

 <p>COLLEGE OF MARIN</p>	<p>GOVERNANCE REVIEW COUNCIL</p>
--	---

Governance Review Council (GRC)

November 2, 2022: 2:00 to 3:00 pm on Zoom

Minutes

Present: Sara McKinnon, Jon Gudmundsson, Joanna Pinckney, Steve Carrera, Jorge Chan, John Campbell and Angela Olmanson

Guest: Tim Wat – co-chair of Standard IV of the Accreditation Task Force.

1. Approved Agenda
2. Approved Minutes from May 4, 2022 and October 5, 2022
3. Discussion
 - a. New GRC Members – Members introduced themselves as we have a new Classified Professional member – Joanna Pinckney – from the Performing Arts (Music) Department.
 - b. Elect Chair for GRC 2022-2023/2024 – Sara McKinnon was nominated and chosen unanimously to continue as chair. Sara noted that she was planning on retiring at the end of Spring 2024.
 - c. FYI about Facilities Committee name and charge – deferred.
 - d. Accreditation ISER and GRC – visit from Timothy Wat, Standard IV co-chair
Tim joined the meeting and explained his objective for meeting with GRC. Several parts of Standard IV.A of the ACCJC accreditation Standards are related to Participatory Governance and as such fall under GRC. The rest of Standard IV have to do with the President and the Board of Trustees. He told the committee that ACCJC is assuming that the College is fully accredited based on the 2016 ISER and that we basically need to show that we are continuing to do what we said we were doing in 2016. He

wanted to know where he can find information and documentation for this. Sara shared the 2016 ISER pages from Standard IVA and we discussed each one.

Standard IV.A.3 mentions our Participatory Governance System (PGS) Plan. The committee spent the last 2 years reviewing and revising this plan. This included checking Title 5/Ed code languages for any changes, adding a general statement regarding anti-racism at the beginning, updating any processes that had changed, and most recently adding the CTEC committee.

Note – actually two committees – the Student Access and Success Committee (SASC) had been replaced by the Guidance, Resources, Integration and Transformation (GRIT) Committee (see Jan 22, 2020 GRC minutes), and the Strong Workforce Advisory Committee had been added since 2016 and then replaced by the Career Technical Education Committee (CTEC) in 2022. (See May 4, 2022 GRC Minutes)

All governance committees reviewed their charges generally and with the instruction to include anti-racist languages in their charges as appropriate. All of these charges went to PRAC and then to GRC. If GRC still had questions, the committees reviewed further and sent back revised charges or explanations. When GRC approved the charges, they were forwarded to College Council. They were then incorporated into the new PGS Plan.

This standard also included the PGS Committee Participant Surveys. The committee explained that it had been done in 2017 and then not again until Fall 2021. The committee had reviewed this survey and come up with several suggestions (See March 2, 2022 GRC minutes) - including the flyer which was given out and put in everyone's mailbox at the start of Fall 2022. These survey results are on the home page (currently) of the PGS website. (They may move). GRC will do another survey in Spring 2023.

Standard IV.A.4: Sara shared the 6-year program review schedule plan. Currently no completed Program reviews are posted on the website (since the 2016-2017 cycle) and this schedule is also not posted anywhere

publicly. The old program review website is still accessible, but nothing has been created to replace it on the new website.

Standard IV.A.5: This standard is about ensuring all constituents have a voice in the college governance. As noted below, GRC will be reviewing the make-up and balance between the 4 constituent groups of PGS committees this year. Also noted that the flexibility of ZOOM meetings has actually increased participation especially from the IVC campus.

Standard IV.A.6: This standard requires that the processes and resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated. First of all, each committee has its own website where anyone can read their charges, find out who is on the committee and keep up to date on agenda and minutes for its meetings. Second, at the end of every academic year, PRIE asks the chairs of the committees to document the “Activities and Recommendations” and the “Resulting Actions/Updates” for the year. These reports are consolidated into a *Participatory Governance System Digest* for that year. These are posted on the website and have been completed since 2006. (currently here: <https://gov.marin.edu/>)

Note – regarding program review – while the actual program reviews have not been posted since the process moved to eLumen, the Planning Resource and Allocation Committee (PRAC) posts all presentations and allocation decisions on its webpage. <https://gov.marin.edu/agenda/prac>

- e. Question of # Classified Professionals on committees – Sara briefly explained the situation and the need for a review of this. It will be discussed in December.
- f. PGS Website re-design – gathering input for Shook Chung (Lead Web Designer for the college). Sara asked the committee to send any ideas they might have for the website re-design. Sara will meet with Shook in mid-December and report on progress at the December meeting.
- g. Committee Member Angela Olmanson will be out on maternity leave for Spring 2023.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

1. Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.
2. The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.
3. Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.
4. Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.
5. Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.
6. The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.
7. Leadership roles and the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The College meets the Standard. Policies and procedures authorize faculty, staff, students' and administrators' participation in decision-making processes. This participation occurs primarily through the participatory governance system and processes outlined in the *Integrated*

Planning Manual. The College adheres to these policies and practices as periodic survey results show. Other venues for bringing forward ideas and initiatives exist as well, and they are institutionally supported. Multiple innovative projects have taken root and flourished in this environment.

EVIDENCE LIST

IV.A.2-1	BP 3250 Institutional Planning
IV.A.2-2	BP 3260 Participation in Local Decision Making, p. 2
IV.A.2-3	AP 3260 Participation in Local Decision Making
IV.A.2-4	AP 3250 Institutional Planning
IV.A.2-5	See I.A.3-1, <i>Integrated Planning Manual</i> , revised July 23, 2012
IV.A.2-6	See I.A.4-5, PRIE Planning Web page, College of Marin <i>Strategic Plan 2015-2018</i> , Progress Reports
IV.A.2-7	BSI Steering Committee Web page
IV.A.2-8	Faculty Inquiry Groups Final Report, spring 2014
IV.A.2-9	PGS Member Survey results, spring 2014
IV.A.2-10	See I.B.7-5, College of Marin Campus Community Experience and Evaluation of Participatory Governance, May 6, 2015
IV.A.2-11	See I.B.1-1, <i>Participatory Governance System Plan</i> , revised March 2016

Standard IV.A.3. Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

EVIDENCE OF MEETING THE STANDARD

The College governance system is codified in Board Policy (BP) 3260 Participation in Local Decision Making, which was adopted May 2005 (IV.A.3-1), and BP 3250 Institutional Planning adopted September 2009 (IV.A.3-2). To ensure effective participation in decision making, participatory governance committees and councils are composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The superintendent/president appoints administrators to serve on committees related to their responsibilities and any other committees that require or request manager participation. The Academic, Classified, and Student Senates appoint their respective

representatives to the institution's governance committees.

Participatory governance operating guidelines, committee charges, and responsibilities are outlined in the participatory governance system plan (IV.A.3-3) which is posted on the COM Participatory Governance System (PGS) Web page on the College website (IV.A.3-4). The PGS includes a committee organizational chart also on the College website. Roles and responsibilities for participatory governance committees are outlined in the PGS Plan and are periodically reviewed by the Governance Review Council (GRC) (IV.A.3-5).

Committees may suggest changes in committee structure and/or responsibilities to the GRC by

submitting a proposal outlining the suggested change. GRC evaluates the proposal and makes a recommendation to College Council for approval. As an example, the Facilities Planning Committee in 2014-2015 and the Student Access and Success Committee (SASC) in 2015-2016 asked to have policies and procedures relevant to their work forwarded to them for review. This suggestion was taken up by GRC in spring 2016. The GRC recommended to College Council that this practice be applied to all committees where policies and procedures may impact the committee's assigned charge (IV.A.3-6). This change was approved by College Council and implemented (IV.A.3-7).

Each spring the Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) Office conducts a governance committee participant survey in collaboration with the GRC to assess committee members' perceptions of and satisfaction with the governance system. Results of the survey are used to revise and improve the system (IV.A.3-8). In October 2009 the GRC recommended merging of duties and reformulation of the Budget Committee and the Institutional Planning Committee into the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC). The proposal was accepted by College Council in November 2009 and PRAC was established. In 2014 a budget sub-committee of PRAC was proposed to complete a thorough review and analysis of the budget and report findings to the full PRAC membership. On further discussion PRAC determined that strictly following its stated budget-related functions in the PGS charge would avoid being mired in budget allocation details that are better handled at the division level (IV.A.3-9). PRAC returned in 2015-2016 to its stated PGS function of a broad view of budget assumptions and resource allocation leaving program review budget requests ranking and allocation to PRAC subcommittees and division managers. PRAC also rewrote its charge and created a flowchart for its budget

development process, both of which were approved by College Council and added to the 2016 PGS plan revisions (IV.A.3-10).

In 2015, following the GRC's recommendation, an outside consultant was brought in to review the College governance committee system and make recommendations (IV.A.3-11). This review, along with the GRC spring 2015 findings from its system-wide evaluation (IV.A.3-12), was sent to College Council in December 2015 (IV.A.3-13). In its correspondence, GRC made recommendations for changes, accepting some of the changes suggested by the outside consultant, and included recommended improvements based on its annual evaluation of the committee system. Based on these documents, the superintendent/president made the recommendation to accept the changes suggested by GRC (IV.A.3-14) and this was approved by College Council. These changes were included in the spring 2016 revisions to the PGS plan. The changes will be evaluated in spring 2017 or after sufficient time has passed to ensure that changes have had time to take hold.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The College meets the Standard. Based on Board policies, College of Marin's governance system, delineated in the participatory governance system plan, establishes committees and processes through which administrators, staff, students, and faculty have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance. The committee system gives all constituent groups a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise as evidenced by committee participation. The College has a well-defined system of participatory governance that it follows and continually improves through campus wide survey results and improvements recommended by GRC, the committees, College Council, and the senates.

EVIDENCE LIST

IV.A.3-1	See IV.A.2-2, BP 3260 Participation in Local Decision Making
IV.A.3-2	See IV.A.2-1, BP 3250 Institutional Planning
IV.A.3-3	See I.B.1-1, <i>Participatory Governance System Plan</i> , revised March 2016
IV.A.3-4	See I.B.8-18, COM Participatory Governance System Web page
IV.A.3-5	Governance Review Council Web page
IV.A.3-6	Proposed revisions to <i>Participatory Governance System Plan</i> , p. 41
IV.A.3-7	College Council Draft Meeting Minutes, October 13, 2016, p. 1
IV.A.3-8	See II.C.2-4, PRIE Survey Results Web page, Participatory Governance System
IV.A.3-9	PRAC Meeting Minutes excerpts, 2014-2015
IV.A.3-10	See III.D.3-2, <i>Participatory Governance System Plan</i> , revised March 2016, pp. 24-28
IV.A.3-11	Participatory Governance presentation, October 15, 2015
IV.A.3-12	See I.B.7-4, Governance Review Council Recommendations, April 20, 2015
IV.A.3-13	College Council Minutes, December 3, 2015
IV.A.3-14	See I.B.7-6, President's Response to Recommended Changes to PGS, February 1, 2016

Standard IV.A.4. Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.

EVIDENCE OF MEETING THE STANDARD

The faculty role in making recommendations about student learning programs and services is defined in Board Policy (BP) 4020 (IV.A.4-1) and Administrative Procedure (AP) 4020 Program and Curriculum Development (IV.A.4-2). The College refers to state regulations under Assembly Bill 1725 for guidance on the role of senates and the responsibility of the Board of Trustees to rely primarily upon the senate in all academic and professional matters under 10 + 1, and codified in BP 3260 (IV.A.4-3) and AP 3260 (IV.A.4-4) Participation in Local Decision Making.

The faculty role in program, curriculum, and course development is defined in AP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development; program discontinuance in AP 4021 Program Discontinuance (IV.A.4-5); program revitalization in AP 4022 Program Revitalization (IV.A.4-6); course approval

procedures in AP 4023 Course Approval (IV.A.4-7); criteria for degrees in AP 4025 Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education (IV.A.4-8); and distance education in AP 4105 Distance Education (IV.A.4-9).

Student learning programs and services are driven by both the faculty and academic administrators at College of Marin (COM). Faculty members individually and as members of departments, working closely with their department's chair, are responsible for creating, implementing, and evaluating student learning outcomes (SLOs) within their departments (IV.A.4-10). Faculty at the department level are also responsible for creating and revising course outlines (IV.A.4-11).

The Academic Senate's Curriculum Committee is responsible for making recommendations regarding courses and degrees. This key committee meets weekly during the academic year and is composed of faculty, staff, students,

and non-voting administrators from the instructional divisions. It reviews and maintains course outlines, as well as degree and certificate requirements for all credit and noncredit programs. It not only reviews and approves substantive curriculum content but also many technical aspects of curriculum writing (IV.A.4-12).

At the administrative level, the senior vice president of student learning and student services directs all curriculum activities, planning, and development for instructional programs and services. The assistant vice president for instructional support oversees an array of curriculum and instructional support services and works closely with the Office of Instructional Management, the Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Senate (IV.A.4-13).

In addition to the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate also maintains committees in specialized areas of student/faculty academic interest including the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Council (SLOAC) (IV.A.4-14), the General Education Committee (IV.A.4-15), the Academic Standards Committee (IV.A.4-16), and the Distance Education Committee (IV.A.4-17).

The program review facilitator is appointed by the Academic Senate and the senate oversees the program review process. Ultimately, program reviews are reviewed by specific governance committees if requests are made for equipment, faculty, or other personnel or supplies. As an example, program reviews requesting additional faculty are routed by the program review facilitator to an ad-hoc subcommittee of PRAC that reviews and ranks faculty hire requests (IV.A.4-18), while requests for equipment are routed to the Instructional Equipment Committee, another subcommittee of PRAC (IV.A.4-19 and

IV.A.4-20). Division deans and other academic administrators provide PRAC with an overview of each division's program reviews in the spring (IV.A.4-21). Committee recommendations are then reviewed by PRAC, along with the division overview presentation materials, and PRAC makes recommendations to the superintendent/president (IV.A.4-22).

A key role of the Academic Senate in College governance is the appointment of faculty representatives to all participatory governance bodies, as specified in the College's participatory governance system plan. The Academic Senate, the program review facilitator and the SLO facilitator have been instrumental in deliberating, informing, and implementing the College's outcomes-based goals, including development, implementation, and assessment of the five general college wide/general education SLOs and oversight of the development of the SLO Web pages for posting SLO assessment and record keeping (IV.A.4-23).

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The College meets the Standard. State regulations, Board policies, and administrative procedures designate the faculty's role in curriculum and student learning. Educational administrators oversee a range of academic activities collaborating with the Academic Senate, department chairs, and faculty. The Academic Senate's leadership in guiding the College's curriculum and student learning programs and services demonstrates its central role in making key decisions on academic matters. Evidence in policies and procedures, in Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate agendas and minutes, and in communication between these bodies and key administrators demonstrates that faculty and academic administrators participate fully in this process.

EVIDENCE LIST

IV.A.4-1	See II.A.1-1, BP 4020 Program, Curriculum, and Course Development
IV.A.4-2	See II.A.5-6, AP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development
IV.A.4-3	See IV.A.2-2, BP 3260 Participation in Local Decision Making
IV.A.4-4	See IV.A.2-3, AP 3260 Participation in Local Decision Making
IV.A.4-5	See II.A.15-2, AP 4021 Program Discontinuance
IV.A.4-6	See II.A.15-3, AP 4022 Program Revitalization
IV.A.4-7	AP 4023 Course Approval
IV.A.4-8	AP 4025 Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education
IV.A.4-9	AP 4105 Distance Education
IV.A.4-10	See I.B.2-1, <i>Assessment Plan 2012</i>
IV.A.4-11	See II.A.1-6, Course Outline Guide, revised spring 2014
IV.A.4-12	See I.C.9-3, Curriculum Committee Web page
IV.A.4-13	Senior Vice President of Student Learning and Student Services and Assistant Vice President for Instructional Support job descriptions
IV.A.4-14	See II.A.11-1, Instructional Student Learning Outcomes Web page, Student Learning Assessment Council
IV.A.4-15	See I.B.2-18, General Education Committee Web page
IV.A.4-16	Academic Senate, Senate Subcommittees Web page, Academic Standards Committee
IV.A.4-17	See IV.A.14-16, Academic Senate, Senate Subcommittees Web page, Distance Education Committee
IV.A.4-18	FTFAC Recommendations for Full-Time Faculty Requests from 2015-2016 Program Review
IV.A.4-19	See III.B.2-6, Instructional Equipment Ranked List of Requests 2015
IV.A.4-20	See III.B.2-7, IEC Recommendations Memo, May 12, 2015
IV.A.4-21	See I.B.7-7, PRAC Budget Creation Presentations for FY 2016-2017, administrator presentations
IV.A.4-22	See III.B.2-8, PRAC Memo, Final Recommendations for Allocations from 2014-2015 Program Reviews, May 21, 2015
IV.A.4-23	See I.C.3-8, Student Learning Outcomes and Program Reviews Web page

Standard IV.A.5. Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.

EVIDENCE OF MEETING THE STANDARD**Relevant Perspectives and Aligned Expertise and Responsibility**

Board policies delineate the Board's authority, its delegation of authority to the superintendent/president, its role in institutional planning and finances, and its consideration of the public's interests (See IV.C.1, IV.C.5 and IV.C.12 for more detail).

The *Participatory Governance System (PGS) Plan* addresses student, administration, staff and faculty participation on College governance committees (IV.A.5-1). As defined in the plan, there is a clear governance structure in place involving faculty, staff, administration, and students. Representatives from constituent groups are appointed to seats on all governance committees according to the rules set in the plan. The superintendent/president appoints managers to committees. All committees have at least one position designated for a student.

Student participation is always challenging because of the demands of school work and other activities. However, the committees make every effort to accommodate student participation.

Committee chairs are selected by committee members, except for the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC). The president of the Academic Senate and the senior vice president of student learning and student services co-chair PRAC. The senior vice president also serves as the non-voting chair of the Instructional Equipment Committee. The vice president of finance and college operations (VPFCO) and the executive director of planning, research, and institutional effectiveness (PRIE) serve on PRAC in alignment with their responsibilities and the PRIE executive director also serves on the Educational Planning Committee. The VPFCO also serves on the Facilities Planning Committee. The chief information officer/director of information technology serves on the Technology Planning Committee and the executive director of human resources on the Professional Development Committee. Committee recommendations for instructional equipment, facilities planning, program development, staffing, and technology planning are forwarded to PRAC annually in order to prioritize funding and prepare long-range plans.

Ultimately, recommendations from PRAC and College Council are forwarded to the superintendent/president, who chairs College Council and makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

Other College committees such as the Curriculum Committee (IV.A.5-2) and Academic Standards Committee (IV.A.5-3) provide input and offer direction in their respective areas of expertise. When warranted, the Board of Trustees will invite expert advice from specific constituent groups during Board of Trustees meetings and retreats. Leaders of various constituent groups, including the

senates, meet individually with the College superintendent/president at least once a month to facilitate communication and informal problem solving. The senate presidents have a standing item on the Board of Trustees agenda in order to report senate-related issues at all regular Board of Trustees meetings (IV.A.5-4). Students are represented on the Board of Trustees in accordance with Education Code (sections 72023.5 to 72023.7). The student trustee position is an elected, one-year position (IV.A.5-5).

In addition to broad representation through the committee system, the faculty's interests are represented through the Academic Senate, elected department chairs (including monthly chairs' meetings with the senior vice president of student learning and student services) and United Professors of Marin (UPM) (the faculty union). UPM and the District work jointly through the Union District Workload Committee (UDWC) (IV.A.5-6), the Professional Standards Committee (IV.A.5-7), and the Professional Affairs Committee (PAC) (IV.A.5-8). The Academic Senate represents specific faculty interests through its Curriculum Committee, the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Council (SLOAC) (IV.A.5-9), the General Education Committee, Academic Standards Committee, and the Distance Education Committee (IV.A.5-10).

Staff are represented through the California School Employees Association (CSEA) (IV.A.5-11) and Service Employees International Union (SEIU) (IV.A.5-12) (the two classified unions) and the Classified Senate (IV.A.5-13). Administrators are represented through the President's Cabinet, which meets regularly (IV.A.5-14). In addition, managers, supervisors, and confidential employees meet with the superintendent/president as needed. Instructional administrators attend chairs' meetings, which occur once a month during the semester. Students are involved in all levels of College governance including governance

committees, the Board of Trustees, and the Student Senate, known as Associated Students College of Marin (ASCOM) (IV.A.5-15).

The eight participatory governance committees and College Council include a total of 38 faculty positions, 21 classified staff positions, 20 administrator positions, and 19 student positions. This is in addition to voluntary membership in modernization activities, senate committees, hiring committees, ad hoc groups, student advisory positions, and the unions. The College is small and is dependent on staff, faculty, and students who are willing to participate in College governance. As a result, the College is becoming increasingly reliant upon college wide communication tools including the College's Web pages, e-mails, and briefings to keep College constituents involved and informed. Committee meetings are open and are calendared on the College Web page. Academic Senate agendas and minutes are available online (IV.A.5-16), as are all Board of Trustees meeting agendas and minutes (IV.A.5-17) and PGS committee agendas and minutes (IV.A.5-18). The College has worked hard to increase involvement and communication in participatory governance and to make it easy for everyone to keep abreast of these activities. Announcements are made at Convocation and in the *President's Weekly Briefing*; committees communicate with the senates to encourage committee appointments and fill vacancies; and the Governance Review Council considers ways to make membership more convenient (IV.A.5-19). Encouraging off-campus and Indian Valley Campus participation in committee meetings by using teleconferencing or videoconferencing when in-person attendance is not possible is an example of efforts to increase involvement, but at this point that capability is limited.

In spite of the high number of constituents involved in the governance process and the availability of information about governance committee activities, about 30 percent of

survey respondents said they haven't participated on PGS committees because they do not know enough about those committees. Nearly 40 percent said they had not been asked to participate (IV.A.5-20).

The College has addressed this lack of awareness by putting in place activities that will encourage greater knowledge about and participation in the committee system. At the Fall 2016 Convocation, GRC gave a presentation about the committees and their responsibilities. Tables were set up outside the theater so that faculty and staff could meet with committee members, learn more about the committee's work, and sign up to serve (IV.A.5-21). In addition, GRC has now been tasked with maintaining contact with committee chairs on an ongoing basis. GRC has also been assigned responsibility for continuing to increase participatory governance visibility and actively working to engage new faculty, staff, and students in committee work. In addition, a quorum has been changed to a simple majority of the council or committee's filled seats and a committee can take action even if a governance group does not provide a representative. Changes to the PGS plan also now allow the assigned staff resource person to serve as a committee member with the consent of their constituent group.

Timely Action

All planning documents have published timelines, and strategic planning progress and outcomes are tracked and reported annually. Program reviews are done annually, on two and three-year cycles for each program. These reviews feed into the annual budget allocation timeline and require recommendations from PRAC by the end of spring semester. The superintendent/president returns a letter to PRAC outlining which recommendations have been accepted no later than early fall of the new fiscal year, but usually by the last PRAC meeting of spring semester. The process ends with Board budget approval for the new fiscal

year (IV.A.5-22). Board policies and administrative procedures are updated on a regular basis (See I.B.7).

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The College meets the Standard. Board policies delineate its authority and delegate authority to the superintendent/president as well as assuring the public's interest in the College is

accommodated through processes for public input. The College aligns responsibility and expertise in its internal participatory governance system while assuring opportunities for input from all constituencies' perspectives. The major College planning, budget, and program review processes follow prescribed timelines and those timelines are met. Board policies and administrative procedures are routinely updated.

EVIDENCE LIST

- IV.A.5-1 See I.B.1-1, *Participatory Governance System Plan*, revised March 2016
- IV.A.5-2 See I.C.9-3, Curriculum Committee Web page
- IV.A.5-3 See IV.A.4-16, Academic Senate, Senate Subcommittees Web page, Academic Standards Committee
- IV.A.5-4 Board Meeting Agenda, June 21, 2016, p. 2, example
- IV.A.5-5 BP 2015 Student Trustee
- IV.A.5-6 Union District Workload Committee meeting summaries, examples
- IV.A.5-7 See I.C.9-1, UPM/MCCD Collective Bargaining Agreement, January 1, 2014-December 31, 2016, pp. 121-122
- IV.A.5-8 See I.C.7-7, *Faculty Handbook*, Opportunities/Responsibilities Web page, Professional Affairs Committee
- IV.A.5-9 See II.A.11-1, Instructional Student Learning Outcomes Web page, Student Learning Assessment Council
- IV.A.5-10 See IV.A.4-16, Academic Senate, Senate Subcommittees Web page
- IV.A.5-11 CSEA Contract, July 1, 2012-June 30, 2015
- IV.A.5-12 Service Employees International Union Local 1021 Collective Bargaining Agreement, January 1, 2014-December 31, 2016
- IV.A.5-13 Classified Senate Web page
- IV.A.5-14 Profiles: Leadership Team Web page
- IV.A.5-15 See II.C.4-8, Associated Students College of Marin Web page
- IV.A.5-16 Academic Senate, Agenda and Minutes Web page
- IV.A.5-17 Board of Trustees Agendas and Minutes website
- IV.A.5-18 See I.B.8-18, COM Participatory Governance System Web page, PGS Standing Committees
- IV.A.5-19 See I.B.7-4, Governance Review Council Recommendations, April 20, 2015, p. 3
- IV.A.5-20 See I.B.7-5, College of Marin Campus Community Experience and Evaluation of Participatory Governance, May 6, 2015
- IV.A.5-21 Participatory Governance presentation, Fall 2016 Convocation
- IV.A.5-22 *Participatory Governance System Plan*, revised March 2016 pp. 27-28

Standard IV.A.6. The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.

EVIDENCE OF MEETING THE STANDARD

The manner in which constituent groups participate in decision making is guided by the California Educational Code as specified in Section 70901(b)(1)(E) and in College of Marin's (COM) *Participatory Governance System Plan (IV.A.6-1)*. The plan includes an outline of the participatory governance system (PGS), committee charges and responsibilities, and governance procedures that guide meeting operation and participatory decision-making processes. Along with the PGS plan, documents that specify the decision-making process in areas such as distance education or professional development are available on the College website. These documents, in concert, guide the decision-making process (IV.A.6-2).

The decision-making process and the resulting decisions are widely communicated via committee meetings and minutes (IV.A.6-3), the senates, department meetings, convocation, campus email notifications, the College website, *President's Weekly Briefings (IV.A.6-4)*, the vice presidents' newsletters (IV.A.6-5), and all Board minutes and agendas posted on the website (IV.A.6-6). Board policies and administrative procedures are circulated to and addressed by governance committees with topic expertise, and policies and procedures are posted on the website (IV.A.6-7).

Decisions are documented via committee minutes, memos to the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) from its committees, memos with recommendations from PRAC to the superintendent/president, and responses to those memos from the superintendent/president. Final decisions regarding budget allocations, policies and procedures, and other Board decisions are documented in Board minutes. Committee

members representing students, staff, and faculty are expected to report back to their constituents. The PGS committee's monthly agendas and minutes are posted on the PGS Web pages (IV.A.6-8).

As an example of communication across the institution, at the Spring 2016 Convocation, the superintendent/president handed out a three-fold pamphlet providing an overview of the *Strategic Plan 2015-2018* and encouraged all attendees to read and share the goals, objectives, and performance indicators. The pamphlet also included the College's mission statement (IV.A.6-9). At the Fall 2016 Convocation, the Governance Review Council (GRC) presented on PGS and invited faculty, staff, and students to join committees and participate in discussion and making recommendations on a variety of institutional issues and priorities (IV.A.6-10).

As stated in IV.A.5, despite the numerous avenues for communicating information about the governance system and its output, many members of the campus community are still not aware of this information. Multiple steps are being taken to increase awareness and participation.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The College meets the Standard. The process for decision making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the College in multiple forms. Even so, there is still lack of awareness by some of this information and the PGS responsibilities and tasks. College of Marin is taking steps to improve its communication processes and regularly assesses its participatory governance system.

EVIDENCE LIST

IV.A.6-1	See I.B.1-1, <i>Participatory Governance System Plan</i> , revised March 2016
IV.A.6-2	See I.A.4-5, PRIE Planning Web page
IV.A.6-3	See I.B.8-18, COM Participatory Governance System Web page
IV.A.6-4	Office of the President Web page, From the President's Desk
IV.A.6-5	<i>Student Learning and Student Services Newsletter</i> , fall 2015
IV.A.6-6	See IV.A.5-17, Board of Trustees Agendas and Minutes website
IV.A.6-7	See I.C.8-10, Policies and Procedures Web page
IV.A.6-8	See I.B.8-18, COM Participatory Governance System Web page, PGS Standing Committees
IV.A.6-9	See I.B.7-9, <i>Strategic Plan 2015-2018</i> , brochure
IV.A.6-10	See IV.A.5-21, Participatory Governance presentation, Fall 2016 Convocation

Standard IV.A.7. Leadership roles and the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

EVIDENCE OF MEETING THE STANDARD

Administrative roles and evaluations, including the superintendent/president, are discussed in IV.B.1, IV.B.2, IV.C.3, Standards III.A.5, IV.C.10 address Board evaluation, Evaluation of the participatory governance system (PGS) is in IV.A.3. The College implemented a governance system in May 2005 that provides a clear path for faculty, staff, student, and administrative participation in college decision-making and mechanisms for evaluation and improvement. Faculty, staff, students, and administrators are appointed to serve on governance committees by their respective constituent groups. College governance committees ultimately report to College Council, which is composed of the leadership of the four constituencies and is chaired by the superintendent/president (IV.A.7-1). The Governance Review Council (GRC) (IV.A.7-2), which reports to College Council, is charged with overseeing the governance system to ensure that it functions effectively. Its responsibilities are clearly outlined in the *Participatory Governance System Plan* and

include conducting "an evaluation of the governance system annually or more frequently when deemed necessary by two of the senates or the Board of Trustees" and recommending "changes and revisions to the governance system that are based on the outcome of the evaluation process and consistent with current laws and regulations" (IV.A.7-3).

When the participatory governance system plan was launched in 2005, there was College wide agreement that it would be a "living document" so that changes and improvements could be made whenever necessary to ensure its integrity and effectiveness. These changes and improvements would be based on constituent group feedback from survey data, interviews, and committee member discussions.

To meet this responsibility, the GRC with Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE), develops and conducts an annual governance participant survey for those who serve on governance committees. In 2010, 2012, and 2015 the survey was sent to everyone College wide, regardless of whether

they served on a committee. The results of the surveys are published on the Participatory Governance Web page (IV.A.7-4). An email announcement about the survey results is sent to the College community. The GRC with PRIE, analyzes the survey results and makes recommendations for improvement. The GRC also reviews recommendations received from committees and constituent groups throughout the year to change and improve the governance system. Recent changes to the governance committees, recommended by GRC and approved by College Council, will be evaluated in spring 2017 or when sufficient time has passed to be able to determine the effectiveness of the newly implemented changes. Two of those changes involve communication—increasing the visibility of the governance committees so that more faculty, staff, and managers are aware of PGS responsibilities and tasks and increasing interaction between GRC and the other PGS committees (IV.A.7-5 and IV.A.7-6). Both issues are being addressed.

The College, through PRIE, prepares a Governance Digest each year that highlights the work of the governance committees. Reports are compiled using committee chair reports and/or committee minutes and include the activities, recommendations, and resulting actions and updates for each committee. The digest is posted on the Participatory Governance Web page (IV.A.7-7).

Program review as a decision-making and resource allocation process is regularly evaluated. First, for providing feedback to programs about their program review, student learning outcomes (SLO) assessments, and allocation requests; and second, for improving the program review template. The Program Review Web page includes an allocations page showing the rankings and results for requests (IV.A.7-8). In addition, the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Council (SLOAC) prepares a feedback sheet addressing the SLO portion of the program review (IV.A.7-9).

Program review, as a decision-making and resource allocation process, is regularly evaluated by the subcommittees of the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) that receive and prioritize portions of the program review and by SLOAC (IV.A.7-10). Recommended improvements to the program review template are reviewed by the program review facilitator, SLOAC, and PRAC and changes are made as warranted (IV.A.7-11).

Board policies and administrative procedures that relate to College decision-making processes are reviewed by the governance committees or Academic Senate committees that address the specific topics, such as academic standards, technology, or facilities. Recommendations from committees are then addressed by College Council and presented by the superintendent/president to the Board of Trustees (IV.A.7-12).

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The College meets the Standard. Leadership roles are evaluated through formal personnel evaluations and the superintendent/president's assessment of institutional needs. For the last eleven years, College of Marin has utilized a formal participatory governance decision-making system and processes that are regularly assessed and modified as warranted. Although the system is institutionalized and periodically modified for improvement, broadly communicating the committee's responsibilities to the campus community and communication between committees remains a work in progress. There is still some degree of disconnect between the ready availability of information on the College website and through the College email distribution lists and the level of awareness of that information among the College's constituent groups. These communication issues are being addressed through changes in governance system processes.

EVIDENCE LIST

- IV.A.7-1 *Participatory Governance System Plan*, revised March 2016, p. 5
- IV.A.7-2 See IV.A.3-5, Governance Review Council Web page
- IV.A.7-3 *Participatory Governance System Plan*, revised March 2016, p. 20
- IV.A.7-4 See I.B.8-18, COM Participatory Governance System Web page, PGS Committee Participant Surveys
- IV.A.7-5 See I.B.7-4, Governance Review Council Recommendations, April 20, 2015
- IV.A.7-6 See I.B.7-6, President's Response to Recommended Changes to PGS, February 1, 2016
- IV.A.7-7 See I.B.8-18, COM Participatory Governance System Web page, Governance Digest
- IV.A.7-8 See III.D.2-4, Program Review Allocation Results Web page
- IV.A.7-9 See I.B.4-8, Program Review SLO Assessment Response Sheet
- IV.A.7-10 See I.B.9-5, Planning and Resource Allocation Committee Web page, Agendas, Minutes and Meeting Materials, Presentations/Additional Materials/Accreditation Evidence
- IV.A.7-11 PRAC Meeting Minutes, September 8, 2015
- IV.A.7-12 *Participatory Governance System Plan*, revised March 2016, pp. 14-16