Governance Review Council  
May 22, 2013  
3:00 – 4:00 p.m., ASC 136  
Meeting Summary

**Present:** Chialin Hsieh, Kathleen Kirkpatrick, Christine Li, Matt Markovich (Chair), Joan Rinaldi, Rion Smith, Wendy Walsh and Barbara David (Staff Resource)  
**Absent:** Gerardo Orantes and Dominic Suvonnasupa

**Agenda**
1. AGENDA  
2. MINUTES  
3. PGS MEMBER SURVEY  
4. END OF ACADEMIC YEAR WRAP UP

**Minutes**

**Agenda**
*Agenda approved by consensus.*

**Minutes**
*Minutes of 02-13-13 approved by consensus.*

**Other – Lack of Student Participation (non-agenda item)**
- Members voiced concern about the lack of student participation on the PGS committees and suggested the following possible solutions:
  - **Verbally describe committee functionality to students.**
    - At the beginning semester, PGS representative(s) should visit student group(s) and explain how the various of the committees work.
  - **Provide incentive(s) for PGS participation:**
    - Provide stipends?
    - Provide credit?
    - It was indicated that students in one of COM’s leadership classes already gain points from serving on PGS committees.
GRC members voiced concern that student participation in PGS should not be limited to just the top achievers (e.g. Alpha Gamma Sigma members.)

- Provide iPad?
- Consider figuring out, not just one, but a list of incentives.
- Consider asking if ASCOM would be willing to jointly incentivize the students (via a monetary donation toward gift such as iPad).

**Student Collaboration:**
- Consider getting the PGS student representative of the various committees to work together.

**PGS Orientation**
- The importance of providing PGS orientation to all new PGS representatives, not just to the students, was emphasized, adding that it would streamline the committee’s work. (K. Kirkpatrick reminded GRC members of the PGS information provided both to attendees of the New Faculty Academy and anyone accessing the PGS website -- the PGS System Overview PowerPoint, PGS Fact Sheet and FAQ’s.)

*Chialin Hsieh and Chair Matt Markovich indicated they would meet during the summer to discuss implementation of the above-referenced suggestions, including: 1) discussing incentives with the Director of Student Affairs Arnulfo Cedillo in the summer; 2) discussing and making preparations to visit ASCOM in the fall to explain how each committee works; 3) discussing overall PGS training/orientation; and 4) inviting student representatives to work together.*

PGS Member Survey – Initial Review of Results

- **Observations**
  - Better response rate than last year (noting possible reason of “survey burnout” last year due to numerous surveys)

- **#13: Committee members attended regularly.**
  - Noted 10 respondents disagreed. (Although it was noted that time conflicts sometimes become difficult for all PGS members, the decreasing student participation rate was highlighted.)

- **#16: Participation in this PGS committee was important and valuable to the College.**
  - Noted high percentage of agreement.

- **#18: I understand my committee’s charge and responsibilities.**
  - Noted high percentage of agreement.

- **#19: Our committee worked effectively towards fulfilling its charge and responsibilities.**
  - Noted high percentage of agreement.
#20: Our committee’s recommendations and proposals moved through the Participatory Governance system and received a response.

- Noted significant number of Unknown’s and Not Applicable’s.

*Members agreed this feedback should be sent to PGS committee chairs.*

#21: Overall, I am satisfied with the Participatory Governance System.

- Noted five respondents were not satisfied.

**Distribution of committee-specific survey results**

- When members discussed the distribution of survey results *disaggregated by individual committees*, a concern was raised about the possible breach of the promise of anonymity made to respondents.

- However, the following reasons were cited to promote distribution of the disaggregated information:
  - GRC’s #1 goal of improving; and
  - the accreditation assessment requirements.

- Further, it was added that the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) survey results already had been shared with EPC to improve its functionality.

GRC members agreed to:

a) approve the sharing of the PGS Member Survey results disaggregated by individual committees with the committees;

b) add the following language in future surveys to clearly inform respondents that their committee’s results will be shared− and that such results will never target “types of respondents” (i.e., Classified Professionals, Faculty, Administrators, or Students):

“Your committee’s results will be shared with your committee − but responses will remain anonymous. “

c) compare the survey’s response rates next year and the following year, keeping in mind the possible effects of this policy’s implementation.

**Confidential Wording in Results**

**GRC Members agreed that:**

a) Survey results should be screened for confidential wording before distribution; and

b) if confidential wording appears, it should be “blanked out”.

**End of Academic Year Wrap Up**

**Future Agenda Items**:

- **PGS Member Survey**: Chair Matt Markovich and Director of PRIE Chialin Hsieh to report back on progress of action steps cited above.

- **Email B. David with possible future agenda items**.

**Thanks to Kathleen Kirkpatrick** was expressed in appreciation for her excellent service to the Participatory Governance System (as she prepares to retire at the end of June 2013).

**Thanks to all GRC members** was expressed for their great teamwork.