

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

For Collegiality in Action (CIA), College Governance Restructuring, and the 1st Draft of the College Governance Handbook

Q: Why did we engage in the Collegiality in Action process?

*Under the direction of Chancellor Carroll, in May 2018 a group of Collegiality in Action (CIA) facilitators were invited to assess the campus climate and our participatory governance structure and processes. Considerable time has been invested to provide assistance regarding the successful implementation of State law, Board Policies and regulations in college governance. The CIA team identified two main areas of concern: **a)** strained relationships between constituency groups on campus; and **b)** a lack of clarity and understanding of both the function and structure of participatory governance at the college.*

Q: How was the college involved in this initial work?

*An initial core group of 8 members (the 4 constituency group leaders plus 1 additional member from each constituency group) worked with CIA facilitators in an attempt to address the relationship issues for about 6 months. Ultimately, the group arrived at an impasse and were unable to continue this work. This allowed the CIA work to re-direct its focus and all of its energy into area **b)**, an improvement of the participatory governance processes at Miramar College.*

Q: Was this process open for everyone to participate?

*This has been an open process. The CIA facilitators recommended that the initial stages of our effort to re-build the college's governance structure be done by two specific workgroups: **1)** a Participatory Governance (PG) committee and **2)** an Academic and Professional Matters (APM, 10+1) committee.*

Q: Was there an open call for interest in participating in these two workgroups/committees?

Yes. Over the course of several months during spring 2019, constituency groups canvassed their members for interest in serving on these workgroups/committees.

Many announcements were made to keep the campus community informed about the process:

- *A college-wide survey on Participatory Governance Committees - March 2019.*
- *College-wide Open Forums about this process - April 2019.*
- *Since fall 2018 there have been over 12 CIA related meetings, not including separate PG and APM committee meetings.*
- *Progress from each phase has been reported out at CEC and at constituency meetings.*

Q: What was the composition of the workgroups/committees?

*The Participatory Governance (PG) Committee was composed of **20** appointed members, five (5) from each constituency. By design, the core of this workgroup was the membership of the College Governance Committee (CGC). The Academic and Professional Matters (APM) Committee was composed of **13** appointed members - 8 Faculty, 2 Classified Professionals, 3 Administrators, and 2 Students. Additional faculty, classified professionals, students, and administration were encouraged to participate and did.*

Q: Who were the specific members of the CIA Workgroups?

*In response to calls from their constituencies, the following people **volunteered** to work as part of the Collegiality in Action college governance re-structure efforts. The College Governance Committee (CGC) would like to acknowledge and thank the following members for their significant hours of service:*

<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Classified Professionals</u>	<u>Administration</u>	<u>Students</u>
Lisa Brewster	Joyce Allen	Lou Ascione	Alana Bermodes
Valerie Chau	Dan Gutowski	Cheryl Barnard	Van Dao Minh Anh
Lisa Clarke	Terrie Hubbard	Brett Bell	Sayeh Dehestani
Darrell Harrison	Cheyanna Morence	Adrian Gonzales	Kelly Dunlap
Mary Kjartanson	Sam Shooshtary	Paulette Hopkins	William Wyatt
Marie McMahan	Sean Young	Patricia Hsieh	
Laura Murphy	Xi Zhang	Daniel Miramontez	
Wheeler North		Linda Woods	
Larry Pink			
Alex Sanchez			

Q: Why weren't current committees directly consulted regarding potential changes?

A key to creating an improved college governance was to better understand the distinct roles of various committees on campus. In preparation for this work, the first task was to undergo group training on the Brown Act, Title 5, Ed Code, etc. The CIA facilitators recommended that we focus first on general restructuring efforts prior to working on specific committees.

*It was also recognized that committees needed to be separated into three basic functional categories: **1) Participatory Governance, 2) Academic and Professional, and 3) Operational.** Many of the current committees were heavily intertwined, containing functions in all categories, and this issue needed to be resolved first, prior to consulting specific committees.*

The ability to recognize unnecessary redundancy would become clearer after assessment of the entire system within this new paradigm. Thus, some basics elements needed to be in place before consulting committees about specifics details. In terms of changes to the reporting structure, this involved clarifying the roles of committee and then aiming to streamline the flow of information within these committees on campus prior to receiving detailed feedback from various committees.

Q: Where are we in the process now?

In conjunction with the College Governance Committee (CGC), we have now reached the phase for campus-wide dissemination of the first Draft College Governance Handbook (CGH) and will be being the process of collecting, evaluating and incorporating feedback from individuals, committees, departments, and constituency groups.

Q: What do I do now? Is there an overall timeline?

Please read this revised College Governance Handbook (CGH), talk about it with your colleagues, department, committees, and provide your feedback through your constituency or committee. All feedback will be considered and catalogued as transparently as possible (e.g., a college website).

Our goal is to utilize the month of March to collect, analyze, and incorporate feedback so that we may take a final draft of the CGH through the participatory governance approval process in the month of April.

Q: What significant changes are being recommended?

Based on a comprehensive survey of our governance system, other systems within the CCC system, and input from the CIA facilitators, some of the following have been suggested as major changes to improve our structure and function:

- *Clear delineation of committees that make recommendations on Academic and Professional Matters (10+1) and those that make recommendations on Participatory Governance issues.*
- *Clear identification of committees and groups that function outside of governance in a purely operational capacity.*
- *Clear descriptions of the roles of different constituencies in decision-making.*
- *Clear definitions and standardization of committee structures/functions, including use of proxies, quorum, agendas, minutes, and processes for moving recommendations forward.*
- *Clear understanding of the routing of information, recommendations, and decisions within our college governance system.*

Q: What will some of the benefits be to the college?

There are many possible benefits to our college from this experience:

- *Through the meetings and discussions, many involved have a much better understanding of Participatory Governance and what it is intended to do. This knowledge can be shared throughout the college in many different venues.*
- *The processes we are obliged to follow will be more clear and obvious to all groups on campus.*
- *The work being done will be better aligned with the way that other successful colleges conduct governance business.*
- *Processes will be streamlined where possible, and this will likely make our recommendations and decision making more effective and efficient, taking less time to get things done within our governance system.*

Q: What will happen if a committee on which I currently serve is changed or dissolved?

One of the primary functions of Collegiality in Action was to look at the overall structure and functionality of our governance system. As a part of this work, many committees have been altered, enhanced, restructured, and in some cases dissolved. If this happened to a committee on which you serve, you will be able to participate on other committees.

Q: Can I chose my own committee?

All members of the college community are welcome to attend any college governance meetings as guests. However, as has always been the case, appointments of voting members to committees are made by constituency leaders or are designated by position.

Q: Why are there term limits to service on a committee?

Term limits are important in maintaining a healthy governance process and are successfully used in California Community Colleges' governance models. They can help to promote equity and diversity and give all of our campus community members an opportunity to contribute as a voting member of different committees. Term limits currently exist and haven't changed substantially in this draft version. Measures will be in place to ensure cyclical rotation of memberships so as to not unsettle the knowledge base and/or experience level of the committee as a whole.

Q: How will term limits be implemented?

As the College Governance Handbook is finalized, the College will develop a committee rotation and assignment process that ensures fair participation and continuity of committee membership.

Q: Why is the CIA recommending the development of a master calendar?

During our discussions, we discovered that many committees have overlapping meeting times that often requires voting members to choose between attending one meeting over another. In addition, many individuals are restricted from joining committees based on limited availability. A master calendar would contain schedule information for all Miramar College and District governance meetings. Establishing a more comprehensive master calendar will allow for more committee meeting flexibility and fewer conflicts with various meetings and other works schedules that currently impede many from greater access and involvement in our participatory governance process.