

GEMQ Minutes 12:50 – 1:50 p.m. November 21, 2019 CAK 224

	Members	Liaisons/Admin./Staff/Guests
X	Debbie Cazares, <i>Early Childhood Studies</i>	
X	Kristine Di Memmo, <i>Planning and Development</i>	
X	Malika Bratton, <i>Nursing</i>	
	Joel Montes, <i>ASRCC</i>	
X	Mike Barnes, <i>Counseling & Guidance</i>	
	Dana Chamberlin, <i>Student Accounts</i>	
	Angel Contreras-Fregoso, <i>ASRCC (Student)</i>	
	Peter Curtis, <i>Music</i>	
X	Stephanie Lowry, <i>Nursing</i>	
	Louie McCarthy, <i>I.T.</i>	
X	Rebecca Kessler, <i>CTE, Cosmetology</i>	
X	Wendy McEwen, <i>Institutional Effectiveness</i>	
X	Wendy McKeen, <i>Chemistry</i>	
X	Cynthia Morrill, <i>English & Media Studies</i>	
X	Carla Reible, <i>English & Media Studies</i>	
X	Paul Richardson, <i>Chemistry</i>	
	Johanna Vargas, <i>Veterans Services</i>	

1. Call to order
2. Approval of Agenda (m/s/c Richardson / McKeen)
3. Approval of Minutes (October 17, 2019) (m/s/c Kessler / McEwen)
4. New Business
 - a. Guided Pathways SOA document – for approval (m/s/c Richardson / McEwen) 1 nay
 - i. Short-notice request – state chancellor’s office sent it out a couple of weeks ago and has to be approved through Board of Trustees by March 1st, 2020.
 - ii. Added specific student equity and success story components
 - iii. Will send out a “1 pager”
 - b. Mission, Vision and Values (revised process and discussion)
 - i. Revised this year
 - ii. Concerns about the process not being followed – and GEMQ not having as effective of a voice in the process as intended

- iii. True 1st read of revised process
- iv. GEMQ worked on it and then it went to EPOC and other groups and was significantly revised.
- v. New process has stronger oversight / coordination by GEMQ. Important to get feedback from all parties. Voices need to be heard. It is important for GEMQ to take control of the process.
- vi. 2 components – annual review and then for significant changes of strategic planning cycle
 - Potentially add what “significant changes” might be
- c. GEMQ Committee and subcommittee structure review
 - i. “Spider web” structure
 - ii. 2nd page is GEMQ structure
 - Changes include sharing Program Review and Assessment with TLLC
 - Adding Equity Review Committee
 - Focused on systems change
 - Consolidating Academic, co-curricular subcommittees into the overall committee, but if faculty-specific voting needs to occur that is being specifically included in the process.
 - 1st step – will inform conversations in the spring
 - Is there a movement to intentionally link who is on the LC with who is on a committee? Yes. RDAS is an example – RDAS members chair the committees
 - Where does GEMQ fit in the voting piece of prioritization? Should they vote?
 - For prioritization, used to be pieced up and reviewed.
 - Process was revised to better reflect strategic planning, link to goals, etc. Not just a “give me stuff” proposal.
 - Working on a Resource Approval Proposal which will help with better understanding of what is being requested.
 - By Laws currently say GEMQ doesn’t vote – but we can revise the by Laws

d. College Goals

- i. Share some assignments / goals with TLLC and RDAS
- ii. Include current District Strategic Planning goals and RCC Goal Alignment and also Guided Pathways pillars.
- iii. Is the wording correct? Are we missing anything? It is a large document, but VP DiMemmo will send it out in its entirety if you'd like.
 - How can we better manage documents?
 - SharePoint vs Microsoft Teams? Will determine what works best.
- iv. This will become part of the GEMQ charge
- v. Goal 2 about transfer – Vision for Success – set during a Strategic Planning retreat in January 2019
 - Discussion about transfer and CTE and value of both tracks

e. Prioritization Debrief

- i. Meeting where voting was occurring, could agree to take as is or break apart
 - That piece (breaking apart) should have been done earlier
 - Meeting should have just been a ranking
 - Mechanism to FAQ? Maybe use MS Teams as the electronic bulletin board to share information, ask questions, and get feedback.
- ii. Liked the shorter Summaries, but some of the STEM seemed to get lost because the detail wasn't understood. Monitors is another example.
 - 1st year of summaries – some VP's did a better job than other
- iii. Already funded – but need more additional information about the funding. Need to revise the summaries to make that more clear.
 - Bring a template to GEMQ to review / revise
- iv. Feedback from the SAS request for faculty prioritization. Was a miscommunication.

f. Strategy for 5-year Program Review Process (feedback to send to Program Review)

- i. Group discussion for programs – led by the faculty.
- ii. Underwater cyber security example
- iii. Conversation should include faculty, classified staff and support mechanisms, and administration
- iv. Guiding Questions – same as in 101 and other training documents

v. Trying it with EAR, AUT, ENG, OIE

5. Committee Reports

- a. Program Review Committee (Cynthia Morrill)
 - i. District Program Review Committee – not sure what their role is.
 - ii. Meet twice a year. Watchers – not the Slayers.
 - iii. Going to the District Academic Senate and get a new charge
- b. Assessment Committee (Wendy McEwen)
- c. Report from EPOC (Debbie Cazares)
- d. Methods and Metrics (Brandon Owashi)
 - i. 1st meeting
 - ii. PowerBI Dashboard – check it out
 - iii. Data element dictionary up and online
 - iv. Data coaching – ask peers if they are interested.
 - Going to send out what that means for being a data coach.
- e. Governance Committee (Malika Bratton)
- f. Student Equity (new representative)

6. Old Business/Action Items

- a. GEMQ Committee Structure Review (Tabled for spring)
 - i. Strategic Responsibilities
 - ii. Operational Responsibilities
 - iii. Membership
- b. VP Plan Review Process and Protocols feedback (Tabled for spring)
 - i. Process feedback
 - ii. Other

7. Public Comment/Announcements

8. Adjourn

Minutes submitted by: Wendy McEwen