountability**

Members acknowledged:

- Inconsistent attendance has affected ACC’s effectiveness.
- The need for stronger accountability measures.
- The possibility of adjusting meeting frequency (e.g., quarterly vs. monthly).
- The value of consistent, engaged representation.

### **E. Operational vs. Strategic Role**

Discussion clarified potential differentiation between:

- College Leadership Council (CLC) as strategic and executive-facing.
- ACC as a forum for cross-constituent discussion, synthesis, and collective recommendation.

Several members suggested ACC could:

- Serve as the forum where representative groups bring forward previously discussed issues.
- Function as a cross-constituent dialogue space before recommendations reach executive leadership.
- Address college-wide issues such as:
  - Student access to AI tools
  - Eight-week course model implementation
  - Academic integrity policies
  - Technology and systems governance

## **F. Governance System Mapping**

A recommendation emerged to:

- Convene representatives from all governance and representative groups.
- Conduct a structured “system mapping” exercise.
- Clarify roles, decision pathways, communication flow, and areas of authority.
- Align policies and charters with actual practice.

Members noted that AERC is currently reviewing aspects of governance, and coordination between groups will be important to avoid duplication or conflict.

## **4. Next Steps**

The following potential action items were identified:

## 1. Governance Alignment Discussion

- Coordinate with AERC and other governance bodies to clarify roles and shared governance structure.

## 2. Charter Review

- Review and potentially revise ACC charter to clarify:
  - Purpose
  - Scope
  - Attendance expectations
  - Meeting cadence
  - Student representation process

## 3. Governance Mapping Session

- Consider convening a broader cross-group session in Spring 2026 to define governance structure and relationships.

## 4. Reinforcement of Attendance Expectations

- Revisit attendance requirements and accountability measures consistent with policy.

# 5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:00 a.m.