

Cañada College

Annual Review of Participatory Governance

Spring 2013

Reviewed by Planning & Budgeting Council

May 1, 2013

May 15, 2013

Table of Contents

	Page #
Overview	1
Process	1
Key Recommendation for Implementation	2
Recommendations from Key Participatory Governance Groups	2
Reports from Key Groups:	4
Planning & Budgeting Council (PBC)	4
Instruction Planning Council (IPC)	6
Student Services Planning Council (SSPC)	8
Administrative Planning Council (APC)	10
Academic Senate	12
Classified Senate	15
Associated Students	17

Annual Review of Participatory Governance Spring 2013

Overview

The annual evaluation of the participatory governance structure at the college is described in the Participatory Governance Manual. This review takes place during the end of the spring semester each year as the key governance groups are winding down their planning and program review activities and take the time to reflect on what worked and what can be improved.

Process

The process for the evaluation of participatory governance is as follows:

“In order to assure institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment, the participatory governance and decision-making processes (planning, program review) will be evaluated regularly. The Planning & Budgeting Council and the College President will share primary responsibility for assuring this evaluation is completed. These evaluations are set up to ensure the participatory governance structure provides for:

- *a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;*
- *evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions; and*
- *educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes.*

Elements of the Evaluation Process

- *Staff and Student Survey:* Periodically, the faculty, staff and students will be surveyed to determine if the processes described in this document are working effectively.
- *Review by Primary Participatory Governance Groups:* The primary participatory governance groups: IPC/SSPC/APC/Academic Senate/Classified Senate/ASCC will review the data collected and make recommendations for improvement based on the data.
- *Review by Planning & Budgeting Council:* The PBC will receive reports from the primary groups and recommend changes to processes as needed.

Timeline for the Evaluation Process

Annual Timeline	Group	Activity
March	PBC	Reviews evaluation questions for key governance groups, which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?• Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?• How is the coordination among the governance groups working?• How well did the annual planning process work this year?• How well did the new hire priority setting process work?• Are there any structural issues which should be addressed?• Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus?• How effective is the group?• What could be changed for the upcoming year?
April	IPC, APC, SPC, PBC	Respond to the evaluation questions on governance and prepare information to be shared with PBC
May	PBC	Report from the governance groups reviewed and discussed. Changes made as needed.

Recommendations for Implementation

At the May 1st meeting, the PBC recommended implementing the following changes based on the review of the report:

1. Start PBC meetings at 2:10pm
2. Purchase new tables for Building 2, Room 10
3. Set goals for the upcoming year – most will be in the strategic plan, but there may be others; this can be done at either the last meeting of the year or the first meeting of the new academic year
4. Revise the hiring process to a) change the timeline to make the decision by the end of February; b) adjust the “discussion” meeting to add priority setting and ask others (beyond Cabinet) to facilitate
5. Add reports from SSPC/IPC/APC/Academic Senate/Classified Senate/ASCC

Specific Recommendations from the Key Participatory Governance Groups

From Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC)

1. Start meetings on time – look at starting at 2:10 as faculty have classes
2. Purchase new tables for 2-10
3. Set goals for the 2013-14 academic year – maybe at the last meeting of the year
4. Review annual plan/program review process
5. Revise the hiring process “discussion” time to add a priority setting process, change group leaders, and determine best way to provide information to the president

From Instruction Planning Council (IPC)

1. Continue to meet regularly and have additional meetings as necessary
2. Use taskforce committees, as needed.
3. Change timeline for hiring – move earlier.

From Student Services Planning Council (SSPC)

1. Share more information among the groups – e.g. have IPC reports at SSPC
2. APC needs to distribute agendas and minutes if they are not already doing so
3. All Participatory Governance Group Agendas and Minutes should be on Inside Cañada
4. Keep annual plan/program review form the same (it works)
5. Possibly set a few overall SSPC Goals

From Administrative Planning Council (APC)

1. Develop a general calendar of APC meetings for the year.
2. Change hiring timeline to end by February 28
3. Allow new hire discussion groups to prioritize
4. Change the group leaders to have faculty/staff facilitators
5. Add reports from SSPC/IPC/APC/Academic Senate/Classified Senate to the PBC agendas

From Academic Senate

1. Perhaps rearrange the agenda, but no real changes necessary.
2. Define what the ‘desired level’ for participation is—is it 100% of FT Faculty, 75%, or what?—and measure it. This would help to understand how much participation is really there, and to set goals for the future.
3. PT Faculty—it might help to have a PT Faculty Senate, especially as a way to increase PT Faculty awareness of Participatory Governance (that it exists, that it’s important, and *why* it’s important)

to participate), and even change the culture of PT Faculty 'buy-in' of Cañada being a 'home campus'. However, it was noted that it also might not work.

4. FT Faculty—need more participation from those who don't tend to serve on committees.
5. Perhaps a newsletter, such as the Accreditation Newsletter, would be a good idea in order to disseminate information better, and perhaps encourage participation from all sectors.
6. Moving the hiring process up is key.

From Classified Senate

1. "Agendize" reports from the other groups similar to what Academic Senate does (e.g. reports from PBC, SSPC, APC, IPC and Academic Senate) so there is more communication; reps would be assigned reports to make
2. Identify ways in which Classified Senate can be proactive rather than reactive
3. Set goals at the end of the semester for the upcoming year or at the beginning of the semester for the year with a calendar of what is to be done each month
4. Work on the "image" of the group as to what they do so others will know (e.g. advocacy, classified voice, etc.)
5. Consider sending out the Classified Senate agenda campus-wide
6. Have voting for the New Hire Process
7. Identify a mix of group leaders for the small group discussions (not all supervisors)

From the Associated Students

1. Ensure minutes have more details on what occurred
2. Create program assessment to assess what attendees learned at Spirit Thursdays
3. Post all agendas and minutes on the ASCC/College Webpage and repost to social media
4. Create SLOs for each program, ensuring events have more structure and can be evidence based
5. Set goals at the retreat, and throughout the year so that all can participate
6. Create more advertising/presence of ASCC
7. Train more efficiently on Participatory Governance Manual
8. Create an orientation to ASCC that can be utilized campus-wide (possibly collaborating with orientation/ambassadors)

Individual Group Comments

The following pages include the comments on the evaluation forms from the Planning and Budgeting Council, the Instruction Planning Council, the Student Services Planning Council, the Administrative Planning Council, the Academic Senate and the Classified Senate.

Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL
April 17, 2013

Participatory Governance Groups: SSPC, IPC, APC, PBC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate

How is the coordination among the governance groups working?

- Committee and council work has improved
- Representatives do bring information to their groups and then back again to PBC
- The Senates do communicate regularly and the participatory governance groups do work together well
- The PBC is much more cohesive – it is good to have the combination of the CPC and the Budget Committee as people were going to two separate meetings and neither group worked well as there was too much work
- It might be useful to have a subcommittee on budget – will need to see next year
- There was a question about oversight – not really much oversight on budget – but can have a subcommittee; program review drives much of what happens in budget

Are the integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual working?

- So far, yes

Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?

- Probably OK; the student likes that there are student representatives on the committee; have students at all levels of participatory governance and they do a recap at ASCC
- Yes, it seems individuals have good levels of awareness; there seems to be trust that the PBC will be getting things done well
- Crowds are small because we have limited staffing
- Some classified might not be able to attend as it is hard to get away for two hours

Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?

- Yes

Does the group set annual goals? if so, did it meet them?

- Somewhat; the goal this year was to focus on accreditation
- Even though it is not “official”, we do have things we are working on

Does the group set a calendar (plan) of agenda items? if so, was the calendar achievable?

- Yes – there are a number of calendars that the PBC follows

How effective is the group?

- Very effective; much more effective than CPC and Budget Committee
- People feel good about coming to the meetings – it is a good way to spend time and the group is productive; everyone gets along and it is a good culture

Communication of Participatory Governance Groups

Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? Are they posted in a timely manner?

- Yes; Maggie does an excellent job!

Do they have enough description/explanation to be comprehended by people who did not attend the meeting?

- Yes

Should we standardize posting minutes on Inside Cañada? (IPC for instance still posts them on Sharepoint)

- Yes; we are a public institution and our meeting agendas and minutes should be accessible through Inside Cañada

Annual Planning/Program Review Process

How well did the new hire priority setting process work?

- Worked well; great to have the ability to have conversations
- Need to have different group leaders
- Figure out system of reporting information to the president; maybe the president should be present

Are there any structural issues that should be addressed?

- Academic Senate will be discussing the Annual Plan/Program Review process
- Some issues they discussed included increased visibility; more effective documents; sharing results; hiring as a separate document

Recommendations Based on the Dialogue

1. Start meetings on time – look at starting at 2:10 as faculty have classes
2. Purchase new tables for 2-10
3. Set goals for the 2013-14 academic year – maybe at the last meeting of the year
4. Review annual plan/program review process
5. Revise the hiring process “discussion” time to add a priority setting process, change group leaders, and determine best way to provide information to the president

Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL (IPC)
April 19, 2013

Attendees: Carol Rhodes, Patty Hall, Janet Stringer, David Johnson, Jan Roecks, Frank Austin, Nick Martin, Jonna Pounds, & Linda Hayes; Jo'an Tanaka taking minutes of meeting.

Participatory Governance Groups: SSPC, IPC, APC, PBC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate

How is the coordination among the governance groups working?

Much better than in past years as everyone feels included in the process; classified senate also feels the coordination among the governance groups is working as they are being included throughout the process. Structure is more inclusive, clearer lines of demarcation; communication stronger. How essential if one is on a committee to be on all committees? Redundancy—much less duplication this year—much better; PBC reps should bring decisions from individual participatory governance groups to PBC and these items should be on a Consent Agenda for approval and not have additional discussion take place—we need to make a formal recommendation to the governance structure to have a Consent Agenda on PBC's agenda.

Are the integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual working?

Yes

Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?

Faculty & staff that want to be aware are aware; student government is very strong and reps report back to ASCC.

Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?

Yes

Does the group set annual goals? if so, did it meet them?

Yes and Yes...

Does the group set a calendar (plan) of agenda items? if so, was the calendar achievable?

Yes, APPs reviewed in spring by IPC members; hiring is agendaized, etc.

How effective is the group?

IPC is effective and brings current topics for discussion; follows agendas... doing great...

What could be changed for the upcoming year?

Hold 1st & 3rd of the month meetings on calendar; continue with taskforces depending on the items we need to deal with; taskforce on e-portfolios went well; discuss and get feedback as a whole committee;

Communication of Participatory Governance Groups

Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? Are they posted in a timely manner?

Yes and Yes

Do they have enough description/explanation to be comprehended by people who did not attend the meeting?

Agendas and Minutes are thorough and the people who did not attend the meeting would be able to follow what decisions were made.

Should we standardize posting minutes on Inside Cañada? (IPC for instance still posts them on Sharepoint)

IPC has minutes posted in both Inside Cañada and SharePoint for the past one and one-half months and will continue to post in both locations.

Annual Planning/Program Review Process

How well did the new hire priority setting process work?

Went well

Are there any structural issues that should be addressed?

Timeline proposed change... we are asking to start the hiring process one month sooner from the beginning and then we are able to go out earlier with the job postings so we will get the best person for the job. We are behind in hiring as our sister colleges are approximately one month ahead of us and our hiring committees will have to work in early June to complete the process. Most faculty (instructional) committees throughout the state complete in late April/early May so faculty can inform their institution that they are not coming back before leaving for the summer so they can start their replacement procedure.

Recommendations Based on the Dialogue

1. Continue to meet regularly and have additional meetings as necessary; use taskforce committees, as needed.
2. Change timeline for hiring.

Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
STUDENT SERVICES PLANNING COUNCIL (SSPC)
March 27th, 2013

Attendees: Regina Blok, Jeanne Stalker, Margie Carrington, Soraya Sohrabi, Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez, Bob Haick, Sandra Mendez, Kim Lopez, Robin Richards

Participatory Governance Groups (SSPC, IPC, APC & PBC)

How is the coordination among the governance groups working?

- Although interconnected, it is hard to draw the lines between them except during the new position hiring process when the SSPC, IPC and APC meet together to hear presentations
- Used to have IPC member on SSPC who would report – would be nice to do so now
- It would be helpful to have the APC agenda and minutes circulated (not sure if they are – don't remember receiving them)

Are the integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual working?

- The annual planning/program review calendar and the new position hiring process worked well

Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?

- We have had great participation on SSPC from students
- Everyone is so busy – it is difficult to find time to attend all of the group meetings – so even though the information is provided and the meetings are open, it is tough to get there
- One person departments make it difficult to leave the office

Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?

- Some of the agenda is required – i.e. we need to do certain things to be in compliance with accreditation, state regulations, etc. and we are doing it well
- This compliance agenda leaves little time to be creative about what we are doing and develop new initiatives

Does the group set annual goals? if so, did it meet them?

- The SSPC has not set overall goals – we work with the programs to help them achieve theirs
- This might be something we will consider for next year

Does the group set a calendar (plan) of agenda items? if so, was the calendar achievable?

- We follow the annual planning/program review calendars as well as the new position timeline and both have been achievable

How effective is the group?

- 100% ☺
- We are working together and taking responsibility for what needs to be done; there is synergy in the group
- Good attendance at the SSPC meetings – which means the meetings are good
- Good reviews – constantly looking at ways to improve

What could be changed for the upcoming year?

- Not much
- Maybe set some overall goals for SSPC
- We already look continually at ways to improve
- Have wine with the cheese and nuts at the meetings

Communication of Participatory Governance Groups

Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? Are they posted in a timely manner?

- Yes, they are distributed to all of the campus on a regular basis
- They are provided in a timely manner

Do they have enough description/explanation to be comprehended by people who did not attend the meeting?

- Yes

Should we standardize posting minutes on Inside Cañada? (IPC for instance still posts them on Sharepoint)

- YES! All agendas and minutes should be readily accessible on Inside Cañada

Annual Planning/Program Review Process

How well did the new hire priority setting process work?

- This year was much better than last year; lots more discussion and thoughtful conversation about all of the campuswide positions
- Made lots of comments and changes for the SS positions at SSPC prior to going to college community; collaborative activity
- It was good to be flexible about making adjustments in positions as things change from spring to late fall; need to be flexible

Are there any structural issues which should be addressed?

- Redefining a couple of the programs was beneficial – it clarified and highlighted the various units
- Having the forms stay the same for the second year was great! It is nice to have the same format to use

Recommendations Based on the Dialogue

1. Share more information among the groups – e.g. have IPC reports at SSPC
2. APC needs to distribute agendas and minutes if they are not already doing so
3. All Participatory Governance Group Agendas and Minutes should be on Inside Cañada
4. Keep annual plan/program review form the same (it works)
5. Possibly set a few overall SSPC Goals

Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING COUNCIL (APC)
April 30, 2013

Attendees: Linda Hayes, Roberta Chock, Robin Richards, Dave Vigo, Vickie Nunes, Robert Hood, Larry Buckley, Lucy Carter

Participatory Governance Groups: SSPC, IPC, APC, PBC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate

How is the coordination among the governance groups working?

Great, when this group was set up the overlap of sitting on other committees, the feedback would go back and forth. Working and flowing.

Are the integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual working?

Hiring deadlines should be revisited re: tighten up dates and end by February 28. The process for equipment deadline is working and the Annual Plan/Program Review timeline is OK.

Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?

Yes, people know what is going on-- good participatory governance.

Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?

Yes; focused on program reviews to inform what is need; charge of APC is in the participatory governance; mission statement in governance manual is accurate

There is some confusion about what the APC does and when it meets; the meetings are not on a master calendar – need to make changes; put on master calendar for 3 times per year. These are September/October (to review plans and decide which positions to take forward), February (to review the positions with the other groups) and March (presentation of the Annual Plan/Program Review).

Does the group set annual goals? if so, did it meet them?

Yes, review annual plan/program reviews—met goal

Does the group set a calendar (plan) of agenda items? if so, was the calendar achievable?

A calendar has been set up and it is achievable

How effective is the group?

Effective—focus on plans...

What could be changed for the upcoming year?

Need to develop a calendar and post on APC website, quarterly bring forward revised program plans, connect to overall strategic plan of the college—put on timeline and make sure they are well communicated. Send link to college community letting folks know.

Need to add to PBC agenda: Reports from the Participatory Governance Groups

Communication of Participatory Governance Groups

Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? Are they posted in a timely manner?

Agenda and minutes are posted; during the year end update, APC will share results from academic year. In the future all will be sent out to community.

Do they have enough description/explanation to be comprehended by people who did not attend the meeting?

Yes

Should we standardize posting minutes on Inside Cañada? (IPC for instance still posts them on Sharepoint)

Yes, all is posted in Inside Cañada

Annual Plan/Program Review Process

How well did the new hire priority setting process work?

Change hiring timeline; process went well, everyone understood what was done, break out groups worked well; need to complete the timeline by February 28 (including President's recommendation)

Are there any structural issues that should be addressed?

Yes; need to add voting as part of the discussions of the new positions

Recommendations Based on the Dialogue

1. Develop a general calendar of APC meetings for the year.
2. Change hiring timeline to end by February 28
3. Allow new hire discussion groups to prioritize
4. Change the group leaders to have faculty/staff facilitators
5. Add reports from SSPC/IPC/APC/Academic Senate/Classified Senate to the PBC agendas

Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
ACADEMIC SENATE
April 25, 2013

Attendees: Sandra Mendez, David Clay, Monica Malamud, David Meckler, Lorraine Barrales Ramirez, Alicia Aguirre, Denise Erickson, Leonor Cabrera, Akilles Speliotopolous, Anne Nichols, Sarah Harmon, Doug Hirzel, Ana Miladinova, President Larry Buckley.

Participatory Governance Groups: SSPC, IPC, APC, PBC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate

How is the coordination among the governance groups working?

- The same people are on every governance group, which is both good for communication and bad for participation.
- Representatives are on many committees.
- Communication and coordination is good overall.
- Agendas and minutes should **not** be on SharePoint; make the available directly from Inside Cañada for all groups. (ASGC minutes are not currently there, but other Participatory Governance group minutes are.)

Are the integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual working?

- Yes, it is helpful.
- We need to put all the planning calendars in one place, easily accessible from Inside Cañada, and don't just rely on email to disseminate information.

Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?

- Mixed reviews:
 - Some thought that it was not good, since the same people attend all the meetings, and there is no interest on the part of non-ASGC officers to come to the meetings unless there is something on the agenda that they either are presenting or want to complain about.
 - Others thought that since division representatives do report to the divisions, the information is getting disseminated to all faculty. So the awareness is there, if not the participation.
- Part time faculty—while there are a few exceptions, the buy-in to making Cañada a 'home campus' isn't there—it's not part of the culture. So, few PT Faculty attend ASGC or any other meetings, including division meetings, because either they are teaching elsewhere, have other commitments, or are generally not as interested. Also, awareness of agendas and meetings isn't as good as it could be with PT Faculty.
- Full time faculty—again, the same FT Faculty participate on all of the Governance Committees. Part of the problem is that we have too few FT Faculty. However, there are some who do not choose to participate—we need to get some of them into the mix.

Possible solutions:

- Define what the 'desired level' is—is it 100% of FT Faculty, 75%, or what?—and measure it. This would help to understand how much participation is really there, and to set goals for the future.
- PT Faculty—it might help to have a PT Faculty Senate, especially as a way to increase PT Faculty awareness of Participatory Governance (that it exists, that it's important, and **why** it's important

to participate), and even change the culture of PT Faculty 'buy-in' of Cañada being a 'home campus'. However, it was noted that it also might not work.

- FT Faculty—need more participation from those who don't tend to serve on committees.
- Perhaps a newsletter, such as the Accreditation Newsletter, would be a good idea in order to disseminate information better, and perhaps encourage participation from all sectors.

Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?

- Yes

Does the group set annual goals? if so, did it meet them?

- Yes; the ASGC met most of their goals, with particular respect to Program Review and Accreditation.

Does the group set a calendar (plan) of agenda items? if so, was the calendar achievable?

- Yes to both questions
- However, it would be wise to post goals and the (general) calendar on the ASGC website at the beginning of the year, so that all faculty can see the topics to be covered in the year.

How effective is the group?

- Very effective—lots of work has been done and analyzed. Goals were met.
- This shows that this group continues to participate despite many of the topics being District rules/regulations. The outside work that is done is reflected at the meetings, such that every member brings something to the table and enriches the experience of serving on ASGC.

What could be changed for the upcoming year?

- Not many changes need to be made.
- Perhaps rearrange the agenda, but no real changes necessary.

Communication of Participatory Governance Groups

Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? Are they posted in a timely manner?

- Yes

Do they have enough description/explanation to be comprehended by people who did not attend the meeting?

- Yes

Should we standardize posting minutes on Inside Cañada? (IPC for instance still posts them on Sharepoint)

- Yes—Not on SharePoint. Put on Inside Cañada.

Annual Planning/Program Review Process

How well did the new hire priority setting process work?

- Fine overall—no one has heard negative comments.
- It was improved over previous years, and hopefully it will continue to improve.
- Move the hiring process sooner, so that large group considerations can be met.

- The College Forum can be done earlier rather than later. That way the global picture and goals can be expressed.
- Voting in the ASGC review of positions was all over the place—everyone made a very strong case for their request, and this led to a real lack of consensus. Perhaps there could have been more discussion, analysis, etc.—it might not have changed the results, but it might have made for more consensus.
 - It was noted that the large College Forum in 2-10 *did* provide time for discussion and analysis

Are there any structural issues that should be addressed?

- Perhaps Cañada could push the start of the hiring process to the fall.
 - It would be good to push up the process to fall, so that we'd announce positions at about the same time as Skyline and CSM—who post positions in January/February/
- However, the President isn't really comfortable with the forecast of the budget until mid-March or April; he could give a general estimate in January/February, but the data aren't known really until later.

Recommendations Based on the Dialogue

1. Perhaps rearrange the agenda, but no real changes necessary.
2. Define what the 'desired level' for participation is—is it 100% of FT Faculty, 75%, or what?—and measure it. This would help to understand how much participation is really there, and to set goals for the future.
3. PT Faculty—it might help to have a PT Faculty Senate, especially as a way to increase PT Faculty awareness of Participatory Governance (that it exists, that it's important, and *why* it's important to participate), and even change the culture of PT Faculty 'buy-in' of Cañada being a 'home campus'. However, it was noted that it also might not work.
4. FT Faculty—need more participation from those who don't tend to serve on committees.
5. Perhaps a newsletter, such as the Accreditation Newsletter, would be a good idea in order to disseminate information better, and perhaps encourage participation from all sectors.
6. Moving the hiring process up is key.

Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
CLASSIFIED SENATE
April 29, 2013

How is the coordination among the governance groups working?

- The coordination is working generally; could use improvement. Faster communication would be helpful.
- There is a need for more participation by classified
- It might be useful to “agendize” reports from the other groups similar to what Academic Senate does (e.g. reports from PBC, SSPC, APC, IPC and Academic Senate) so there is more communication; reps would be assigned reports to make *

Are the integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual working?

- Yes, they worked.

Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?

- Faculty seem to be participating more than staff or students
- There may be issues with awareness and time restrictions for classified staff
- Being a member of groups can be a big time commitment which some classified staff might not be able to do

Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?

- Yes, at times; sometimes there are things on agenda which have an action but it might be too late
- Need to be proactive rather than reactive *
- Send reminder emails and calendar to encourage activity

Does the group set annual goals? If so, did it meet them?

- Set a standing goal for scholarships – may want to add more
- May want to set goals at the end of the semester for the upcoming year or at the beginning of the semester for the year *

Does the group set a calendar (plan) of agenda items? if so, was the calendar achievable?

- It would be good to have an annual calendar of activities and this can be distributed to classified staff *

How effective is the group?

- Do accomplish scholarship goal
- Have made recommendations for appointments to other governance groups and committees and these processes have worked well
- Need to work on the “image” of the group as to what they do so others will know (e.g. advocacy, classified voice, etc.) *

What could be changed for the upcoming year?

The items with the (*) are areas where the Classified Senate recommended changes for improvement:

1. "Agendize" reports from the other groups similar to what Academic Senate does (e.g. reports from PBC, SSPC, APC, IPC and Academic Senate) so there is more communication; reps would be assigned reports to make
2. Identify ways in which Classified Senate can be proactive rather than reactive
3. Set goals at the end of the semester for the upcoming year or at the beginning of the semester for the year with a calendar of what is to be done each month
4. Work on the "image" of the group as to what they do so others will know (e.g. advocacy, classified voice, etc.)

Communication of Participatory Governance Groups

Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? Are they posted in a timely manner?

- Look at sending out the Classified Senate agenda campus-wide *

Do they have enough description/explanation to be comprehended by people who did not attend the meeting?

- Yes

Should we standardize posting minutes on Inside Cañada? (IPC for instance still posts them on Sharepoint)

- Yes, should be on Inside Cañada

Annual Planning/Program Review Process

How well did the new hire priority setting process work?

- Small group interaction was good
- Need to have the voting added
- The group leaders should not be all supervisors

Are there any structural issues that should be addressed?

- No

Recommendations Based on the Dialogue

1. Consider sending out the Classified Senate agenda campus-wide
2. Have voting for the New Hire Process
3. Identify a mix of group leaders for the small group discussions (not all supervisors)

Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF CAÑADA COLLEGE
May 8, 2013

How is the coordination among the governance groups working?

The ASCC feels that coordination among governance groups is acceptable. The ASCC believes coordination can be improved by allowing an orientation on the committees to happen at both the beginning of Fall and Spring semester, as well as a packet created for each student when they are inducted into the ASCC to allow a dialogue among governance groups. The ASCC believes this orientation, including being clearer on when meetings of these governance groups occur and what has occurred during them (having them posted online/social media) would bring forth more awareness of the leadership/participatory governance opportunities.

Are the integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual working?

The ASCC is unaware of integrated planning calendars in the Participatory Governance Manual and the new ASCC members (70% since Fall Semester) have not heard of a Participatory Governance Manual at all. ASCC would like to read the Participatory Governance Manual and have a quiz associated with knowing the manual. ASCC also suggests there be training and a 'student understandable' version of the manual.

Are we achieving the desired levels of awareness and participation from faculty, staff and students?

The ASCC feels that they would like to reach a higher level of awareness and participation from students throughout the year. They feel like that can be achieved through setting a reachable goal of how many students they would like at each program, and how many students they would like utilizing their social media to access ASCC information. ASCC also feels that more advertisements, a solid ad campaign, word of mouth, and tabling must be stronger so that the ASCC presence is felt and interactive participation in programs increases.

Is the governance group advancing the appropriate agenda?

The governance group's benchmarks of Leadership, Community, Change, and Mentorship is felt to be appropriate, and the ASCC would like to further advance this agenda by branching out to more areas of the campus and creating a higher level of awareness, reach, and mentorship to more students.

Does the group set annual goals? If so, did it meet them?

Yes, the ASCC sits down during the 1st retreat and sets up annual goals for the year and checks these goals each month. ASCC would like the opportunity to continue to set goals throughout the year since many ASCC members do not get to participate in the goal setting that happens in August.

Does the group set a calendar (plan) of agenda items? if so, was the calendar achievable?

Yes, the ASCC sits down during the 1st retreat and sets up a calendar plan for the year and checks these goals each month. The calendar includes goals and programs that will happen throughout the year. The calendar could be more achievable if SLOs were attached to each program, thus creating a specific learning outcome and framework to make each program more achievable.

How effective is the group?

The ASCC is effective by setting goals and calendar events at the beginning of each year and follows through with said goals and events. The ASCC would like to be more effective in reaching their benchmarks and engaging students holistically.

What could be changed for the upcoming year?

The ASCC would like to create more assessment opportunities to fully understand how effective their work is. Because an ASCC event happened, it does not mean it was effective in reaching its goals. The ASCC also feels that meetings can be more effective by allowing more members to speak and utilize their strengths. The ASCC also created more goals for the coming year that can be found under recommendations.

Communication of Participatory Governance Groups

Are agendas and minutes communicated to the entire campus? Are they posted in a timely manner?

The agendas and minutes are communicated through the entire campus through two bulletin boards—one outside of The Center for Student Life and Leadership Development, and one outside of the learning center. The agendas and minutes are posted according to Brown Act rules. The ASCC would like to see agendas and minutes available to students through the ASCC website and social media so that anyone can access agendas and minutes at any time.

Do they have enough description/explanation to be comprehended by people who did not attend the meeting?

The ASCC agrees that the minutes have become more detailed throughout the year, however they do not believe someone who was not present at the meeting could fully understand what happened at the meeting. More details in the minutes will be added in the future.

Should we standardize posting minutes on Inside Cañada? (IPC for instance still posts them on Sharepoint)

The ASCC believes minutes and agendas should all be posted on the website for anyone to access at any time to have a transparent and understandable system.

Recommendations Based on the Dialogue

1. Ensure minutes have more details on what occurred
2. Create program assessment to assess what attendees learned at Spirit Thursdays
3. Post all agendas and minutes on the ASCC/College Webpage and repost to social media
4. Create SLOs for each program, ensuring events have more structure and can be evidence based
5. Set goals at the retreat, and throughout the year so that all can participate
6. Create more advertising/presence of ASCC
7. Train more efficiently on Participatory Governance Manual
8. Create an orientation to ASCC that can be utilized campus-wide (possibly collaborating with orientation/ambassadors)