**COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION 1**

1. Math Center, Comm lab (new fall 2012), ECenter, (Student learning no) Student Success workshops, online orientation
2. SP-reports, participatory handbook

2/3 Will have a college budget plan to flow from the District RAM, Program Review

1. Surveys (internal) & Board reports

5/6 Planning model

Transfer center & Student Success Center timeline might be off due to construction

Calworks & Upward Bound move to more student friendly and accessible location

What in report indicates activities/focus on student services?

We have develop a rubric to help address measureable, attainable, and time based results for assisting

our students.

Process is regularly assessed in yearly intervals for business service office

Suggestion: A preset test with SLO questions to be taken when students register for each class, to get a true picture of what they really know.

A planning process that takes into consideration potential impacts on existing instructional programs before new programs are developed.

Where is “Calendar of Committees” (RC Website)

We need a full time researcher for this to work

If a plan with all these qualities can be developed, we need to simply do it.

Sounds good, we have no additional recommendations, saying that it might have been easier to think critically with a “warning” that we would be asked to respond.

1. Process should be clearly defined

Encourage professional development of faculty, institutionalize student success initiative rather than relying on short term grants and soft money.

Discuss the possibility of Madera/Oakhurst representation on all District committees

1. San Joaquin Delta’s plan has the clearest and most concise layout to address this recommendation (hand out from July 25 Cabinet)

I feel the classified staff are not prepared to comment on these recommendations. There is a lot of information/facts we are not aware of to make knowledgeable comments.

In the Business Office we have been completing a rubric sheet to determine how much time is spent helping students with questions, payments and general information.

Have coach give an in service on how to start the school year and how to start class.

**COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION #2**

College has held numerous focused meetings on a continuous bases, with results being share at multiple open meetings for the various groups.

Standardization of one reporting form for RC/MC/OC.

OK, no recommendation at this time, hard to concentrate and review with so little time @ end of sitting for 3 hours.

Introduce prior to presentation, so we can respond as you go through items point by point.

This seems to be in progress with SLOs, PLOs and yearly program review updates for programs, however Blackboard folders are often hard to locate or open.

There are no consequences to not doing this. Who is responsible?

Possible consequences: no curriculum = pull classes or tar and feather

Good progress. No need for improvement.

I think you need to identify how and when outcomes are published and how they are being discussed widely. Maybe Academic Senate as a report may be a good venue. How is the RC public/community off campus notified of these accomplishments and results?

Various outreach has been done; departments need to be identified and “called on the carpet” to do what needs to be done.

Limit duplication services.

We need an enforcer to get the stragglers.

**COLLEGE RECOMMENDATION #3**

The college has developed new planning models to address the flow of information and identifies the places where each participatory body is represented.

Better information dissemination not only from committee chairs but committee representatives. Some type of orientation like activity for new committee representatives. Which includes the COA (committee operating agreement) for better understanding of purpose. Revise shared governance handbook and actually follow/practice it. The District and campuses will continue to be warned if it continues to ignore CSEA.

Clear understanding and communication of Madera/Oakhurst representation on all RC committees.

Budget and allocation of funds-how are these decision made? Is the RAPP process being revised?

Faculty participation is usually ignored so that “participation” is in name only!

Make clear exactly how the decision process is implemented!

Participatory governance should translate all areas such as the facilities improvement plans-i.e. what each options means.

Statement of “mission” for each committee posted so it’s easy to understand purpose and goals and responsibilities and objectives.

How do you hold an “individual decision maker” accountable?

Keeping E6 updated is critical. Some standard needs to be established.

Participatory governance decision-making structure and processes are generally clear; however, they are frequently not observed. It seems that the more important a decision is the less likely it will involve the participation of those groups which should be included.

Make decision-making a real shared responsibility.

Formalized committee rep orientation process including responsibilities and relation to other committees.

Clear plan delineating subcommittees and committees responsibilities/processes, etc.

Provide minimum 30 day advance notice of meeting when faculty and staff input is requested.

Add information on Academic Senate and discussions in senate on split from Willow and the role of the Madera faculty on senate and the new Madera/Oakhurst faculty Association (Check AP/May Senate Minutes for evidence). Process for defining Willow subcommittee of committees like Academic Standards, Academic Senate, etc.

More faculty input in new faculty prioritization.

We need online access to a master list of all committees with-Committee Description/mission, members, sub-committees & meeting dates with links to agendas/minutes.

Enlist faculty and staff in short and long planning of program, budget, facility implement & changes.

Establish a climate of trust and respect so that faculty and staff feel comfortable enough to voice their opinions.

There are & have been wholesale changes at this college with no faculty input, or that of advisory committees. 2 examples-the cancellation of the SEED program and the development of the New High School Ag program on our campus.

No further recommendations. If you wanted more feedback you should have presented this earlier in the day and explained clearly what you expected.