

**Annual Review of the Participatory Governance Committees at Cañada
Dialogue at the
Classified Senate
April 29, 2013**

Attendees:

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

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)