

Participatory Governance System Evaluation (2025–2026)

8 June 2026

Prepared by the Governance Review Council:

- Enrique Amador Mendieta (student)
- Emy Bagtas-Carmona (management)
- Ryan Byrne (management)
- Farhan Khaliq (student)
- Dave King (faculty chair)
- Melanie Palomino (classified professional)
- Joanna Pinckney (classified professional)
- Wendy St. John (faculty)

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	2
2. Methods	2
3. System-wide Themes.....	3
4. Progress on Last Year’s Recommendations	4
5. Committee-Specific Observations	4
Reflections Completed in Committee	4
A. College Council	5
B. Environmental Action Committee (EAC).....	5
C. Facilities and Safety Planning Committee (FSPC)	5
D. Guidance, Resources, Integration, and Transformation Committee (GRIT)	5
E. Governance Review Council (GRC)	5
F. Professional Learning Committee (PLC)	6
G. Technology Planning Committee (TPC)	6
Individual Committee Member Reflections	6
H. Institutional Equipment Committee (IEC, 2 reflections)	6
I. Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC, 3 reflections)	6
Reflections Not Completed	7
J. Career and Technical Education Committee (CTEC)	7
K. Educational Planning Committee (EPC).....	7
6. Recommended Priorities for 2026–2027	7
7. Appendix.....	7

1. Executive Summary

According to our charge, College of Marin's Governance Review Council is responsible for conducting an annual evaluation of our participatory governance system (PGS) to assess the extent to which the college is actively maintaining it, committees are fulfilling their charges effectively, and the system's processes are open, transparent, and equitable.

This year's evaluation found that most PGS committees are meeting regularly, with charges that broadly reflect their work and members who are genuinely committed to the process. Several committees demonstrated strong leadership, well-organized meetings, and meaningful equity-focused work. Many also identified clear recommendations for their own improvement.

However, recurring concerns emerged across multiple committees: communication gaps between committees and their constituencies, uncertainty about how committee work connects to institutional decisions, and uneven participation, particularly among students and faculty. Some committees face significant challenges around the clarity of their roles and internal processes, and there has not been significant progress on many of last year's system-wide recommendations.

The GRC's central recommendation for 2026–2027 is the redevelopment of the PGS Plan and website. Most of the system-wide concerns identified this year—including unclear roles, communication gaps, leadership transitions, and participation barriers—highlight the need for updated, clearer governance structures. At the same time, many committees have identified concrete steps to improve their own efficacy, and those efforts also deserve support. This work, both system-wide and committee-level, will require sustained commitment from College Council, the administration, PGS committee chairs and members, and student, classified professional, and faculty leadership.

2. Methods

The GRC's 2025-26 Participatory Governance System Evaluation was developed through a more qualitative, reflection-based process than the prior year's evaluation.

GRC began planning the process in Fall 2025. On November 20, 2025, GRC consulted with Holley Shafer, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, to gather feedback on how to conduct the annual evaluation. Based on that consultation, GRC considered a focus-group-style approach and ultimately agreed to ask committees to engage in structured self-reflection, while also preserving an option for individual members to share their perspectives separately.

The process was introduced more broadly during the January 12, 2026 FLEX session. At that session, GRC gathered initial feedback, explained the direction of the evaluation, and let participants know that committees would later be asked to complete a self-reflection as part of the annual PGS evaluation process. This early conversation helped prepare committees for a more reflective, dialogue-based evaluation model and gave participants advance notice that committee-level reflection would be requested later in the semester.

On April 3, 2026, GRC Chair Dave King sent a message to PGS committee chairs explaining the process. The message noted that the 2024-25 evaluation had been based on an anonymous survey of PGS committee members, while the 2025-26 evaluation would ask each committee to complete a reflective questionnaire evaluating its work, reflecting on the prior year's evaluation, and providing system-level feedback on the PGS. Chairs were asked to facilitate the discussion in a committee meeting and to work collaboratively and inclusively toward a collective reflection. They were also asked to provide individual committee members with the questionnaire so members could submit reflections directly to GRC if they were unable to participate or felt more comfortable providing feedback separately.

The reflection questionnaire asked committees to respond in three areas: 1) evaluating the committee's work during the year, 2) reflecting on the prior year's PGS evaluation, and 3) providing system-level feedback to GRC and College Council. The questionnaire specifically asked committees to consider alignment with their role and charge, realistic improvements for the coming year, progress related to last year's recommendations, barriers to participation or coordination, and areas of the PGS Plan needing clarification or support.

Seven of the eleven PGS committees completed the reflection as a committee. Two additional committees were represented through individual reflections. Two committees did not submit reflections.

This year's evaluation differs from the 2024-25 evaluation. Last year's report was based primarily on an anonymous survey of PGS committee participants and included quantitative response-rate data. This year's evaluation is based primarily on committee self-reflections and individual written reflections. As a result, the 2025-26 report should be understood as a qualitative synthesis of submitted feedback rather than a quantitative survey report.

3. System-wide Themes

The following emerged as PGS **strengths** across multiple committees:

1. Many committees reported alignment between their charge and their work, with dedicated members who show up prepared and engaged.
2. Several committees demonstrated effective leadership, well-organized meetings, and clear agendas and minutes.
3. Many committees demonstrated a commitment to improvement, including expanding meeting schedules, reviewing charges, and strengthening equity-focused work.

The following emerged as PGS **concerns** across multiple committees:

1. Some committees reported ongoing challenges in committee silos, communication gaps, and duplicated efforts.
2. Some committees reported a lack of clarity on how committee work connects to and influences institutional planning, budgeting, and administrative decisions.
3. Some committees reported that work can feel performative or disconnected from decision-making.

4. Some committees reported a lack of student participation.
5. Some committees reported a lack of faculty participation.

4. Progress on Last Year's Recommendations

Last year, in the GRC's 2024–2025 PGS evaluation, we identified several system-wide recommendations. Below is the GRC's assessment of our progress in each area:

1. **Clarify governance roles and processes.** While some progress has been made in terms of revising the PGS organization chart and improving feedback loops between committees, this year's reflections point to the need for significant work to be done in this area.
2. **Facilitate reviews and revisions of committee charges.** Substantial progress was made in encouraging committees to review their charges at the beginning and middle of the academic year. However, as this year's reflections identify, many committees would benefit from updating, clarifying, and aligning their charges in the coming academic year.
3. **Provide governance training and onboarding.** Some progress in this area, particularly with appointing committee members in the spring semester for the following fall. This year's reflections identify that further training of committee members and chairs as well as onboarding of new members should be a priority.
4. **Incentivize participation.** No progress was made on this recommendation. This remains a priority for the next academic year.
5. **Strengthen student participation.** Results have been mixed on this recommendation according to this year's reflections. Recruitment strategies and collaboration with ASCOM have been explored by GRC and College Council, with some actions taken to improve student outreach for the next academic year. Improved member onboarding and mentoring remain to be implemented.
6. **Broaden communication.** While some progress was made in creating more structured communication between some committees, this year's reflections point to the need to further clarify channels of communication and coordination among committees and between committee members and the constituent groups they represent.
7. **Prioritize meeting in person.** This year's reflections did not address this recommendation. Most committees have elected to meet via Zoom due to advantages for scheduling and accessibility.

5. Committee-Specific Observations

Reflections Completed in Committee

The following section summarizes recommendations identified by PGS committees who completed their self-reflection process collectively. These reflections are included in the appendix of this report.

Committees are encouraged to use these as a basis for goal setting in the next academic year, and GRC and College Council are asked to support these recommendations when broader institutional support may be needed.

A. College Council

1. Schedule important topics and major changes one month ahead of board presentation to allow for discussion, coordination with constituencies.
2. Clarify and maintain a consistent reporting relationship with the GRC.
3. Work with GRC on multi-stage revisions to the PGS Plan, including consultation with CCLC and ASCCC, joint drafting, and campus-wide feedback.
4. Ensure that other PGS committee recommendations are consistently communicated to College Council to support its role as the umbrella governance body.

B. Environmental Action Committee (EAC)

1. Recruit and support student participation on the EAC.

C. Facilities and Safety Planning Committee (FSPC)

1. Clarify the committee's role in influencing facilities priorities and project timelines, and identify opportunities to move beyond an informational role toward active involvement in planning and prioritization.
2. Develop clearer communication channels between FSPC and the campus community, including a feedback mechanism for employees and students to raise facilities and safety concerns.
3. Create a clearer system for prioritizing and tracking facilities concerns.

D. Guidance, Resources, Integration, and Transformation Committee (GRIT)

1. Establish a clear process for leadership selection ahead of the chair transition.
2. Update the charge on the GRIT website to reflect the committee's work.
3. Align the GRIT review template to updated program review templates to streamline the review process and feedback loop.

E. Governance Review Council (GRC)

1. Facilitate redeveloping the PGS Plan and website.
2. Advocate for more support from College Council and the College more broadly in redeveloping the PGS Plan and website.
3. Revise the GRC's charge to focus on its core responsibilities and priorities.
4. Improve outreach, onboarding, and mentorship to student members on GRC.
5. Increase its meeting lengths to accommodate its workload.

F. Professional Learning Committee (PLC)

1. Change the PLC composition by designating the Faculty FLEX Coordinator and Classified Professional Development Coordinator as committee chairs, with an elected alternative if either position declines to serve.
2. Collaborate more with other committees on professional learning opportunities, such as Umoja Equity Institute and Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Action committee.

G. Technology Planning Committee (TPC)

1. Work with PRAC, IT leadership, and administration to clarify the role and alignment of TPC within the institution's technology planning and governance structure.
2. Revise the TPC charge with direct and measurable actions—in consultation with IT leadership—to better support IT and the college.
3. Propose a subcommittee or working group to focus on emerging technologies that will impact the college on an institutional level.
4. Complete the District's 5-year Technology Plan.
5. Invite the GRC to give updates at a meeting each academic year.

Individual Committee Member Reflections

The GRC also received individual reflections from members of the following committees. Since these represent individual perspectives rather than committee-wide consensus, recommendations are noted where themes emerged across multiple submissions. Individual reflections have not been included in the appendix.

The GRC encourages these committees to use these individual recommendations as a starting point for goal setting in the coming year, and to complete a committee-wide reflection as part of next year's PGS evaluation process.

H. Institutional Equipment Committee (IEC, 2 reflections)

1. Clarify the committee composition (including chair), membership, and processes.
2. Begin planning and scheduling meetings for spring in the fall.
3. Improve communication to departments and supervisors about IEC's role, request criteria, and submission process.
4. Strengthen student participation on IEC.

I. Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC, 3 reflections)

1. Reaffirm the committee's role as a recommending body and clarify the scope of PRAC's planning responsibilities.
2. Improve communication flow between PRAC, the President, and constituent groups regarding decisions, priorities, and outcomes.
3. Provide PRAC with clear budget parameters to better align recommendations with available resources.

4. Ensure consistent and equitable processes for reviewing and communicating decisions on requests.
5. Establish clearer procedures for leadership transitions to minimize disruption to committee work.
6. Encourage broader participation to serve on PRAC.

Reflections Not Completed

J. Career and Technical Education Committee (CTEC)

CTEC has been recently reformed and is in the early stages of re-establishing its meeting and recommendation processes. The GRC encourages CTEC to complete a reflection on this process next year.

K. Educational Planning Committee (EPC)

The Educational Planning Committee was unable to complete its committee reflection this year due to a cancelled end-of-year meeting, and no individual reflections were submitted. The GRC encourages EPC to complete a reflection next year.

6. Recommended Priorities for 2026–2027

Based on the strengths, concerns, and recommendations identified in this year's reflections, and on the work remaining from last year's recommendations, the GRC recommends the following as priorities for 2026–2027:

1. Identify specific practices that are working well and areas needing improvement on PGS.
2. Redevelop the PGS Plan and website, including committee roles, relationship to institutional planning and prioritization processes, communication expectations, leadership transitions, and term clarity.
3. Facilitate better communication of committee work to campus community and between committee members and their constituency groups.
4. Increase communication, transparency, and coordination laterally across governance committees.
5. Establish a standard feedback-loop process so committees know where recommendations go, who responds, and how outcomes are communicated back.
6. Encourage student and faculty outreach, participation, and mentoring in PGS.
7. Identify options for incentivizing participation on PGS committees.

7. Appendix

The following committee reflections were completed collectively during committee meetings and represent the consensus of each committee's members. Please note that individual reflections have not been included in this appendix but are represented in section 5 above.



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (PGS) COMMITTEE REFLECTION

PGS Committee: College Council

Instructions: The Governance Review Council requests that committee chair(s) facilitate a discussion during a committee meeting to reflect on its work this academic year and to document this in the following questionnaire. Please respond to each question to the best of the committee's abilities and ensure that all members are encouraged to participate and that all voices are reflected.

Individual committee members are welcome to submit feedback directly to the GRC if they are unable to participate or would prefer to offer a separate reflection outside of the full committee discussion.

Please submit the completed form to GRC Chair Dave King (dking@marin.edu) by May 14th, 2026.

Section 1: Evaluating Your Committee's Work This Year

- How well has your committee's work aligned with its role within the PGS?
- Does your committee's current charge reflect the work you have been doing this year? If not, where does it feel misaligned?
- What is one or more realistic improvement your committee could implement this semester and/or next academic year to strengthen its effectiveness?
- Over the past year, Participatory Governance processes and recommendations have been discussed regularly by College Council (CC), with productive BP/AP and policy-related conversations. There is agreement that new initiatives and major revisions should come to CC early and consistently to provide context and obtain feedback from constituents. Making PGS a standing agenda item at CC was seen as effective in supporting this goal.

Maintaining a clear reporting connection between the Governance Review Committee (GRC) and CC is important. While David King will be on sabbatical next semester, Mia Robertshaw will serve on GRC and help maintain continuity though someone else on GRC may attend CC for this purpose. Discussions have linked the PGS Plan, committee charges, and recommendations, including concerns about how committee membership is populated and the historical origins of governance structures.

Any significant revision to the PGS Plan will require broad engagement and buy-in from all governance groups. GRC and CC will need to work together to define the revision process, including scope, timeline, and stages of consultation. A proposed approach is to begin fall discussions focused on process design, potentially through a joint GRC/CC meeting or working group, followed by a draft shared campus-wide for feedback. There is no clear precedent, and the process is expected to be multi-stage.

Input from CCLC and the Statewide Academic Senate was discussed, with consensus that earlier consultation would be more helpful.

Section 2: Reflecting on Last Year's Evaluation (for continuing members)

- Which strengths identified in last year's [Participatory Governance Evaluation Report](#) reflect your committee's work this year? How?
- Which concerns identified in the report are reflected in your committee's work this year? Why?
- Which committee-specific or system-wide recommendations has your committee worked to address this year? How?
- Which recommendations do you feel your committee still needs to address? Why?
- CC continues to evolve as an umbrella and recommendation body. Progress was noted in moving ideas forward, particularly in BP/AP discussions and incorporating feedback. Examples of CC-level recommendations include facility naming items and institution-wide discussions such as housing.

There is interest in ensuring that other committee recommendations are consistently communicated to CC, so members have a timely, real-time understanding of campus-wide committee work. While communication methods may vary depending on timing and topic, better alignment and awareness across committees remains a goal. When possible, CC review before Board action—such as one month ahead—was identified as a better practice, allowing time to report back to senates, recognizing that timing constraints do not always allow this. For important topics and major changes to policies and procedures, CC will plan to agendize well in advance to ensure there is enough time for discussion and input at the committee and senate level.

Section 3: System-Level Feedback to GRC and College Council

- Where does the PGS break down or create barriers to effective participation, communication, or coordination?
- Are there parts of the [PGS Plan](#) that need clarification, updating, or additional support?
- Is there anything else you would like the Governance Review Council and/or College Council to consider as they work to strengthen the PGS?
- When asked if GRC could assess feedback around the ACCJC Standard 4.3 and how committee members for about the campus climate of collaboration in decision-making, Dave King reported that while surveys have captured general sentiment, there is strong interest in moving beyond “temperature checks” toward identifying specific practices that are working well and areas needing improvement.

- Suggestions include enhanced training for committee chairs, improved communication of committee work to the campus, and clearer integration across committees—issues that should be addressed within the PGS Plan. Next year was identified as an opportunity for more intentional and structured campus engagement around these topics.



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (PGS) COMMITTEE REFLECTION

PGS Committee: Environmental Action Committee

Instructions: The Governance Review Council requests that committee chair(s) facilitate a discussion during a committee meeting to reflect on its work this academic year and to document this in the following questionnaire. Please respond to each question to the best of the committee's abilities and ensure that all members are encouraged to participate and that all voices are reflected.

Individual committee members are welcome to submit feedback directly to the GRC if they are unable to participate or would prefer to offer a separate reflection outside of the full committee discussion.

*Please submit the completed form to GRC Chair Dave King (dking@marin.edu) by **May 14th, 2026.***

Section 1: Evaluating Your Committee's Work This Year

- How well has your committee's work aligned with its role within the PGS?
Our work these past months, has been in alignment with the PGS system.
- Does your committee's current charge reflect the work you have been doing this year? If not, where does it feel misaligned? : Yes, part of my work besides teaching in to participate in a governance committee.
- What is one or more realistic improvement your committee could implement this semester and/or next academic year to strengthen its effectiveness? I believe we have been effective in our charge. It is important to recruit students. Student participation has not been strong.

Section 2: Reflecting on Last Year's Evaluation (for continuing members)

- Which strengths identified in last year's [Participatory Governance Evaluation Report](#) reflect your committee's work this year? How?: not applicable to us since our committee is new.
- Which concerns identified in the report are reflected in your committee's work this year? Why?.Not applicable since our committee is new.
- Which committee-specific or system-wide recommendations has your committee worked to address this year? How?: We have highlighted the new to update the Master Landscape plan including new initiatives at the college such as the " Learning Landscapes project", The monarch butterfly waystations, the new system for waste management, electric vehicle charging stations.

- Which recommendations do you feel your committee still needs to address? Why?: Since our committee is new we are working at a good pace. There are matters such as mass transit for students and faculty that need to be addresses. For example, shuttles for bus /train stations to campus facilities.

Section 3: System-Level Feedback to GRC and College Council

- Where does the PGS break down or create barriers to effective participation, communication, or coordination? So far, our committee has worked very well. The organization of the committee is excellent. Good planning for agendas, good communication between member.
- Are there parts of the [PGS Plan](#) that need clarification, updating, or additional support?: No need to improvements so far.
- Is there anything else you would like the Governance Review Council and/or College Council to consider as they work to strengthen the PGS? : we need ways to publicize the role of PGS among students and find more ways to recruit students. Perhaps the Administration could start a dialogue with faculty to have them actively informing students about the importance of participating in governance committees.



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (PGS) COMMITTEE REFLECTION

PGS Committee: Facilities and Safety Planning Committee

Instructions: The Governance Review Council requests that committee chair(s) facilitate a discussion during a committee meeting to reflect on its work this academic year and to document this in the following questionnaire. Please respond to each question to the best of the committee's abilities and ensure that all members are encouraged to participate and that all voices are reflected.

Individual committee members are welcome to submit feedback directly to the GRC if they are unable to participate or would prefer to offer a separate reflection outside of the full committee discussion.

Please submit the completed form to GRC Chair Dave King (dking@marin.edu) by May 14th, 2026.

Section 1: Evaluating Your Committee's Work This Year

How well has your committee's work aligned with its role within the PGS?

The Facilities and Safety Planning Committee has remained aligned with its role within the Participatory Governance System by regularly reviewing facilities-related concerns, discussing campus safety needs, and providing a forum for communication between constituent groups and administration. The committee maintained structured meetings, agendas, and minutes, while working collaboratively to identify and discuss facilities priorities across the district. Committee discussions consistently focused on supporting a safe, functional, and student-centered campus environment.

Does your committee's current charge reflect the work you have been doing this year? If not, where does it feel misaligned?

Overall, the committee's charge reflects the work being conducted this year, particularly in relation to facilities planning, maintenance concerns, and campus safety issues. However, there are times when the committee serves more as an informational or reporting body rather than being directly involved in long-term planning or prioritization decisions. Greater clarity regarding the committee's role in influencing facilities priorities and project timelines may help strengthen alignment between the committee charge and operational realities.

What is one or more realistic improvement your committee could implement this semester and/or next academic year to strengthen its effectiveness?

One important improvement would be developing clearer communication channels between the campus community and the committee so that concerns related to facilities and safety can be more consistently shared, tracked, and addressed. This could include a centralized reporting or feedback mechanism that allows employees and students to communicate concerns more directly to the committee.

Additionally, creating a clearer system for prioritizing and tracking facilities concerns discussed by the committee would improve transparency and help members better understand project status, timelines, and resource limitations.

Section 2: Reflecting on Last Year's Evaluation (for continuing members)

Which strengths identified in last year's Participatory Governance Evaluation Report reflect your committee's work this year? How?

The committee demonstrated several strengths identified in last year's evaluation, including structured meetings, collaborative discussion, and consistent documentation through agendas and meeting minutes. Members participated respectfully and worked to maintain open dialogue around facilities and safety concerns affecting multiple campus constituencies.

The committee also benefited from strong participation from operational and administrative areas that were able to provide updates and context regarding ongoing facilities projects and maintenance issues.

Which concerns identified in the report are reflected in your committee's work this year? Why?

One ongoing concern reflected in the committee's work is the challenge of communication and transparency regarding facilities planning timelines, project prioritization, and follow-through on identified issues. Committee members sometimes expressed uncertainty about how concerns raised within the committee ultimately move through administrative processes or budgeting priorities.

There were also concerns regarding aging infrastructure and deferred maintenance issues, including problems related to the swimming pool facility, operational heating systems, and maintenance needs at the Child Study Center.

Which committee-specific or system-wide recommendations has your committee worked to address this year? How?

The committee worked to improve organization and communication by maintaining regular meetings, documenting discussions carefully, and encouraging participation from committee members. The committee also continued discussing significant facilities concerns in an open forum so that issues impacting safety and operations remained visible and documented.

Members raised concerns about the condition of the swimming pool, including cracks in the pool structure and operational limitations caused by only one functioning heater. The committee also discussed safety and maintenance concerns at the Child Study Center playground, where aging mulch has decomposed and contributed to mold and fungus growth. The program has explored replacement options, including rubber mulch solutions intended to improve long-term safety and maintenance outcomes.

Which recommendations do you feel your committee still needs to address? Why?

The committee would benefit from clearer mechanisms for tracking concerns after they are raised and better communication regarding the status of projects and repairs. Members would also benefit from additional clarity regarding how committee recommendations are incorporated into institutional planning and budget prioritization processes.

The committee continues to face challenges associated with aging infrastructure and limited resources, which can make it difficult to address all identified needs in a timely manner.

Section 3: System-Level Feedback to GRC and College Council

Where does the PGS break down or create barriers to effective participation, communication, or coordination?

A recurring challenge within the PGS is ensuring that communication flows effectively between governance committees, operational departments, and the broader campus community. Committees sometimes lack visibility into how recommendations move forward after discussion, making it difficult to fully understand decision-making processes or timelines.

Additionally, some committee members may not always feel fully informed about broader institutional planning efforts connected to facilities and safety issues, which can limit the committee’s ability to provide proactive input.

Are there parts of the PGS Plan that need clarification, updating, or additional support?

Additional clarification regarding the role of committees in institutional planning and prioritization processes could strengthen participation and improve understanding of how committee feedback informs decision-making. More consistent communication regarding outcomes, timelines, and implementation of recommendations would also be beneficial.

Is there anything else you would like the Governance Review Council and/or College Council to consider as they work to strengthen the PGS?

Continued efforts to improve transparency, communication, and coordination across governance committees would strengthen trust and engagement in the participatory governance process. Providing committees with clearer feedback loops regarding recommendations, project status, and institutional priorities may help members feel more connected to the outcomes of their work and improve overall effectiveness of the PGS.



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (PGS) COMMITTEE REFLECTION

PGS Committee: GRIT

Instructions: The Governance Review Council requests that committee chair(s) facilitate a discussion during a committee meeting to reflect on its work this academic year and to document this in the following questionnaire. Please respond to each question to the best of the committee's abilities and ensure that all members are encouraged to participate and that all voices are reflected.

Individual committee members are welcome to submit feedback directly to the GRC if they are unable to participate or would prefer to offer a separate reflection outside of the full committee discussion.

Please submit the completed form to GRC Chair Dave King (dking@marin.edu) by May 14th, 2026.

Section 1: Evaluating Your Committee's Work This Year

How well has your committee's work aligned with its role within the PGS?

- GRIT work is well-aligned with the role defined with PGS
- The description on this page: <https://gov.marin.edu/>, needs to be updated to reflect our actual charge

Does your committee's current charge reflect the work you have been doing this year? If not, where does it feel misaligned?

- The Committee agrees that it is aligned.

What is one or more realistic improvement your committee could implement this semester and/or next academic year to strengthen its effectiveness?

- Align the GRIT Review template to the updated instructional and soon-to-be non-instructional program review templates to streamline the review process and feedback loop.

Section 2: Reflecting on Last Year's Evaluation (for continuing members)

Which strengths identified in last year's [Participatory Governance Evaluation Report](#) reflect your committee's work this year? How?

- (1) The group was committed to improvement throughout the year
- (2) Apart from a bumpy start in the fall due to a lack of faculty volunteers and concerns about quorum, we met with regularity on schedule
- (3) Leadership could be more effective with more clarity on process and responsibilities

- (4) GRIT members interacted effectively with excellent and respectful dialogue
- (5) GRIT members demonstrated dedication by regularly showing up for meetings and being prepared to actively participate
- (6) Representation was an issue as lack of faculty participation in the fall resulted in the committee not having its first meeting until late November
- (7) GRIT completed many reviews of program reviews and the SEAP, while also collaborating on the program review template revision project
- (8) GRIT met entirely online this year, although we recognize the value in meeting in person for occasions when we might be inviting another committee to attend

Which concerns identified in the report are reflected in your committee's work this year? Why?

- (1) We are aligned with our charge- no concerns
- (2) There continues to be concern that GRIT feedback on program reviews is being sent into the void, as there is currently no structure that requires faculty to respond to recommendations, etc. However, we believe that the revised program review template and process will be a structural fix to this issue going forward
- (3) Transparency- no concerns
- (4) The process for leadership selection remains unclear. The current chair was appointed by the President due to a mid-semester vacancy, but in the past, this committee has held elections for the chair.
- (5) Communication around meetings and agendas was very good. Final review document was not always shared with the committee (or the committee wasn't told when it wasn't sent for various reasons).
- (6) Workload for committee members seems reasonable, but it can be a lot for the chair and admin. We recommend that this is a consideration when selecting the next chair.
- (7) As mentioned earlier, participation from faculty hindered getting the committee off the ground at the start of the year. It would also be helpful for the chair or another PGS knowledgeable person to provide context and an opportunity for student participants to ask questions. We understand that something like this may be in development.

Which committee-specific or system-wide recommendations has your committee worked to address this year? How?

- (1) While GRIT is clear on its role, the feedback loop on recommendations could be better. This will hopefully be addressed in the new PR process.
- (2) GRIT includes its charge on its review template, so it is a clear reminder of what our role is in PGS
- (3) More governance training, especially for the chair and admin support would be helpful

- (4) The only current incentive available to GRIT members is the desire to ensure that equity is being addressed widely across the institution, and it is accurately and thoroughly expressed in the reports and reviews produced by the college.
- (5) The student participants on GRIT would benefit from an orientation and mentorship related to PGS. Students want to engage and are unsure how.
- (6) Communication on GRIT is strong, but some of our own internal loops could be strengthened, as mentioned previously
- (7) The committee agreed that because the work GRIT does is so text focused, it can be helpful to do the work on Zoom.

Which recommendations do you feel your committee still needs to address? Why?

- Leadership on GRIT will once again shift with the retirement of the chair. Work is underway to ensure that the PR recommendations will be included in a structure that requires faculty to respond to recommendations.

Section 3: System-Level Feedback to GRC and College Council

Where does the PGS break down or create barriers to effective participation, communication, or coordination?

- Unfortunately, we did not get to these questions, as we were working off the evaluation questions in last year's plan. However, I think many of our answers above speak to some of our concerns and suggestions for areas for improvement

Are there parts of the [PGS Plan](#) that need clarification, updating, or additional support?

- While we did not have time to review the entire PGS Plan, the section on GRIT accurately reflects the work done by the committee

Is there anything else you would like the Governance Review Council and/or College Council to consider as they work to strengthen the PGS?

- PGS training for all committee participants and chairs is helpful to ensure everyone is clear about their roles and responsibilities of the committee.



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (PGS) COMMITTEE REFLECTION

PGS Committee: Governance Review Council

Instructions: The Governance Review Council requests that committee chair(s) facilitate a discussion during a committee meeting to reflect on its work this academic year and to document this in the following questionnaire. Please respond to each question to the best of the committee's abilities and ensure that all members are encouraged to participate and that all voices are reflected.

Individual committee members are welcome to submit feedback directly to the GRC if they are unable to participate or would prefer to offer a separate reflection outside of the full committee discussion.

Please submit the completed form to GRC Chair Dave King (dking@marin.edu) by May 14th, 2026.

Section 1: Evaluating Your Committee's Work This Year

- How well has your committee's work aligned with its role within the PGS?
- Does your committee's current charge reflect the work you have been doing this year? If not, where does it feel misaligned?
- What is one or more realistic improvement your committee could implement this semester and/or next academic year to strengthen its effectiveness?

GRC has worked toward aligning more with its role in PGS by identifying systemic needs and a method to improve PGS going forward. (Spring appointments, FLEX workshops, annual PGS evaluation process and template, membership tracking, outreach)

GRC needs to further facilitate outreach, onboarding, mentorship to students, work toward redeveloping the website and PGS plan, revise its charge.

GRC should also consider the following actions to implement next year:

- Assign GRC liaisons to attend one meeting per semester of each major PGS committee.
- Create a standing "PGS Coordination" item on every GRC agenda
- Facilitate follow-up with committees by developing a simple tracking document to monitor implementation and progress of recommendations, and report back to College Council and GRC members.

Section 2: Reflecting on Last Year's Evaluation (for continuing members)

- Which strengths identified in last year's [Participatory Governance Evaluation Report](#) reflect your committee's work this year? How?
- Which concerns identified in the report are reflected in your committee's work this year? Why?

- Which committee-specific or system-wide recommendations has your committee worked to address this year? How?
- Which recommendations do you feel your committee still needs to address? Why?

These were the recommendations for the GRC from last year's PGS evaluation: Refine the GRC charge to prioritize core responsibilities such as reviewing committee charges, supporting participatory governance processes, and tracking systemic recommendations. Strengthen onboarding of new members to improve continuity from year to year. Increase meeting frequency and/or duration to allow sufficient time for committee business.

GRC successfully refined its focus on the core responsibilities and priorities in its charge since last year's evaluation. GRC made progress on supporting PGS processes and systemic recommendations, but these recommendations will require an overhaul of the PGS plan. GRC can do more work to strengthen onboarding of new members, especially students. GRC kept its meetings at 1-hour once per month, with the addition of one longer meeting near the end of the semester. We recommend extending meetings to 1.5 hours in the fall.

Section 3: System-Level Feedback to GRC and College Council

- Where does the PGS break down or create barriers to effective participation, communication, or coordination?
- Are there parts of the [PGS Plan](#) that need clarification, updating, or additional support?
- Is there anything else you would like the Governance Review Council and/or College Council to consider as they work to strengthen the PGS?

GRC needs more support from College Council and constituency groups to fulfill its obligations to maintain our PGS.

GRC encourages the college to support the system-level priorities identified in this year's PGS Evaluation (2025-2026).



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (PGS) COMMITTEE REFLECTION

PGS Committee: Professional Learning Committee

Instructions: The Governance Review Council requests that committee chair(s) facilitate a discussion during a committee meeting to reflect on its work this academic year and to document this in the following questionnaire. Please respond to each question to the best of the committee's abilities and ensure that all members are encouraged to participate and that all voices are reflected.

Individual committee members are welcome to submit feedback directly to the GRC if they are unable to participate or would prefer to offer a separate reflection outside of the full committee discussion.

Please submit the completed form to GRC Chair Dave King (dking@marin.edu) by May 14th, 2026.

Section 1: Evaluating Your Committee's Work This Year

The committee over all felt that our work aligned well with our actual work and our charge. The thing that is misaligned in our current charge is our composition. We would like to change the composition to be...

Committee Chairs:

- Faculty FLEX Coordinator
- Classified Professional Development Coordinator
- Or someone that wants to be elected from the group if either of those positions do not wish to serve

In addition to the chairs:

- Two classified staff
- Two Faculty
- Two Administrators

This allows the positions that should be in the chair positions to be the chairs while still having two more voices from each constituent group. It is important in professional learning that we gather many voices.

One realistic improvement is collaborating more with other committees. We want to lift up professional learning happening other places. We will be inviting committees to come to our meetings in the new year starting with UEI and IDEA committee.

Section 2: Reflecting on Last Year's Evaluation (for continuing members)

In this past year we have continued to have good collaboration among those on the committee. We have also kept good representation from all groups except for students.

We did not have any concerns in the last report but I think we want to continue to encourage more communication and participation within the committee.

In the system wide recommendations we reviewed our charge multiple times throughout the year. We would like to grow in getting consistent student participation, prioritize meeting in person, and broaden our communication with other committees.

Section 3: System-Level Feedback to GRC and College Council

One area PLC has identified as a barrier is in training around serving on a committee and being a chair. For many employees they don't know the goals of the committee and how to effectively share their voice. For chairs some are appointed and are not given any information on effective facilitation or coming to consensus.

One area to edit in the PGS plan that needs updating is when it says "chairs will notify Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness Office whenever there is a change in representation and will maintain current lists of committee representatives and their term of office" under operating guidelines. I don't believe that is how we are currently running the system.



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (PGS) COMMITTEE REFLECTION

PGS Committee: Technology Planning Committee (TPC)

Instructions: The Governance Review Council requests that committee chair(s) facilitate a discussion during a committee meeting to reflect on its work this academic year and to document this in the following questionnaire. Please respond to each question to the best of the committee's abilities and ensure that all members are encouraged to participate and that all voices are reflected.

Individual committee members are welcome to submit feedback directly to the GRC if they are unable to participate or would prefer to offer a separate reflection outside of the full committee discussion.

Please submit the completed form to GRC Chair Dave King (dking@marin.edu) by May 14th, 2026.

Section 1: Evaluating Your Committee's Work This Year

How well has your committee's work aligned with its role within the PGS?

We are aligned to an extent, but the charge should be re-evaluated. This committee is a valuable resource which could be utilized more intentionally toward positive changes.

- Our committee is writing the College of Marin Technology Plan. We determined an outline, collected the results from recent surveys, and organized to align the new plan with California Vision 2030 and with the values and mission of the District. The surveys identify effective technology and gaps. The committee will continue to help draft this plan in coordination with IT and their planned objectives.
- Through our conversations, we are inspired to propose flex sessions contributing to professional learning and development.
- We indirectly “assure student, staff and faculty involvement in technology planning and provide guidance for major technological decisions”, but we are not directly vetting technology projects. We are informed of technological decisions, and we do hold discussions. Each committee member represents different COM departments, so we are given the chance to share our well-rounded perspectives.
- During AY 2025-26, the TPC conducted conversations involving any tech issues that we learn about from students or from our own experience.
- Employees from the IT department sit on the committee. Therefore, the committee will often recommend technology centered training opportunities, outreach and communication, and ask for support information that will contribute to the efforts of different departments.

Does your committee’s current charge reflect the work you have been doing this year? If not, where does it feel misaligned?

We do not provide guidance regarding major technological decisions.

We do not evaluate existing and new technology ideas and plans to promote equity-mindedness and antiracism.

We do not (and have not for several years) done the following:

- Inform the College community in[of] advances and opportunities in technology to support teaching and learning.
- Disseminate information about the current activities and future plans in each of the technology areas (Infrastructure, Information Systems, Instructional, and Student Services).
- Maintain a comprehensive overview of the entire technological effort in the District.
- Assess and develop policy on matters such as intellectual property rights, appropriate use of technology, and standards.
-

What is one or more realistic improvement your committee could implement this semester and/or next academic year to strengthen its effectiveness?

In academic year 2026-27, the TPC would like to accomplish a few goals which include but are not limited to:

- 1) Revisit our charge and write it with direct and measurable actions to best support IT and the College. We hope to accomplish this with an administrator to help guide the group. We hope to have a clear understanding of our relationship and responsibilities to PRAC, as TPC is a subcommittee under PRAC.
- 2) The committee would like to form a subcommittee or workgroup which will focus on emerging technologies that will impact the College on an institutional level, as opposed to a curriculum level.
- 3) We hope to complete the District’s 5-year Technology Plan.

Section 2: Reflecting on Last Year’s Evaluation (for continuing members)

Which strengths identified in last year’s [Participatory Governance Evaluation Report](#) reflect your committee’s work this year? How?

- Strong leadership. Heather has done a great job organizing our committee.
- Attendance for the committee was consistent, and we obtain quorums for voting.
- We have proposed ideas to strengthen communication on the part of IT for different issues.
- We made progress toward writing the next College of Marin 5-year Technology Plan.

Which concerns identified in the report are reflected in your committee’s work this year? Why?

- As members join participatory committees such as TPC or are elected to leadership roles, there is an absence in training and understanding of commitment and expectations. This has been a reoccurring talking point.
- Faculty should not miss more than one meeting per semester, but we have a few members who do not show up regularly. Reminders are provided and folks have been called out. This is somewhat effective. As noted above we did achieve a quorum.
- We would like to define specific actions that produce measurable outcomes. We’d like to build a greater sense of pride in making a positive impact.

Which committee-specific or system-wide recommendations has your committee worked to address this year? How?

We’ve made recommendations regarding outreach with tech information including listing smart rooms for those who schedule, offering a flex training session for use of the TVs in the conference rooms when setting up hybrid meetings, etc. All are documented in our minutes and posted online.

Which recommendations do you feel your committee still needs to address? Why?

TPC will work to define their charge, define a potential subcommittee for emerging technology, and expand the committee’s scope where it makes most sense to help the District.

Section 3: System-Level Feedback to GRC and College Council

Where does the PGS break down or create barriers to effective participation, communication, or coordination?

We would like leadership from administration on how to better **align IT and TPC**.

We would like leadership from administration on how to better **align TPC and PRAC**. Guidance from PRAC and what is expected from that committee will be helpful going forward, as TPC is their subcommittee.

Are there parts of the [PGS Plan](#) that need clarification, updating, or additional support?

Again, the charge and responsibilities are vague and need to be reframed with the current IT director and staff (so that we can help the whole College); and that there are limits to what we/TPC can recommend based on CCC rules and Title 5.

Is there anything else you would like the Governance Review Council and/or College Council to consider as they work to strengthen the PGS?

- Provide initial training for new chairs/co-chairs.
- Offer flex training to include participation agreements and expectations.
- Come to one of our meetings and share updates each AY.
- Explain the connection between committee/subcommittees or make those connections be known clearly.