

Governance Review Council (GRC)

May 6, 2020: 3:10 to 4:00 pm online Zoom

Meeting Summary

Present: Steve Carrera, Sara McKinnon, Jon Gudmundsson,

Absent: Angela Olmanson, David Snyder

Agenda: Approved

Approve Minutes

- Minutes from March 4, 2020 approved

Point of Information

- Wednesday, April 1 from 3 pm to 4 pm in AC 303 - Cancelled

Review Answers from VP Eldridge

The Committee reviewed the answers to its questions sent by VP Jonathan Eldridge. The answers were detailed and much appreciated. We have the following comments:

A. Will PR reports due in a particular year be printed (pdf-ed) and made public?

- The answer was: *...I don't know that anyone has decided whether they will be available internally to the College community only or more widely made available.*
- The committee's preference and recommendation is that these be open to public.

B. Another concern was raised around how facilities and general technology needs are articulated through the program review process. It was stated that they were addressed through questions in the template, but we did not find specific questions around these areas. We looked through the PR Template from eLUmen. While there are ways detailed on pages 3-4 of the answers for discipline-specific technology requests, we did not find a place to express general facilities and say general classroom technology issues.

Summer and Fall plans

Sara will work with Shook on the website issues outlined in the March meeting minutes. She will also begin a draft of a revised PGS Plan also based on the issues outlined in March. These will be brought bac to the committee in the fall.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 2, 2020

Governance Review Committee

Questions for VP Jonathan Eldridge regarding Program Review, governance, and budgeting.

According to the 2015/16 PGS Plan – the specific committees that had input into the budgeting process were IEC, PRAC and of course, ultimately, College Council and the BoT. Just before I left the Senate in Spring 2017, a Strong Workforce committee had been set up to process proposals for the use of SW Grant moneys. However, this was not yet a governance committee.

The Strong Workforce Advisory Group—which the Senate established to help allocate SW funds—became the Strong Workforce Advisory Committee (SWAC) when it became clear the SW funds would be forthcoming annually for the foreseeable future. It was agreed SWAC should be a subcommittee of PRAC because of its role with both planning and resource allocation regarding the Strong Workforce program. SWAC currently makes recommendations to PRAC.

According to the 2015/16 PGS Plan, we laid out the process for Program Review’s timeline and connection to PRAC and the budgeting process. There is a flow chart on pages 27-28 in the Plan. Again, since I left the Senate and PRAC after Spring 2017, this seems to have been gradually modified particularly since there was no formal program review over the last couple of years. Therefore, GRC is trying to understand how this process actually works now within Program Review and within the governance system.

A hiatus was taken to re-envision the program review process at the suggestion of the department chairs and consultation at both senate and PRAC. A consultative process resulted in the senate and PRAC approving a new program review template, which now includes annual data embedded within it (from PRIE) and a standard set of questions as a base. Program review is now on a six-year cycle, but the questions are to be discussed at the department level every year and those discussions chronicled in the template, culminating in a synthesis of the conversations (and planning, goals, projects, etc. arising from them) which then is reviewed by an outside committee. The feedback from that group is provided back to the department for consideration as the cycle begins again. This approach was taken to make program review a meaningful planning and assessment exercise, rather than a mechanism through which to ‘request stuff.’ Ultimately, resource requests will tie back to the discussions chronicled in the program reviews, but we are just now in the first year of the first cycle, so that will happen beginning this next year. Non-instructional program reviews will begin this next year. The pandemic interrupted the last phase of their template development.

I will also note that the **COM Integrated Planning Model** hasn’t been updated since 2012. I believe that the changes we made regarding the Program Review process - particularly to the PRAC charge in 2015/16 and its flowchart - addressed some of the changes that had taken place. Thus, I am asking about changes to the Program Review Process with that in mind.

The flowchart is roughly still accurate. I say roughly, because it may vary in timing or exact approach each year (as was the case last year as PRAC asked areas to look at a three-year budget reduction exercise). But it largely still works and is intact.

With that, we have the following questions which will help us to update the PGS Plan:

Governance Review Committee

Questions for VP Jonathan Eldridge regarding Program Review, governance, and budgeting.

Regarding Program Review which through 10+1 regs is the purview of faculty and so faculty should be having input: *Faculty had input into the redesign of program review—and the academic senate ultimately approved the new format.*

1) The college is poised to use eLumen as the platform for program review. *The College is using eLumen. Two years' worth of data is in each department-specific template and faculty have access. Some have been using it, with the rest slated to begin this spring.*

- Is there a cycle of who does it when? Is that published somewhere? *Yes. Cari Torres was working with chairs earlier this semester to finalize a rollout of the sixth-year report (having ECE and Business begin that in year one, followed by other departments staggered across five years so we would not have all departments complete the external review in the same year). That list was not quite finalized before the pandemic but Cari can provide the latest draft. It will be posted to the web when finalized.*
- How often must each discipline do it? *Every discipline should spend time every year in conversation about their data and the questions in the template. Every sixth year is the synthesized report of those discussions and the external review.*
- If it is faculty who are writing it up, how do the deans have access in eLumen? (I'm quite sure they do...I just want to be able to explain it.) *eLumen gives read and/or write access to whomever is determined to need it (via Cari's office's coordination). Department faculty have read and write access. Deans have read access.*
- Will PR reports due in a particular year be printed (pdf-ed) and made public? *Probably not printed, but they will be made available after departments react to the external review—likely via the website, but I don't know that anyone has decided whether they will be available internally to the College community only or more widely made available.*

Who actually provides/writes up/puts together the following parts of PR for a specific program/discipline now and how often? (The faculty of the program, the department chair, PRIE, the Dean???) *The idea behind the program review is for department faculty to engage in discussion. Program data is provided annually and allows faculty to discuss (via the guiding questions within the template) those areas listed below.*

- Review of SLOs
- Review of program stats
- Review of access and success and equity issues
- Review of the health/success of a program
- Review of curriculum
- Review of facilities issues
- Review of technology needs
- Review of professional development needs if applicable

2) Who makes presentations to PRAC now. In years when there has been no formal program review, how did this work? *Deans present on their division to PRAC after working with chairs*

Governance Review Committee

Questions for VP Jonathan Eldridge regarding Program Review, governance, and budgeting.

and others to create the presentation. As the program review cycle unfolds, information from wherever each department is in the cycle will be incorporated via that interactive process.

3) How are FT faculty needs requested and justified? Does FTFAC still exist? *Recently, PRAC has been able to recommend full-time faculty requests, which have come to PRAC after substantive discussion by faculty at the department level and then collective conversation between departments as the dean has prepared the presentation. FTFAC will be used if/when requests come forward that need to be prioritized (meaning resources may allow for some, but not all requests to move forward). Given PRAC is heavily weighted with faculty, this approach has worked well in recent years.*

3) How has the flowchart on pages 27-8 been modified?

See above.

4) How do/will the various governance committees intersect with program review? In the past, the sections of PR that related to a governance committee were reviewed by that committee. (In a recent chairs meeting, Meg seemed to say people thought no one read the PRs. That was far from the truth. In fact, I have not seen a plan laid out for the PRs to be reviewed in eLumen in the future. Please explain. (When you click on “program review” on the COM website, you arrive at SLOAC and then if you click on PR in the right hand corner, you come to the website that I maintained for 8 years – the last posting being for 2016-2017...)

I think this question is answered in part above, but after the external review and any edits at the department level, the six-year synthesis report will route through participatory governance. In the interim years, the fact that the faculty discussions are chronicled in the template will make it easy for specific content to be used by faculty to make requests, to answer questions of committees, and to inform institutional planning work.

5) Specifically, we would like to know about the transformation of IEC. In the plan it was still called the Instructional Equipment Committee. However, I remember it being renamed as the “Institutional Equipment Committee”. This was because instead of just looking solely at the distribution of Instructional Equipment monies from the state, it was going to look at a broader set of funds that came from several sources.

Yes, this is correct. Institutional Equipment Committee seemed more inclusive given the committee would be making recommendations for equipment purchases to support instructional and non-instructional areas.

- Please list the various sources of funding that are looked at by this committee and which disciplines these funds may be limited to. *State instructional equipment funds, Strong Workforce funds, Perkins funds, and Measure B funds make up the majority of sources. All are available to instructional programs and all but the instructional equipment funds can be used for non-instructional equipment—although most of those requests are for academic departments, just for things not directly tied to classrooms/labs.*
- Please explain any changes to the IEC charge and committee make up that might be different from the last approved plan. *Other than the name and looking more coherently at a variety of funding sources, it's pretty much the same.*

Governance Review Committee

Questions for VP Jonathan Eldridge regarding Program Review, governance, and budgeting.

- How do this committees' recommendations come to PRAC for consideration? How do they intersect with presentations from each dean? *See next bullet.*
- Does the CCCCCO still require a 5-year plan on equipment and how has that played into planning? *Yes. Each year the dean works with faculty to update the 5-year plan and prioritize requests for the current year. Those requests are then presented to the IEC and the committee works to maximize the collection of funds to meet as many needs as possible (the last few years we have been able to fund pretty much every request). The IEC then makes its recommendations to PRAC. PRAC then includes its recommendations on the IEC recommendations in its larger resource allocation recommendation to the President for inclusion in the tentative budget.*

6) Given the above transformation of IEC, how does SWAC fit into this picture?

SWAC has a series of guidelines to follow in terms of requests. Many requests do not involve equipment. Those go from SWAC to PRAC. Equipment requests are looked at by IEC, but since they have been reviewed by SWAC, IEC makes sure there isn't any 'double-dipping' taking place, as SWAC generally makes its recommendations ahead of IEC's recommendations.

7) Regarding funds from the formerly separate BSI, SE and SSSP - is this now called the "Integration Plan"? Does GRIT have something to do with this? How are proposals or needs vetted, requested, allocated, reported on.

Tonya Hersch can provide details—and has provided many details on multiple occasions to the GRC in the past on this matter—but yes, GRIT (as a subcommittee of PRAC) reviews these categorical fund-based plans and also makes recommendations to PRAC.

8) Finally, how does the Bond play into this process???

The bond includes monies specifically designed to support institutional equipment needs, so it primarily intersects with IEC. The major projects of the bond (buildings and renovations) were called out in the facilities master plan—which the Facilities Planning Committee worked with consultants to draft—which routed through participatory governance for approval. College Council has acted as the oversight committee for capital projects.