

PURPOSE:
LOCATION:

Participatory Governance Leaders Meeting

Item 3d: President's Prioritization – Reassign Time

Item 4:

however, the state will now only allocate funds for specific activities. In addition, Slater mentioned, the state required that the college match each 3SP dollar spent with three general fund dollars. Slater provided a simplified example, stating that if the campus hired one counselor using 3SP funding, the campus would then also have to fund three counselor positions using general funds. Slater went on to comment that 3SP has many unknowns and that the college was doing the most to capture the funding, but would only do so responsibly. Slater noted that the Student Equity Workgroup would like to help develop a 3SP crosswalk in the future.

Elaine Kuo then asked for clarification on what exactly PaRC was required to rank on the Prioritization Survey. Miner stated that PaRC should review the vice presidents' prioritization presentation materials and rank their top ten faculty priorities and the top three staff priorities. Heiser noted that she would assume Ion Gregorio's vote. Heiser then asked when PaRC would vote. Kuo stated that the Prioritization Survey would open at the May 7 PaRC meeting. The results would be presented at the May 21 PaRC meeting.

Miner quickly commented on the President's Prioritization – Reassign Time, noting that the reassign time for the tenure review coordinator had already been approved. The increase in the amount of reassign time for this position was justified as the coordinator now oversaw more faculty during the tenure process. Messina added that the college had an understanding with the Faculty Association, which allowed this position to evolve with respect to the workload.

4. Program Review Committee Recommendations – 1st Read

Mummert presented the Program Review Committee Recommendations to PaRC, commenting that the program review process was much stronger this year and also that the process was still under review. PRC completed twenty-seven program reviews and assigned each program a green, yellow, or red rating. Mummert noted that the rubric, which was approved in the fall, underwent additional changes after some program had written their reviews. PRC was aware of this fact during the review process. This year PRC gave a yellow rating to seven programs. Mummert mentioned that of the seven yellow ratings, Spanish was the biggest concern for PRC due to the program's consistent decline in enrollment. Mummert reported that the Program Review Committee Recommendations would appear on the May 21 PaRC

learning outcome (SLO). Chris White echoed Starer and Messina's concerns for a yellow designation process. White reported that the remediation plan had not been solidified by PRC. Miner added that in the case of the overarching processes of instructional programs, remediation plans should look to establishing a three-year timeline. Kuo affirmed that remediation plans should be published by June 18.

Sam Connell represented the Anthropology Department, which received a yellow rating on their program review. Connell commented that the program was working to improve their review by connecting their outcomes to the college mission statement and also by provide better metrics. Craig Galwick reported that PRC process findings would be brought to Integrated Planning and Budget Committee (IP&B) over the summer so that the PRC process could be reviewed and improved. Bernie Day commented that instructional faculty might not be aware of the resources available for program review support