Evaluation of the Participatory Governance Process and the College Benchmarks

4/16/2014

APC met and discussed these assignments on Wednesday, April 16, 2014.

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 (Standard IB):

"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."*

I. Timeline for the Evaluation Process

Group: IPC, APC, SSPC, and PBC

Timeline and Task:

- April 2014
  - Respond to the College Benchmark Evaluation Questions - II
  - Respond and update the Specific Recommendations from the Key Participatory Governance Groups - III

- o Campus-wide survey asking employees to evaluate governance structures and processes
- May 21—Report to PBC

II. College Benchmark (Standard IB2 and IB3) Evaluation Questions

1. Are the benchmarks we set to achieve as a college appropriate?
2. How well does the College implement its goals? Suggestions?

APC discussed the Cañada College Benchmarks and Goals. After analyzing the actual results from 2011-12 and 2012-13, the committee discussed and decided that our #4 Transfer Benchmark is too high. Instead of 275, the committee decided to set the Transfer Benchmark 250. #4a UC/CSU Transfer Benchmark was asked to adjust to 150 instead of 165. The reason was that our enrollment was decreasing over the years and expected high transfer rate might be unreasonable. The committee asked to continue monitoring our benchmark and to have more than 2-year information in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the benchmarks.

III. Specific Recommendations from the Key Participatory Governance Groups

Please update the status on your recommendations by checking the appropriate box. These recommendations were from the "Annual Review of Participatory Governance Spring 2013"

The following information are from APC

APC went through each of the specific recommendations from the key participatory governance groups and discussed its completion.

From Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC)

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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	√			

Comment:

- **APC suggested PBC to review and update Participatory Governance Manual.**

- **APC suggested PBC to create one calendar for monthly tasks for all planning committees (PBC, IPC, SSPC, and APC)**
- **APC suggested to review instructional equipment sooner than later.**

From Instruction Planning Council (IPC)

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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)

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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			√	

Comment: # 2. Currently post on the website. Next year, APC will disseminate the agendas and minutes via college emails too.

From Administrative Planning Council (APC)

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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	√			

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
5. Add reports from SSPC/IPC/APC/Academic Senate/Classified Senate to the PBC agendas	√			

From Academic Senate

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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.	√			

Some information APC did not know so APC left them blank.

From Classified Senate

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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	√			

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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

	Completed	Revised	Decided not to do	Did not complete
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)				

Some information APC did not know so APC left them blank.