

# College Governance Committee Minutes

## San Diego Miramar College

Mar 23, 2021 • Zoom • 2:45pm to 3:45pm

**Members:** Adrian Gonzales, Jill Griggs, Mary Kjartanson, Laura Murphy, Marie McMahon, Clarissa Padilla, Sean Young, Channing Booth

**Not Present:** Brennan Pearson, Ananto Sarowar

**Additional Guests:** Dawn Diskin, Carman Jay, Lou Ascione, Adrian Arancibia, Rebecca Bowers-Gentry, Donnie Tran, Melissa Martinez, Monica Demcho, Duane Short, Andrew Lowe, Laura Gonzalez, Mara Palma-Sanft, MaryAnn Guevarra, Wesley Lundburg, Bill Pacheco, Javier Gonzalez

### A. Call to Order

- Meeting called to order at 2:48p.m.

### B. Adoption of Agenda

- Murphy motioned to approve agenda with request to reorder items, start with D.1, presentation regarding Honors Program, continue to D.2, review of Tech Review Committee, then resume Honors conversation, Padilla seconded, agenda approved with adjusted recommendations.

### C. Approval of Minutes (3/9/21)

- Gonzales motioned to approve, Young seconded, minutes approved.

### D. Business:

#	Item
1	<p><b>Review: Current unresolved issues to be clarified to promote effective resolutions for College Governance Handbook.</b></p> <p><b>1. Define and address questions regarding the Honors Com/Program.</b></p> <p>Jay provided an overview of the Honors Program requests for CGC. The first recommendation was for the Honors Program to be categorized as operational. They pointed out it is the best fit as the program does not serve as a recommending body, but is responsible for implementation and carrying out functions of particular requirements on campus. Membership, meeting schedules, procedures and recommendation are set by contracts or other memorandums of understanding specific to each of these processes. They fall under the direction of the District Honors Council and considered a program not a committee. The program on campus does not set curriculum.</p> <p>The second recommendation is to remove “Honors” from the following sentence in the handbook “Chair positions by designation and for which there is reassigned time (e.g. Coordinators for Honors, Curriculum, Guided Pathways, etc.) shall be selected following an application process that is developed in consultation between the College President and the Academic Senate President”. The rational for this request is District Honors Council sets policy governing selection and responsibilities of Honors Coordinators. In the District Honors Program handbook, it states, “At all three colleges the current coordinators, rather than the Faculty Senate, recommend to the administration candidates on coordination. The following criteria apply: knowledge and experience of the Honors Program, experiences with the processes involved and experience with the office/ personnel coordination”. In addition, all budget for the program comes from the district. Lastly, Jay shared some of the</p>

	<p>past faculty involvement pointing out the diverse backgrounds. Some of those included individual from Communication Studies, Transfer Center Coordinator, Sociology, English and Counseling. Additionally pointing out there are other programs on campus with coordinators that do not require Academic Senate appointment. Arancibia added that coordinators try to include faculty by soliciting annually. Some of the participation opportunities for faculty included contracts, courses, faculty retreats, receptions, conference and UCLA TAP Advisory Group.</p> <p>Kjartanson pointed out Honors Program previously sat under the purview of Academic Affairs, with the new recommendation it changes the previous reporting path. Jay pointed out the program is required to submit an annual report to the board of trustees. If listed as operational in handbook, will continue with this standard procedure. President Lundburg shared he spoke to Chancellor Carroll, she noted it is an operational group but there are still pending question to be addressed, will plan to discuss at a future meeting with her. Ascione as the Dean whom oversees Honors Program, reiterated, this program is district-based and reports directly to the Chancellor. As it is overseen by district, it is not in our purview to make changes. The structure is unique from all other programs and committees on campus.</p> <p>McMahon pointed out CGC and the CIA has been trying to identify the connectivity between college and district committees in order to improve communication. Booth pointed out based on the information presented today by Ascione and Lundburg, the program is not under the college, it falls under the purview of district.</p> <p>Booth motioned, Jay clarified motion, to acknowledge Honors Program as operational and to be listed as such in the handbook. Additionally removing “Honors Program” from statement in handbook regarding the selection of coordinators as need is to comply by District Honors Council selection procedures. Gonzales seconded, the motion passes with 5 votes in favor and 1 against.</p> <p>Following the motion, McMahon and Young requested for clarify on remaining questions, asking that the questions that have been presented to the honors faculty several times be answered, including process of faculty selection into program. Lundburg and Murphy to work with Carroll on remaining questions.</p> <p><b>2. Define and address questions regarding the International Education Com. 3. Determine what “Co-Curricular” means and elements included. 4. Compile a list of Co-Curricular Areas in various Com’s and how to address them. 5. Create a Student Wellness Com (from ‘Needs’ com). 6. Create Classified (Staff) Hiring Prioritization Com.</b> Will discuss at a future meeting.</p>
2	<p><b>Review: Tech Review Committee as separate from curriculum:</b>  <b>a) The permanent regular workload for tech review best addressed by a separate Com. b) Tech Review Subcommittee members are different from Curriculum. c) New “culturally responsive curriculum” review responsibility intentionally withheld from Curriculum Com, given to the Tech Review based Academic Senate input.</b>  Short shared last year the Curriculum Technical Review Subcommittee set forward proposed changes regarding membership, which were previously approved, however not</p>

	<p>implemented into new CGH and would like to revisit. The Tech Review Subcommittee is the body that responsible for initial screening of curriculum proposals at the pre-launch phase when first input into Curricunet. They have subject matter individuals that review and provide feedback. If the Tech Review Subcommittee is disbanded, the work still needs to be completed. McMahon clarified, it was never the intent to remove or disband this subcommittee, it was merely to create an ad hoc subcommittee from within the greater curriculum com, pointing out Tech Review is instrumental with best practices.</p> <p>Additionally, Short shared importance of difference of membership for the Tech Review and Curriculum Committees essentially keep these two as separate entities. Lastly, he pointed out the added language under committee goals regarding culturally responsive content. The intent is to ensure this is assigned to Tech Review and not Curriculum to ensure it is part of the initial development phase, to not hinder the potential approvals later in the process.</p> <p>Some discussion revolved around membership, including clarifications if Curriculum Committee members sit on the Tech Review Committee and inquiry about representative from DIEC Committee.</p> <p>Murphy motion to reestablish the Tech Review Committee as it was preapproved into the governance handbook as a subcommittee of Curriculum, Gonzales seconded, all in favor, motion passes.</p>
3	<p><b>Discussion: Continue to Plan for moving forward with the CGH: Identifying Info, Individuals, Processes, Progress and Timeline for: 1) Implementation; 2) elements still under development.</b></p> <p>Will discuss at a future meeting.</p>

**E. Announcements**

- None

**F. Adjournment – 3:45p.m.**

**G. Next Scheduled Meeting: April 13, 2021**

---