

College Governance Evaluation Report

The purpose of this report is to summarize the results of the 2016-2017 CGC Evaluation Tool that was used as a starting point to assess function of Miramar College’s governance committees. The report will provide a summary of these findings, as well as observations and recommendations from the College Governance Committee.

Table of Contents

CGC Evaluation Tool Overview.....	1
Summary of Committee Accomplishments	2
District Governance	7
Committee Observations and Recommendations for Improvement.....	7
College-wide Recommendations for Improvement	10
Appendix: ACCJC Standard IV A.....	11

CGC Evaluation Tool Overview

- Of the 27 committees and subcommittees at Miramar College, 21 (78%) completed and submitting the CGC Evaluation Tool. Those committees will form the basis of the evaluation below. Those that were not included are Chairs Committee, Diversity and International Education Committee, Staff Development Committee, Honors Subcommittee, Student Services PR/SLOAC Subcommittee, and Tenure and Promotion Subcommittee.
- There were several themes that emerged from an analysis of the information, including
 - High percentage of committees/subcommittees had met quorum and were posting minutes and agendas within the required timelines. However, these numbers were self-reported, and there were instances where agendas and minutes were not available on the website, even though they were reported as posted by the committee.
 - Many committees had an abundance of faculty participants, so much so that the term “Additional Faculty” was used to identify those participants who regularly attend the meetings but were not voting members.
 - The majority of committees did not have complete classified professional or student representation.
 - Hours of committee meeting service varied greatly, from one to 28 hours per academic year.
 - Of the committees that completed the Evaluation Tool, eight did not have clerical support to assist with minute-taking and other clerical duties.

Summary of Committee Accomplishments

The following table provides a summary of committee accomplishments for 2016-2017 as self-reported using the CGC Evaluation Tool.

Committee	Accomplishments
<i>Committees</i>	
CEC	Met on a regular basis and allowed for input from all constituent groups.
	Met on a regular basis to make decisions on action items that are defined as AB-1725 matters.
Academic Affairs	<i>Accomplishments were provided as details of minutes for each meeting. (see individual report)</i>
Administrative Program Review	Administrative Services Reviewed Unit Program Review Mission Statements, Aligned Unit Mission Statements with College Mission Statement, and Recommended changes to Unit Mission Statement
College Governance Committee	Created and distributed the CGC Evaluation Tool for 15-16 (pilot) and 16-17 (college wide) to perform comprehensive governance review.
	Recommended changes to the Student Services Committee; approved through CEC.
	Recommended changes to the PR/SLOAC committee to create Outcomes and Assessment Committee.
	Recommended formation of professional development taskforce; recommended formation of Professional Development Committee from restructuring of Staff Development Committee.
	Provided FLEX training on governance, evaluation and leadership.
	Updated committee Membership Lists for 17-18.
	Worked with committees to ensure updated agenda and minute postings.
	Updated information on the committee website pages.
	Updated CG Handbook with all approved committee changes and technical edits.
Curriculum	Reviewed and adjudicated 252 curriculum proposals
	Reviewed and provided recommendations for 16 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures.
Facilities	Campus Art Location Identification and Ranking
	Facilities Needs List Ranking
	Facilities Master Plan Update
	MTS Parking Re-allocation. Reduce allocation from 100 to 60
Faculty (Contract) Hiring	Approved the revised committee page; approved revised 2016-2017 Hiring Proposal Form; approved the revised Timeline .
	Reviewed the outcome of the 2015-16 positions list

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

	Revised the time to develop the new faculty hire list, fall 20106
	Modified the Contract Faculty Hiring Proposal to include a reference to diversity
	Approved to adopt Statewide Industry standards for counselors, librarians, and nurses to be utilized in developing a rubric for the non-classroom faculty hiring proposal.
	Reviewed the methodology applied to the quantitative data used to determine the point system for ranking and agreed to reevaluate the process in the future.
	Approved the 2016 Ranked Contract Faculty Hiring List
Marketing and Outreach	The marketing and outreach plan continues to evolve each semester as the enrollment needs change. The PIO has secured additional funds from \$7,000 to \$17,500 for digital and tv marketing. The PIO has also secured equity funds for tv buy and virtual reality tour and campus map upgrade. A strong workforce program TV/radio and digital buy has been directed by the PIO on behalf of the CTE dean
	The college has entered into several paid partnerships to brand the college as a comprehensive, 2-year California public institution with associate degrees, transfer pathways and CTE programs.
	Built PR materials for outreach team and CTE programs
	Attend meetings to brainstorm on website needs when redesign begins in the spring
	TV spots and program video have been constructed as result of committee feedback.
PIEC	Reviewed committee goals, membership, and meeting schedule for 2016-17 academic year.
	Showcased new interactive planning website with live website links with a "one-stop-shop" approach.
	Updated the 2017-2018 Annual Planning Calendar
	Led efforts on reviewing and updating Educational Master Plan, Division Plans, and operational plans.
	Updated the Planning framework, Mission, Vision statement in SPAS.
	Reviewed SER's Quality Focus Essay (IE) and Standard I. B.
	Reviewed and discussed institutional effectiveness follow-up on action items in Quality Focus Essay (QFE) in the Self-evaluation Report (SER).
	Planned, organized, coordinated, and evaluated Spring 2017 College-wide Planning Summit.
	Provided feedback on Fall 2016 Convocation and presented longitudinal data to evaluate major campus planning events.
	Provided feedback on the Program Review landing page.

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

	Sent Innovation and Effectiveness Plan to Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Taskforce and received recommendation on the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM).
	Reviewed a plan for aligning the SSSP, SEP, BSI, BSSOT, CTE, SWP and SEM
	Received the RP Group Award of Excellence in Planning
Professional Advancement	Met on a regular basis and allowed for input from all advancement applicants.
	Met on a regular basis to make decisions on action items specific to the professional advancement of faculty.
Student Services	New committee structure for Student Equity
	Update of the RFP process for Student Equity Funding
	Accreditation recommendation follow-up
	Proposed changes to SS Program Review/ SLOAC Subcommittee
	Mission Statement Revisions
	Tracking the SSSP/SEP/BSI integration process
Technology	Compiled the IELM/Technology Purchases list to replace aging equipment/infrastructure.
	Compiled the Technology Related RFF Prioritization list and forwarded to BRDS.
	Redesigned the Technology Plan 2.0.: The Next Generation and has gone to constituency groups for feedback and approval.
	Helped with the redesigned of the College website which is scheduled to go live in summer 2017
Subcommittees	
Academic Standards	Adjudicated student petitions.
	Reviewed, made recommendations and approved interdisciplinary program revisions.
	Completed program review and update cycle.
	Successfully recommended and revised district graduation requirements 4 & 5 in catalog policy.
Basic Skills	Reported on Basic Skills Budget for 2015-16.
	Gave monthly budget reports for Basic Skills Budget for 2016-17.
	Developed a Basic Skills Initiative Monthly Budget Form to track expenses.

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

	Presentation on English 42/48.
	Presentation on Math 38/46.
	Reported on the 2016-2017 Budget and expenses for July-August 2016 projects.
	Presentation and discussion of the Basic Skills Report 2011-2016.
	<i>Additional accomplishments were provided as details of minutes for each meeting.</i>
BRDS	2016-17 IELM Allocation, 2016-17 BRDS Unrestricted Fund Allocation, 2016-17 Lotter Funds
	Established 2016-17 BRDS Goals Mapped to Strat Plan and Accreditation Standard.
	Confirmed Committee Membership
	2016-17 RFF Final Review and Ranking
	2016-17 New Continuous Discretionary Resources Allocated
	Draft Update to Budget Resource Review Landing Page
	Draft New SWP Resources for Classroom AV
	Re-allocation of Existing Discretionary Resources
	Review of 2017-2018 Campus Allocation Model
Curriculum Tech Review	Reviewed 129 curriculum proposals for technical items; made minor technical edits and provided suggestions for improvement to faculty originators as appropriate.
Distance Education	Assisted in the development of a faculty/ student survey to select a Course Management System: Canvas vs Blackboard
	Updated the DE Committee recommendation of February 22, 2012, with the following: The Distance Education Committee recommends that all faculty teaching online successfully complete the Online Training Certification Course.
Environmental Stewardship	Distribute sustainability information over the Campus E-mail Distribution List (DL).
	Meet regularly with Dane Lindsay (Facilities Services) to discuss topics of environmental import on campus and ways to implement strategies.
	Invited Republic Waste representative Sarai Garcia to instruct the committee on the process of waste/recycling collection on campus.
	Integrated a Native and Drought Tolerant Plant Labeling Project into BIO 277B: Service Learning course, Summer 2016, taught by Jason Librande, with the goal of producing labels for campus landscape. He has also sent a grant proposal through the college process of approval.

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

	Student Sustainability Scholarship has been approved through Lonnie Pham for 2017 Awards process.
	Purchased refillable Water Containers (2) for campus use
	Designed and produced stainless steel water bottles with Sustainability logo in collaboration with Rob Meyers, Bookstore Supervisor. \$2 of each purchase goes to the ESC.
Instructional PR/SLOAC	Develop disaggregation plan (disaggregate student learning outcome assessment data by subpopulations of students identified in the student achievement section of the Self-Evaluation Report).
	Facilitate instructional program review cycle
	Revise ISLO Survey to better reflect current ISLOs.
	Facilitate Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle
	Committee reviewed the draft curriculum and instructional program chart; a presentation and discussion of diagram requested by the PIEC illustrating the PR process; ongoing discussion of SLO disaggregation
	A discussion/feedback on Miramar's Quality focus on essay appendix occurred; PR diagram was presented and discussed it was unanimously carried forward to the PIE Committee with some changes
	Committee was reminded that the SLO's drive program review had a gap and needed to be addressed; Committee agreed that ISLO survey will be launched next semester.
	Results of the 2015-2016 ISLO analysis was presented and discussed; Reported another ISLO will be given out during Spring semester; Committee was advised that four courses have been selected for disaggregation; a due date was made for chairs to complete their program review by.
	It was moved and unanimously carried that the same SLO to apply to all 270 and 277d courses in different disciplines; presentation was given on developing SLOs and assessment for developing meaningful data; Committee viewed and discussed the updated SLO webpage;
	Reported that Instructional staff is putting ISLO survey together; A request was put in place for the committee's assistance to improve the Child Development program review.
	Discussed that Instructional office staff should have access to assist for Taskstream; Update on ISLO survey responses; Continued discussion of ACCJC recommendations; discussed several people attended Taskstream open office hours
Research	Reviewed and updated RSC goals, membership, and procedures
	Updated the Governance Committee Recommendation Form for RSC
	Updated Miramar College-wide Research Agenda 2016-2017.
	Reviewed and updated Ad-hoc Research Request Form and Process.
	Updated Guidelines for Protecting Data Sensitivity (GPDS) form and the GPDS Q& A document.

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

	Reviewed the 2014-2017 Environmental Scan Report and finalized the content and report outline for the 2017-2020 Environmental Scan Report.
	Discussed and provided feedback on college-wide research projects (e.g., ISLO Survey, SLO score disaggregation, Alignment project, etc.)
	Updated Institutional Research website
Website	With the website redesign, the committee has primarily been a "reporting body", receiving updates on the process such as Discovery & current development status.

District Governance

- Information specific to SDCCD Governance can be found at the following links:
 - [SDCCD Administration and Governance Handbook](#)
 - [SDCCD Participatory Governance Council](#)
 - [Board Policy and Administrative Procedures in relation to District Governance](#)
- Issues related to Integration/coordination at both the governance-level (e.g. policy, planning, budget, etc.) and the procedural- level (e.g. purchasing, travel, building, maintenance, scheduling, etc.) between college and district operations.
 - SDCCD has been transitioning to a vendor based data management system for all its data processes, which includes human resources, fiscal management and student record keeping. This has resulted in a significant impact on governance and decision making as these processes are sorted out and made functional.
 - Procedural and operational process changes and decision-making adaptations have been implemented by a relatively top-down process. In most cases there is little choice in how the above are implemented and the district takes a “wait to see what works” approach. Coupled to this is the ongoing role out of \$1.75 billion in district-wide improvements. The need to move these major projects forward has often taken precedence over improvements in college to district decision making.

Committee Observations and Recommendations for Improvement

The following table provides a summary of observations and recommendations from CGC aimed at improving the function of existing governance committees.

Committee	Observations	CGC Recommendations
Academic Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No classified representation Large number of subcommittees Unclear if there are regular reports to all constituencies on regular basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fill classified membership Consider revision of subcommittee; consolidation of functions; reorganization to place subcommittees under AS.
Administrative Program Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 1 meeting in 2016-2017 No procedures and calendar in Handbook Need to appoint additional faculty member 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add formal procedures and calendar Align with other Program Review Committees or consolidate in college-

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

		wide Program Review committee
Chair's Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair's Committee functions as a subcommittee of Academic Affairs and not a stand-alone committee that reports to all constituencies Committee met on a regular basis but doesn't state calendar in Handbook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change name to Chair's Subcommittee to reflect function Revise committee calendar to reflect regular meeting time Revise Handbook to include parent committee "Academic Affairs"
College Governance Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workload of committee is not commensurate with hours scheduled No clerical assistance with note taking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider increased faculty membership based on interest/ workload
Curriculum Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highest meeting hours of any committee (28) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider increased faculty membership based on interest/ workload
Diversity and International Education Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not respond to requests for CG Evaluation Tool submission Based on information on website: met 4 times in 2016-2017; only posted minutes for 1 meeting; no record of attendees or quorum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise membership so that regular meetings can take place Record minutes with a record of attendees and post within required timelines.
Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 1 meeting with quorum in 2016-2017 Low percentage of minutes posted within deadline High number of "additional faculty" but no "student services" faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review workload and membership if only 1 meeting held per year. Consider increased faculty membership based on interest/ workload
Marketing and Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No "School of Library" exists "Library" spot consistently vacant Quorum only met 20% of time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise membership so that regular meetings can take place Revise handbook to say School of PRIELT, Library and/or change "library" faculty to a broader position
PIEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No "School of Library" exists Only 25% of minutes posted within timeline Vacant classified spots High number of meeting hours with no release for faculty committee chair (22). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Record minutes and post within required timelines Consider release for PIEC faculty co-chair Fill vacant classified positions and/or reduce membership Revise handbook to say School of PRIELT, Library
Professional Advancement Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to website, met 8 times in 2016-2017; all minutes posted There is no "school of library/tech" Goal #2 is identical to the only goal of the subcommittee "Tenure and Promotion" and the subcommittee composition is the same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise handbook to say School of PRIELT, Library or Technology faculty If Goal #2 is performed by the parent committee, dissolve the "Tenure and Promotion Subcommittee"
Professional Development Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No classified representation Need to fill faculty representation 	
Student Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several vacant administrative and classified spots Several "additional faculty" 5 meetings in 2016-2017; only 20% of minutes posted within timeline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review membership to reflect need and attendance

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 4 meetings in 2016-2017 with no minutes posted within timeline • High level of vacancy in classified spots • Handbook statement “Since this committee is composed of a large group who may not all be able to participate at every meeting the minimum Quorum is five (5) members.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise committee membership so that quorum is met for meetings to take place; consider revising classified spots as these are not filling. • Remove Handbook statement regarding minimum quorum. This committee is smaller than others on campus and all committees are bound by quorum rules.
Basic Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLACe no longer exists • Math Coordinator no longer exists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise committee membership to reflect changes in college structure (i.e. faculty coordinator for student success and academic support center)
BRDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link between BRDS and Program Review committees? • Several “additional faculty” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider increased faculty membership based on interest/ workload
Distance Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only met 3 times in 2016-2017 • Large number of “additional faculty” • Limited accomplishments in spite of importance of committee goals • No committee procedures • Includes language “at least 3 distance education qualified faculty”- what does this mean? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise committee membership so that regular meetings take place; • Change language to be specific as to what “DE faculty” means
Environmental Stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quorum only met 40% of time • 0% of minutes posted within timeline • High number of “additional faculty” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise committee membership so that regular meetings take place; • Post minutes within timeline
Honors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not respond to requests for CG Evaluation Tool submission • No committee webpage and no agendas/ minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Group does not function as a stand-alone subcommittee, dissolve.
Instructional PR/ SLOAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High number of meeting hours (21) with no release for faculty co-chair • There is no “school of library and technology” • Several “additional faculty” • Consistently no classified representative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider release for faculty co-chair • Revise handbook to say School of PRIELT • Consider increased faculty membership based on interest/ workload
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of vacant classified spots • Several “additional faculty” • Only 12% of minutes posted within timeline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider increased faculty membership based on interest/ workload • Consider revising classified spots as these are not filling.
Student Services PR/SLOAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not respond to requests for CG Evaluation Tool submission • Based on website, only 2 meetings in 2016-2017 with quorum • Additional administration? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise committee membership so that regular meetings take place;
Tenure and Promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not respond to requests for CG Evaluation Tool submission • No committee webpage and no agendas/ minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Group does not function as a stand-alone subcommittee, dissolve.
Website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only met 1 time in 2016-2017 • Large and important list of goals and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise committee membership so that regular meetings take place;

procedures that are not being performed

- Group does not appear to be functioning as described in handbook; should be revised or dissolved

College-wide Recommendations for Improvement

- The College Governance Committee (CGC) recommends the institutionalization of the process of college governance evaluation, including the completion of the CGC Evaluation Tool by committees, on a three-year cycle, to correspond with other planning cycles on campus (e.g. Program Review).
- The CGC has long recognized several college-wide areas that are in need of improvement for increased coordination, integration and efficiency of governance processes at Miramar College:
 - **Complexity of the governance system:** As evidenced through the above observations, the governance system at Miramar College is a large and complex system of committees and subcommittees with varying roles, often overlapping. It is one of the primary reasons for many of the below recommendations for improvement. In addition, potential systemic changes to CCC funding mechanisms, along with significant changes in the Western region accreditation culture, may necessitate a broader reexamination of Miramar's current governance processes to remain or increase functionality. The CGC recommends an additional evaluation of governance by aligning function with current structure, to ensure that the key operations of the college, strategic goals, and accreditation standards are being addressed efficiently through the current governance committees, with minimal overlap and improved efficiency, and to recommend additional changes to structure.
 - **Progression of governance information through the governance pathways:** Due to the large and complex system of committees and subcommittees referenced above, a primary area for improvement is the progression of governance information through the appropriate governance pathways. While the college has long had a routing form for committees to use to transmit recommendations from one committee to another, or from step to step in the processes, its utilization has not been consistent. This also varies from committee to committee. Those committees that cyclically move items forward do a much better job of this because they use these processes regularly. Those that only intermittently exchange recommendations have greater difficulties maintaining operational continuity. The complexity of various state and local operational calendars and timelines also interferes with the progression of decision-making because the month-to-month work cycle in an academic public institution is remarkably inconsistent. The CGC recommends evaluation of the reporting system and governance structure to improve this issue.
 - **Agendas and Minutes:** Another item for improvement is the consistency of developing and retaining agendas and minutes. Not only does the format and content of these evolve over time, but there is no consistency for format or content across the spectrum of committees. The CGC recommends creation of a common format for these instruments that will track participation, discussion, recommendations, action and follow up items. This format should be relatively common across all committees although specific committee operations and

work product may necessitate variations. The CGC recommends development of some committee operational guidelines to help committees operate annually and assure continuity from year to year.

- **Storage and use of governance information:** The college should investigate how to collectively store and track governance information in a way that is useful for college function and increased efficiency. Essentially, the work product of all committee effort is the planning and implementation of Board Policy; thus all this decision-making data is collectively the evidentiary basis for the college's accreditation. However, the complexity of identifying or developing information technology suited to facilitating these processes has not been readily forthcoming in spite of the college's long standing recognition of the need for it. The CGC recommends exploration of technology such as Taskstream to store and collect governance information.
- **Professional Development:** Professional development in governance and leadership is an ongoing need for a variety of reasons. All college stakeholders need to be adept at managing the college and district's governance and administrative processes. Not only are these processes evolving with every legislative and budgetary cycle but personnel also swirl through a variety of roles and positions. The CGC recommends increase professional development opportunities, to include such topics as: Miramar, SDCCD, and State governance structures, policies, procedures and processes; rules of order, regulations and codes; fiscal processes and requirements; contractual requirements; effective leadership; research and effective use of data to inform decision-making; running meetings; and time/calendar management.

Appendix: ACCJC Standard IV A

The institution recognizes and uses the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for promoting student success, sustaining academic quality, integrity, fiscal stability, and continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are defined in policy and are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief executive officer. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. In multi-college districts or systems, the roles within the district/system are clearly delineated. The multi-college district or system has policies for allocation of resources to adequately support and sustain the colleges.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

1. Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.

College Governance Committee
Spring 2018

2. The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.
3. Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.
4. Faculty and academic administrators, through policy and procedures, and through well-defined structures, have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services.
5. Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.
6. The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.
7. Leadership roles and the institution's governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.