Governance Review Council (GRC)
December 11, 2013
3:00 – 4:00 p.m., SMN 305
Meeting Summary

Present: Christine Li, Matt Markovich (Chair), Julie Oyle, Joan Rinaldi, Cathy Summa-Wolfe and Barbara David (Staff Resource)
Absent: Steve Petker, Lance Reyes, Wendy Walsh

Agenda

1. AGENDA
2. MINUTES
3. PGS MEMBER SURVEY RESULTS
4. STUDENT PGS PARTICIPATION
5. PGS TRAINING AND ORIENTATION
6. COMMUNITY COLLEGE SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT
7. WRAP UP

Minutes

Agenda
➢ Agenda was approved by consensus.

Minutes
➢ Minutes of 10-09-2013 were approved by consensus, contingent upon change noted on page 2 re Governance Digest.
➢ Minutes of 11-13-2013 were approved by consensus.

PGS Member Survey Results (continuation of discussion)

▪ Issue
A significant number of respondents indicated Unknown and Not Applicable in response to question #20 which states:

Our committee's recommendations and proposals moved through the Participatory Governance System and received a response.

▪ GRC Members' Recommendations to Improve Transparency
A. Clarify the committee approval process for the College community.
1. Map out the flow for each committee’s recommendations (including what types of recommendations each committee makes—dollar, accreditation-related, etc.).

2. Note the following factors:
   a. the need for committee recommendations to follow the prescribed flow of the Integrated Planning Model to secure funding;
   b. the need for committee recommendations to coincide with the current priorities established in the College’s strategic planning process (i.e., Strategic Plan objectives/action steps, Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, Distance Education Plan, etc.)
   c. the fact that the final approval or rejection for a committee recommendation (after it has been approved/rejected via the appropriate PGS committees) is made by the president/board of trustees.

B. “Drive people” to find the answers about the status of their recommendations to the following resources:

1. Chairs/Deans
   a. GRC Chair Matt Markovich explained that:
      ▪ program review requests go first to the department Chairs, then to the division deans, for comments and screening followed by the approved ones getting forwarded to the appropriate committees (i.e., Technology Planning Committee) – and chairs/deans often have meetings with their faculty to inform them of the results;
      ▪ staff may contact them about whether their requests were forwarded.

2. COM’s website, including:
   a. the various PGS committee web pages with minutes containing the results of committee discussions re forwarded recommendations;
   b. the PRAC web page with president’s letter citing approved recommendations (noting PRAC receives institutional requests by the end of February from the committees, reviews them, and makes recommendations to the president; president’s letter with final decisions was issued in July last year.)
   c. the PGS web page for the previous year’s Governance Digest: Governance in Action report listing actions taken by PGS committees

3. Additional Notes:
   a. It was reported research indicates there is not sufficient administrative assistant staff time available to correspond with every requester who does not receive approval.)
   b. It was noted a requester’s only way of finding out if their request was not approved is by process of elimination (i.e., interpreting that the absence of a request on either a PRAC-approved or president-approved list signifies lack of item approval).

C. Additional Suggestions for Improvement

1. Use President’s Weekly Briefing to educate College community about/provide the latest updates on the Participatory Governance System.
It was agreed that to improve PGS committee decision transparency, GRC should provide “teasers” in the President's Weekly Briefing on a regular basis with links leading to helpful information as referenced above (i.e., PRAC web page with president’s letter containing approved recommendations, Participatory Governance Digest, PGS web pages, references to explain how all other non-funding-related committee decisions are made and where to find the results).

2. Share the PGS Flow Chart.
   GRC Chair M. Markovich requested that Staff Resource B. David email to members the most current PGS Committee Organizational Chart from the PGS Manual.

3. Communicate with PGS Committee Chairs (suggestion from previous GRC mtg.)
   After a proposed solution is agreed upon, it was agreed that the survey feedback and the solution then should be brought to the attention of the PGS committee chairs.

4. Edit Next Survey (suggestion from previous GRC mtg.)
   For the next survey instrument, it was recommended to attempt to clarify the nature of the “unknowns”.

D. Outstanding Questions re achieving PGS transparency
   GRC members questioned:
   1. How do we operationalize communication with PGS constituents?
   2. Have chairs been adequately trained how to communicate with faculty?
   3. Have PGS members been adequately trained to communicate with constituents?

Student PGS Participation
This agenda item was skipped due to lack of student attendance.

PGS Training and Orientation
- **Issue:** Status of replacement for PGS Staff Resource K. Kirkpatrick (retired)
  - **GRC Chair's Update:**
    Research indicates that Vice President of Student Services Jonathan Eldridge reported the College is looking into the situation; with possibilities of either opening up the position for a stipend or filling the position.

Community College Survey of Student Engagement
- **Background**
  Since College of Marin was going to participate in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and could add up to 15 institution-specific questions, Vice President of Student Services Jonathan Eldridge requested that various groups within the College review a list of “Special-Focus Items” and then submit proposals for topics/questions for inclusion in the survey. Jonathan wrote:
Given our opportunity to get good baseline data in advance of implementing myriad Student Success Act-related initiatives, I encourage you to thoughtfully consider questions that will be helpful to ask again once we have implemented those initiatives. This will help us to verify impact, assess the SLO’s we are building into the initiatives, and better understand what additional factors we may need to consider in the future.”

- **Questions Submitted by GRC**
  The three GRC members who attended the last GRC meeting brainstormed and came up with the following questions for submission (which had to be submitted by the December 6th deadline):

  1. How did you hear about College of Marin?
     a. high school counselor
     b. family/friends
     c. television ads
     d. Internet search/Google
     e. newspaper
     f. delivery of Class Schedule
  2. Was College of Marin your first choice? (yes/no)
  3. Why did you choose College of Marin?
     a. affordability
     b. close proximity to home
     c. small class sizes
     d. job training
     e. transferable credit(s)
     f. personal enrichment
     g. open access

- **Update from GRC Chair**
  It was reported that Vice President Eldridge combined the first three questions into two. (The others were in the system; and the 7th will not be included.)

**Wrap-Up**
(End of semester)

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