Governance Review Council
November 15, 2011
2:00 - 3:00 p.m. HC 124
Meeting Summary

Present:
Scott Blood, Kathleen Kirkpatrick (Staff Resource/Recorder), Matt Markovich (Chair), Mariana Sosa Cordero, Karen Van Kriedt, Wendy Walsh,

Absent:
Victoria Coad, Barbara David (Staff Resource/Recorder) and Chialin Hsieh.

Agenda

1) AGENDA
2) MINUTES
3) EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (EPC) CHARGE
4) COMMITTEE CHAIRS
5) MEETING DAYS/TIMES
6) DATA NUGGETS
7) COMMITTEE REPORTING
8) PGS MEMBER SURVEY
9) COMMITTEE REPORTS
10) PGS AGENDAS AND MINUTES

Minutes

Agenda
Agreed to approve the Agenda.

Minutes
Agreed to approve the Minutes of September 27, 2011.

Educational Planning Committee (EPC) Charge
Reviewed revised EPC Charge that updated the committee’s role in developing and monitoring the Educational Master Plan including GRC recommendations to reference Student Services and update “Student Senate” to “ASCOM.”

• Discussion ensued re. how emergency requests for funds are handled. Key discussion points included:
Kathleen reported that it is PRAC’s responsibility to handle requests for additional funding. The Mini-program review process provides a system to handle requests for additional funds on an annual basis. The regular Program Review process provides a system for departments to identify and request funds.

The question of requests for funding for unanticipated emergencies was raised. Kathleen and Matt commented that the normal chain of command would apply, that is, reporting situation to Dept. Chair, Dean &/or VP of Student Learning.

Kathleen agreed to ask Chialin to confirm this process and email the committee.

**Agreed to recommend revised EPC Charge be sent to College Council for approval.**

**Committee Chairs**

Discussed request from PDC that staff resources be allowed to chair committees. GRC members reviewed and discussed duties of Chairs and Co-Chairs and Staff Resources as outlined in the PGS Plan.

- Key discussion points included:
  - Concern regarding setting up a system where staff resources are used to Chair committees thus taking away responsibility and possibly input from appointed constituents. Seems to go against the “participatory” nature of the system. Perception, real or not, could seem like staff resources or administrators are actually running committees if too many committees did this.
  - Concern regarding WASC’s reaction to staff resources running committees. If WASC visits and wants to meet with PGS Chairs, we should have Chairs who were appointed by their constituency, not a staff resource who would most likely either be an administrator or an administrative support staff.
  - Suggestion - If no one wants to perform the duties of the Chair of a committee and everyone is in agreement, the staff resource could facilitate meetings, but there should still be a Chair appointed and they should work in coordination with the staff resource.
  - GRC did not want to change the duties of Chairs and Co-Chairs as outlined in the PGS Plan.
  - GRC agreed to add language to the duties of the Staff Resource that included meeting facilitation.

**GRC agreed to recommend to College Council revising the PGS Plan by adding the following underlined new language to the responsibilities of Staff Resources on page 10 of the current PGS Plan:**

> Governance Committees may request staff resource members to support committee work, provide information, advise the committee and/or facilitate committee meetings.

**Meeting Times/Days**

Discussed changing GRC meeting times/days since some members have conflicts, however, no time was identified that would work for everyone. Since schedules may change next semester, GRC agreed to wait until spring to see if there may be a better meeting time/day.
Data Nuggets
Last spring GRC implemented a detailed process to distribute Data Nuggets to governance committees and include them as a standing agenda item for discussion. However, the system has proved cumbersome for the following reasons:
1. Frequently, the Data Nuggets did not directly relate to the committee charge.
2. Many Data Nuggets were long and included a lot of detail that was difficult to understand without further explanation.
3. Committees often did not have time to discuss them so ended up skipping that agenda item.
4. Unless someone is present who is familiar with the data that can explain or interpret it, misunderstandings can result.

• Key Discussion Points:
  o GRC supports the dissemination of brief Data Nuggets to the college community through the President’s Briefing and on the PRIE website. They should be brief and simple so people can understand.
  o GRC members agreed that Data Nuggets be deleted as a standing agenda item for the reasons cited above.
  o If a committee identifies a Data Nugget they would like to discuss, they are free to include it on their agenda &/or ask the PRIE Director or the appropriate party to attend the meeting to provide context and answer questions.

GRC agreed to recommend that Data Nuggets be deleted as a standing agenda item for PGS Committees. Kathleen will take recommendation to College Council.

Committee Reports
Last spring GRC implemented a standing agenda item called “Committee Reports” that asked that any members present at a committee meeting who were also members of other governance committees report on the activities of those committees. The process has not proven effective for the following reasons:
1. There often are not members present from other committees thus making the reporting back process inconsistent.
2. Since all committees are not reported on, the reporting process is incomplete.
3. Many committees did not find time to address this agenda item.

• Key Discussion Points:
  o GRC supports the sharing of information, but agrees that systematizing it as a standing agenda item is not working for the reasons cited above.
  o GRC suggests this kind of information sharing be optional and encouraged.
GRC agreed to recommend that Committee Reports be deleted as a standing agenda item for PGS Committee, but information sharing be encouraged. Kathleen will take recommendation to College Council.

**PGS Member Survey Review**
In an effort to increase responses, GRC recommended that the request to complete the Spring 2011 PGS Member Survey be sent to each PGS committee (rather than a general email to all PGS members) along with follow-up emails. Chairs were also requested to remind committee members to complete the survey. Kathleen reported that the responses to the 2011 PGS Member Survey significantly increased over 2010 responses.

2011 PGS Member Survey Respondents:
- Total number of respondents = 42
- Number of Governance Reps = 65 seats
- 64% of members responded

2010 PGS Member Survey Respondents:
- Total number of respondents = 20
- Number of Governance Reps =72
- 14% of members responded.

**Committee Reports –**
Not addressed.

**PGS Agendas and Minutes**
A request was received from PRAC to post PGS committee minutes and agendas on the Web. This item will be carried over to the next meeting.

**Next Meeting Date and Agenda**

Agreed to meet Tuesday, December 13, 2:15-3:15.

*(Agenda items may be e-mailed to barbara.david@marin.edu)*