2025-2026 ASPC

# Membership (Updated 5.15.25)

## Faculty (voting)

* Ruth Rhodes (Chair F2025-S2026)
* Dana Mayer (F2024-S2026)
* Philip Mancus (F2024-S2026)
* **Vacant 1-year (F2024-2026)**
* Kelly Carbone (F2025-S2027)
* Erin Wall (F2025-2027)
* **Vacant 2-year (F2025-2027)**

## Ex Officio (non-voting)

* Crystal Morse (Chief Instructional Officer, Ongoing)
* Nicole Bryant Lescher (CSSO Appointment, Ongoing)
* Madison Servideo (ASCR Appointment, 2024-2025)

# ASPC Group Agreements (Updated 10.4.24)

## Beginnings

* The Chair will provide a context for the agenda items.
* We will come prepared, having read all posted documents before the meeting.
* If we cannot attend a meeting or need to attend in a location other than indicated on the agenda, we will immediately notify the Chair *and* the Academic Senate Office. Coordinator. We understand that meetings can only happen with a quorum (50%+1), so we will communicate to protect each other’s time.
* If we don’t have time to read in advance of the meeting, we will defer to those who have.
* We will be present and on time so the meeting can start.
* We begin each meeting with a reminder of our purpose as outlined in the Senate Bylaws.

## Process

* We write and amend policy using a consensus process and then vote on a document when we believe it is finalized.
* If debate on a specific change in policy or procedure becomes circular or divisive, or if consensus appears to have been reached, members should feel free to call for a vote on that particular change. Otherwise, word- and format-level changes will be made by consensus.
* We value a true and honest decision-making process, including no votes and abstentions.
* We hold space for institutional history *and* new ideas; we consider institutional history and new perspectives as we write policy.
* We can call for a check at any time to ask, “Is this within our purview?”
* We understand the value of processing ideas and will hold space for committee members who need time to take a moment and call for a pause.

## Listening and Speaking

* It is not necessary to raise our hands; we may respectfully speak in the flow of conversation unless someone already has their hand up.
* If we see a hand up, we will acknowledge that person so they can be heard.
* If the discussion gets off track, members should feel free to alert the Chair (in Robert's Rules, a "point of order") to return to the immediate question being debated
* We don’t want one voice to dominate discussion or decision-making.
* We want to hear as much from committee members as the Chair.
* We should actively listen to quieter voices.
* We will respect whoever is speaking and avoid side conversations.

## Being Human Together

* We welcome food and drink at the meeting.
* We appreciate remote participants having their video cameras on.
* We will share equally in committee member work.

## Endings

* At the end of each meeting, the Chair will check in with the committee about who will work on new policy drafts to prepare for the next meeting. The chair welcomes participation in this process and will ensure that the Brown Act is followed when collaborating with individual members.
* The Chair will strive to end the meeting on time.

# [ASPC Guidance for Writing Policy](https://policy.oregonstate.edu/resources/guidance-writing-policy) (Updated 10.4.24)

ASPC’s principal work is to write and review policy, including Board Policies (BPs) and Administrative Procedures (APs), under the direction of the Senate. When we are first tasked to engage in writing or revision, we ask “global” questions:

1. **Is this a job for ASPC? If so, why?** What parts of this policy are part of [“academic and professional matters” outlined in Title V?](https://www.asccc.org/10_1) What changes are more appropriate for the Administration to initiate?
2. **What problem are we trying to solve in our task?** Why is policy change needed? What would a change in policy accomplish?
3. **Who needs to be consulted to understand and solve the problem?** Who might this impact? How are we ensuring equity and inclusion in this process?
4. **What other policies does this affect?** Would a change in this particular policy trigger the need to adjust any other BPs or APs?

1. **What process wheels and/or models might we use?** How have others approached this problem? What new approaches might we try? What does the Community College League of California suggest?

When we begin the writing or revising process, we ask ourselves more local questions:

1. **How can we best articulate the policy’s** **purpose**?
2. **What terms need to be defined** that are not generally understood and/or have a meaning that is specific or important to the policy?

1. **Who does what?**Are we clearly articulating roles and responsibilities for key offices and individuals? When and where is authority delegated?
2. **What processes, if any, are being created?** How can we best organize descriptions in a clear and logical way?
3. **What level of detail is best?** Have we been general rather than detailed so that operations are not constrained and/or amendments are not often necessary?
4. **Is the language clear, brief, and inclusive?** Have we avoided jargon, passive voice, and shorthand? Have we avoided unnecessary repetition by referring to rather than repeating law, policy, and external documents? Have we captured the action and spirit of the Education Master Plan including DEIAA goals?
5. **Is the format consistent and understandable?** Does this policy conform to our layout, format, and style standards?

\*Group agreements and guidance should be discussed and updated at the beginning of each semester.