

1. Consult the stated Mission and Intent of PPAC. Is the PPAC currently fulfilling its stated mission? Why or why not? (15 minutes)

PPAC is fulfilling its stated mission, but not living up to its name. The name does not reflect the advisory nature of the group. Something like Chancellor's Advisory Council for Policy, Planning and Assessment. In the 3rd paragraph, lavender page, in the alphabetical list, PPAC does some of those things, but not all.

PPAC do review and recommendations of policy. PPAC does not set policy. PPAC does fulfill certain aspect of PPAC responsibilities. Eg, PPAC have any role in setting budget priorities. PPAC reviews assessment policy. Fact: Going by the established policy.

No. PPAC is currently information dissemination. PPAC receives directives. Integrates some areas.

Communication seems to be more informational. Not a lot of exchange of ideas. Mechanism for Chancellor to "gather and disseminate information" and base decision making is true. (Item): "Constructing the college budget and setting priorities" is problematic—no direct role or obvious outcomes being reflected in budget decisions. 2 years ago, got a glimpse of instruction timetable but not update since. Would be ideal to have information disseminate with accurate update and follow-up communication.

Partially. The document needs to be reformatted like a mission statement. The current document is centered around the Chancellor, while the accreditation team was focused on the function: policy, planning and assessment (which is in paragraph 3 of the document).

We've hardly done any of this—it's a forum for making announcements—explaining decision. We don't have any say in budgets. By the time it gets to PPAC, decisions have been made. By other bodies discussion/debate are key words. But not part of PPAC reality. Don't have regular participation by all of its constituent bodies of PPAC. Don't have a sense that PPAC issues/discussions are getting disseminated. Items in the penultimate (most) are not (conserved)—like LRDP/budget. Minutes are not easily found. Seems redundant (with other groups).

Not buying done. If we do this, additional structure needed and documentation.

2. What is working? What doesn't work? (15 minutes)

Would like fewer PowerPoint presentations that take up time that could be put to better use. If presentations don't relate to policy, planning or assessment, it shouldn't be there. PPAC members don't feel like they are contributing to the campus via PPAC. They are having no impact when they all just presented info. Lack of continuity. The meetings don't build on each other. There is no follow-up on what got discussed before. Discussions aren't data driven. Shouldn't we be monitoring the performance matrix for the college? Sometimes people see the same presentation at multiple committees—possibly a symptom of poorly defined roles.

Study issues and does not decide them. Not a working group. Just review and assess. PPAC = advisory role. Fulfill old “Provost Advisory Council.” Need business office and HR participation.

Brings leaders of campus. We do not see how PPAC affects Chancellor’s decision-making. No planning and budget construction or setting priorities.

Not so much info exchange or any action decision-making. Not closing the loop on what is coming forward. What’s the resolution or action needed? Break out groups are productive (creative problem-solving)

Process should be more collaborative—not just a forum for reporting updates from the different councils. More of a mechanism to solicit feedback to be considered before the decisions are made.

Works – get to know people across campus. Forum for people to bring up issues. Agenda items are solicited. Friendly and collegial. Does not work – Don’t meet as regularly as we should. We get off on tangents (can be good or bad). I don’t get the sense that “they” really want our opinion... seems like things have been decided beforehand. We don’t make decision. Can’t think of when we’ve voted or made a decision. Some information presented is not pertinent—nice to know but not right for PPAC.

We know what’s happening across campus on a regular basis. Agenda is helpful. Scheduled meeting delays.

3. What about PPAC could change? (15 minutes)

Should have more member-submitted agenda items. It is too top-down, too much in one directions. Change the meeting space to something more intimate and better lit. There is a different energy when we meet outside the Tamarand Room which may be too fond a venue. Change meeting structure so it isn’t all presentations followed by Q&A. Have more opportunities to brainstorm, discuss, and debate. Also, would be good to get more sense of the big picture. How do we fit into the UHCC system? We are the Chancellor’s advisory council, but don’t have a sense of his vision of where he sees the college going. What does he want for KCC in the future? In international education? In STEM? In CTE? The physical facility (LRPD). Memberships—It’s a large group. But until we decide what the group is supposed to do, hard to know who should be there.

Rename PPAC—Let community know it’s only advisory body, not policy setting group. How open and inclusive do you want PPAC to be in policy-making and setting budget?

Action oriented and focus on the mission statement. Share planning resource priorities for potential funding. Structure of meetings.

Time – 1:30 – 3:00 – 1.5 hours. For problem solving survey the greater campus and representatives; bring them to meeting ahead of time. Meeting management (designated facilitator, staying on task). Set outcomes first. Set tone of meeting. Deeper meaning communicated. Master calendar of what is going on in campus. Transparency.

Possibly renaming the groups to add “Chancellor” CPPAC so it is clear that the Chancellor is running the group. Or you could elect a leader and the Chancellor would be a member of the group. More collaborative decision making and transparency in budget allocation process.

We should have focused discussion groups (like this). Revamp the agenda to link it to the purpose of PPAC. Create subcommittees or ad hoc committees to delve into big issues (like technology) and bring recommendations back to PPAC. Shrink the PPAC so discussion can be meaningful. Shorten the PPAC governance document.