All Feedback for **College Governance Handbook** Draft #1

from Spring 2020 Collated by CGC

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment** | **Category** | **Evaluation/**  **Recommendation** |
| Issue Page 12:  *Committee Chair/Co-Chairs must be employed by SDCCD and must have served on the committee as a voting member for at least one year to act as Chair*. So to be chair you have to be a voting member for at least a year? Sounds good, though what about if a new committee is formed? They don’t have a chair? Or there is some sort of waver process for new committees? Should that be in the handbook, or is this such a rare event that it really does not have to be discussed? | Category: Voting membership/structure | **Action:** Recommend language for new committee formation:  *In the event that a committee is new or there are no members eligible for chair, the committee shall select a chair from seated members according to the committee handbook.* |
| Issue Page 11: *Committee membership for the following year will be appointed by each constituent group (i.e., Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Student Government, and College President) and shall be determined during the spring semester prior in accordance with the bylaws of each constituency*. So new hires cannot be one a committee their first year? Is that a violation of the contract? | \*page 22 of contract 7.7.3 & 7.7.4 Category: Voting membership/structure | Clarification for participation vs. Voting member; pending language from Gamboa/Gonzales  **Action:** Added the qualification:  “A committee member is defined as a member who has the authority to vote on a specific committee.” |
| Honors Committee is not a shared governance committee and really is just operational. Should be removed from handbook, but district committee structure, processes and functions should be better outlined to campus. | Category: Senate vs. Operational? | **Action:** Remove committee but outline direct Academic Senate connection between the Honors Coordinator and District to ensure appropriate recommendation and vetting through Academic Senate. |
| I'd like to propose the term limits language be amended to be specific to limiting serving as a committee chair, rather than committee membership altogether.  If there are faculty who are hoping to serve on committees that are full, perhaps we can open/extend membership (perhaps take turns with terms as voting members if needed)?  My department members share consensus with this perspective and are grateful for the time and energy that has been put into drafting this document. | Category: Term limits | **Response:** Terms are an important part of any governance structure to ensure equity and diversity of voting members. It also allows the committee workload to be equitably shared among constituency members across the campus. However, any and all campus members are welcome and encouraged to attend and participate in any governance committee or meeting at any time. In addition, once a member has termed out, they can be added as a member again after a break of one year, pending vacancy on the committee. |
| Online mentor and chair positions should not be linked. (One is elected; the other is appointed. The functions are very different: faculty development vs. facilitating discussion, reporting, holding votes, etc.) Keep them separate. Maintain the committee's advisory status and focus on instructional issues rather than reinventing it as a monitoring body. The primary focus should be bringing constituencies together (administration, technical, faculty) to foster best practices, rather than monitoring standards. (See Current Description of Distance Education Committee, below.) Change "**Desired** experience in both distance and face-to-face classes" to **REQUIRED** experience. | Category: Constituent leaders to discuss with committee | **Action:** The Online Mentor will not be a designated chair of the DE Committee.  **Action:** Change handbook so that designees from the schools will have a requirement for experience, but the at-large designees will only have desired experience. |
| We all value new voices at the table, however, I believe that those voices are at their best when they want to be there. While I understand the spirit of the proposal, I suggest that term limits on committee membership (with the exception of leadership and/ or compensated positions) are not in the best interest of all involved. As we all can appreciate, faculty are individuals and professionals who bring diverse skill-sets to the table, and, as individuals, we naturally have interests in some areas of service more so than others. Because of this, I believe that we, as professionals, should be **trusted and respected** in a manner that permits us to request to serve/ maintain our service in the areas where we choose and where we feel a commitment and connection. It seems that the best work is done when all parties feel invested and respected. | Category: Term limits | **Response:** Terms are an important part of any governance structure to ensure equity and diversity of voting members. It also allows the committee workload to be equitably shared among constituency members across the campus. However, any and all campus members are welcome and encouraged to attend and participate in any governance committee or meeting at any time. In addition, once a member has termed out, they can be added as a member again after a break of one year, pending vacancy on the committee. |
|  |  |  |
| Additionally, often times, it takes years to begin to fully grasp the ins and outs of a specific committee, as well as to hone our expertise in that area. To abbreviate that in order to follow a prescribed formula seems short-sighted and premature. | Category: Term limits | See above response. |
|  |  |  |
| I believe that service by all of those who serve should be autonomous and not micro-managed. To place additional and unnecessary restrictions on of all things "service", can be seen as insulting, lacking professional respect, and will inevitably weaken the voices on committees by "forcing" professors to serve on committees that they may not feel connected to or where they feel they have no buy in. I do not believe that putting rules in place, or enforcing existing ones previously ignored, that force these things in the interest of making space for new voices, or in reaction to people who have remained on committees for years, will accomplish that goal. I believe that actually will simply lower morale even further.. if that is possible. | Category: Term limits | See above response. |
|  |  |  |
| Instead, I ask that we look that the possibility of slightly increasing membership numbers to accommodate the small number of people who feel that they have been unable to serve where they desire as a result of seats being taken up in perpetuity. Maybe we could start there? | Category: Term limits and membership | **Action:** Membership can be increased for any committee that determines there is a need for optimal committee function. |
|  |  |  |
| Maybe when this was written, the concept was considered to be a strength, and maybe in another climate, it could be. However, in our current climate, where we are all stretched so very thin and desperately lacking faculty members, I just have doubts that this policy will garner the positive results originally intended. | Category: Term limits | See above response. |
|  |  |  |
| It seems that as we are in a place of trying to pick ourselves up and nurse our wounds, while many still feel bullied and bruised. In this place, it seems that we are in need of feeling valued, respected, and trusted to do our good work and service as professionals, and catch our breath, without additional threat or boundaries. | Category: Term limits | See above response. |
| Suggest the college be listed as San Diego Miramar College throughout the document. In the Preamble the college is listed as Miramar College. | Category: Editorial | **Action:** Change language to be consistent throughout document. |
| Followings are the College Governance Handbook inputs from the ASG:  1. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee: ASG advocates to increase to 3 student representatives; 2. Enrollment Management Committee: ASG advocates to increase to 3 student representatives; 3. Facilities, Health, and Safety Committee: ASG advocates to increase to 3 student representatives; 4. Marketing and Outreach Committee: ASG advocates to increase to 3 student representatives; 5. Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee: ASG advocates to increase to 2 student representatives; 6. Program Review and Outcomes Assessment Subcommittee: ASG advocates to increase to 3 student representatives; 7. Technology Committee: ASG advocates to increase to 2 student representatives. | Category: Membership | **Action:** Added student representatives as requested.  **Action:** Provided language for quorum to clarify that quorum is based on seated member positions only (i.e. does not include vacant seats). |
| The IPR/SLOAC committee discussed the handbook and would like two (2) at large members added to instructional faculty. These 2 at large members would be in addition to the current instructional faculty listed. The decision was made by the committee as a whole. The Committee has always at 2 at large members which has allowed some flexibility in adding new members. | Category: Membership | **Response:** The faculty list is robust and allows for equity in participation. If there are issues with workload, this item can be addressed after the first year assessment. |
| The IPR/SLOAC committee in addition to adding 2 instructional at large members is concerned that adding PRIELT Designee to every committee is unreasonable. There are only 3 instructional faculty in that area which means that those individuals will be serving on multiple committees and by virtue will have a greater say in the college governance. The IPR/SLOAC committee asks that that be revisited for every committee PRIELT faculty are assigned in the new formula. | Category: Membership | **Response:** After discussion with constituency leaders, recommendation is to keep these representatives as listed, and to reevaluate after the first year assessment to determine if there is a need to change/alter membership to accommodate issues that arise. |
| The IPR/SLOAC committee is concerned about the new Program Review Committee leadership. Currently there is only a SLO coordinator and there is not currently a Program Review coordinator campus wide position. The committee is concerned that the SLO Coordinator will be serving as chair of this committee without a co-chair. Although the committee agrees in the co-chair arrangement as shown, if there is no funding for a Program Review Coordinator then there is no co-chair. Having all the responsibilities of chairing this committee. Additionally as the committee is designed there is no administrative support that a VP would normally bring to a committee There is a significant amount of administrative work that needs to be completed on this committee and without administrative support from the VP or an administrative support person assigned to the committee that would then fall on the 1 recommended co-chair the SLO Coordinator. | Category: Constituent leaders to discuss for possible resolution | **Action:** Provide caveat language that an administrator will act as co-chair until such time as a Program Review Coordinator is identified. Advocate for funding for this critical position. |
| after a brief review, it looks good | :) |  |
| RE: Program Review and Outcomes Assessment Subcommittee  1. I am concerned that we do not have a Program Review Coordinator. (this would leave the SLO coordinator as the only chair). What are the plans to open this up for the college and is it in our current budget?  2. I agree with the request to add 2 at large instructional faculty to the committee for 2 reasons (flexibility in filling positions, additional instructional representation on the committee.)  3. The concern that PRIELT will have representation on almost every committee (potentially giving them a broader say in college governance and the concern that (its my understanding there are only 3 instructional faculty in that area.)  4. "The lack of administrative support for the committee. \*Currently by having a VP assigned to our committee Paulette is able to provide administrative support for the committee. Without that support those admin duties that Eli & Carol bring to the committee would fall on the only co-chair and/or committee members." I have seen that this is definitely an added & necessary support for this committee. In other committees, this is part of "Committee Procedures: ï‚· The Administration will provide the note taker and clerical support.---Can this be added to this committee? | Category: Constituent leaders to discuss for possible resolution | **Action:** Provide caveat language that an administrator will act as co-chair until such time as a Program Review Coordinator is identified. Advocate for funding for this critical position.  **Response:** After discussion with constituency leaders, recommendation is to keep these representatives as listed, and to do an assessment after year one to determine if there is a need to change/alter membership to accommodate issues that arise.  **Response:** Most committees will have the ability to elect a note taker; however, some committees with high levels of clerical need will require a designated administrative support and will be so noted in the Handbook (i.e. College Council). Reevaluate after a first year assessment to see if there needs to be additional support or a designated clerical member. |
| For Guided Pathways: Question: Just wondering why are there only 3 Faculty members? Why not have a Designee from each School to share what they are doing? |  | **Response:** It was determined by GP committee to leave the # of faculty s it is. |
| Thanks, looks pretty straight forward and clear! |  |  |
| Please remove the comment about "The College must provide admin support for the committee." We understand that this is not feasible. | Category: Constituent leader discussion | **Response:** Most committees will have the ability to elect a note taker; however, some committees with high levels of clerical need will require a designated administrative support and will be so noted in the Handbook (i.e. College Council) |
| Please remove the comment that the college must provide admin support for the IRP/SLOAC Committee we understand that this is NOT feasible. (corrected to add the word NOT). | Category: Constituent leader discussion | See above response. |
| Chairs Committee, Academic Affairs, and Faculty Hiring Committee have not formulated their feedback regarding proposed changes. Based on earlier information that this process was going to be delayed until fall, and given the number of other pressing issues these committees have been dealing with, discussion regarding the new handbook was delayed. Due to Brown Act restrictions, it was too late to add this to the agendas of the most recent Chairs Committee and Academic Affairs meetings (after the revised timeline for this process was released). We are holding special meetings of these committees on April 30th for the purpose of discussion and formulating recommendations. | Waiting for feedback from committees | **Response:**  At a Chairs Committee meeting in Spring 2020 the changes were discussed, and it was determined by this committee to accept the recommended changes as seen in Draft #1 of the CGH.  Academic Affairs also accepted the dissolving and restructuring of this committee into the newly created Enrollment Management Com. |
| The realignments look great. Everyone involved has done a great job. My comments are for the redesigned Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee. I was part of the former DIEC last semester and some of the comments made were regarding the number of members in the committee and looking at a few other committees I am hoping that at least 2 Designees be added to the faculty portion of committee membership. This would allow newer faculty to have an opportunity participate in the committee and allow for more diverse voices within the committee that represent the college. I am also hoping, like with the other committees, that there would be someone who has historical knowledge of the committee be a member to help the newer members of the committee. Thank you. | Category: Membership | **Action:** International Educational portion would be operational.  **Action:** Include 4 additional at-large members.  **Action:** Added section at beginning of handbook regarding district committees…  District Committees: Membership positions exist for all constituencies on various San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) committees. These appointment are either by designation or made by the constituency leader. |
| I don't think it’s a good idea to have the contract faculty hiring committee without the instructional deans. They're the ones that know what's going on in their School. One chair usually does not. I'm a chair, and I don't know the current state of Biology or Exercise Science. I would only be able to go by the FT/PT ratios, and they often do not tell the whole story. The VPs on the other hand, are too removed. I’m not saying they shouldn’t be there, only that they can't take the place of the instructional deans. | Category: Committee | **Action:** Change committee name from "hiring" to "prioritization";  **Response:** Committee is charged with shepherding the process; prioritization will already have occurred at the level of chairs and deans. |
| Significant substantive suggestions • Page 12, “identification and selection” section, 2nd bullet point / 4th bullet point: Recommend allowing chair positions by designation and for which there is reassigned time (what’s described in the 4th bullet point) to serve as chair for indefinite two-year terms if they are reappointed. It might be that this is already the case if these positions are “positional assignments.” But if not, I think it should be allowed. It’s often difficult to find anyone willing fill these kinds of positions. For example, the Curriculum Chair before me was someone who had never served on the Curriculum Committee before because no one on the committee was willing to fulfill that role. Also, these positions often require significant knowledge and expertise in the field. Once we find someone willing to serve in one of these positions and educate themselves in the position we should allow them to continue in the position if their appointments are renewed.  • Page 13: Recommend adding a bullet point clarifying the distinction between committee recommendations for policies, planning, and procedures vs. committee decisions when implementing its purpose/charge. I see that later in the document you say that there are separate implementation committees, but in practice many of our committees serve both functions. For example, the Academic Standards Subcommittee makes recommendations about changes to district general education requirements, but they make decisions when implementing their charge to review and adjudicate student petitions. Similarly, the Curriculum Committee makes recommendations regarding proposed district instructional policies and procedures, but makes decisions when implementing their charge to review and approve or disapprove curriculum proposals. • Page 20: This committee seems way too large for its purpose (28 members). Committees usually work best with 6-12 members. Recommend reducing the faculty members to perhaps one or two department chair representatives from each school.  • Page 27: Consider removing this committee entirely, as we already have people with responsibility for this function included in their regular duties (PIO, Assoc Dean of Outreach). If we do keep the committee then consider reducing the number of members to 6-12. • Page 35: Consider removing this committee entirely, as we already have people with responsibility for this function included in their regular duties (FLEX Coordinator, Professional Development Coordinator). If we do keep the committee then consider reducing the number of members to 6-12. • Page 39: Consider removing this committee entirely, as we already have people with responsibility for this function included in their regular duties (AV Supervisor, Computing Support people, PIO). If we do keep the committee then consider reducing the number of members to 6-12. • Page 44: Consider removing this committee entirely, as we already have people with responsibility for this function included in their regular duties (Assoc. Dean of Academic Success, ASC Coordinator, ILC Supervisor). If we do keep the committee then consider reducing the number of members to 6-12. • Page 53: Consider removing this committee entirely, as we already have people with responsibility for this function included in their regular duties (Honors Coordinators, Honors Dean, Transfer Center Director).  • Consider removing the PRIELT Faculty Designee position from some of the committees. This school has a very low number of faculty members so might be stretched to provide one to all committees called for in this document. Instead consider having a “faculty designee” on some committees where PRIELT faculty is not absolutely necessary (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Facilities, Health and Safety; | Category: Committee | **Actions:**  Page 12- already allowed Page 13- need clarification on recommendation; asking for bullet point regarding decisions vs. recommendation (should be defined in charge);  Page 27 (marketing and outreach)- Adjust language; recommend as advisory committee under college council; add language for marketing concerns to constituent leader;  **Response:**  These suggestions were incorporated as much as possible.  The issues that were unclear or not fully understood by CGC remain on the “to get clarification” list. |
| Minor substantive suggestions • Page 8, 4th bullet point: Recommend removing the part at the end that says “governing board for approval” and instead ending after the word “District.” Committee business items are often forwarded to the District but not to the Board of Trustees. For example, no administrative procedure is forwarded to the Board of Trustees. As another example, when I served on the college Research Committee we often forwarded ideas and suggestions to the district Research Council even though these items were not intended for Board approval. • Page 8, 7th bullet point: Recommend removing this entirely as the constituency bodies can just request a verbal report whenever they want it. Or if you decide to keep this in the document, recommend replacing with “Submit verbal reports on the committee’s work to constituency bodies as requested.” • Page 9: Recommend adding a section describing what a “positional assignment” committee member is, since this term is used later in the document. Also, I think it would be a great idea to identify positional assignments in each of the individual committee membership lists, perhaps with an asterisk or something like that. • Page 9, “Ex Officio Member”: Recommend removing this entirely as I didn’t see any of these listed as members of any committee. Or if there are some people intended as ex officio members then they should be listed as such on the committee membership pages. If you are going to keep this category, consider removing the non-voting status. • Page 10: Recommend listing “Non-Voting Member” as an additional category of committee member. Or if we don’t intend to ever have non-voting members, then recommend removing the last bullet point on page 11 that refers to non-voting members of committees. • Page 16, 3rd and 4th bullet points: Recommend removing these. I believe they’re already part of normal committee procedures and Robert’s Rules of Order so not really necessary to list here.  • Page 22: Recommend removing VPI and VPSS from this committee. It doesn’t seem necessary to have all three VPs on this one committee. • Page 29: Recommend reducing the number of members on this committee. We could remove the two faculty designees for example.  • Page 31: Recommend removing VPI and VPSS from this committee. It doesn’t seem necessary to have all three VPs on this one committee. If we do keep all three then the VPSS should be listed instead of listing the VPA twice. • Page 33: Recommend removing all VPs from this committee – it doesn’t seem necessary to have them at all since the Dean of PRIELT is present. Also consider reducing the number of Classified Professionals or restricting to representatives of schools where Classified Professionals conduct the program reviews. • Page 46, “Committee Responsibilities,” 3rd bullet point: Recommend removing this bullet point. It doesn’t seem logical to ask chairs to provide updates to themselves. Also, department chairs already have notification and sign-off authority in Curricunet for this purpose. • Page 53, “Faculty”: Consider reducing the number of faculty members assigned to this committee, perhaps by removing the four “Designees.” Nine faculty members seems unnecessary and potentially unwieldy. | Category: Editorial | **Actions:**  4th bullet - Change to "governing board or designees"  7th bullet - Recommend to keep bullet and change to "provide regular reports" (flexibility for verbal or written)  Page 9 - Need clarification. Not understood what this comment means.  Page 9 – Keep Ex Officio as it is listed under many committees. The Ex Officio is not a com member, but serves as an expert advisor to the committee, and as such does not vote or count towards quorum for any com that has this role.  Page 10 - Remove bullet regarding non-voting members (last bullet page 11). There is not, and technically never has been, a non-voting member on any committee. Now, by definition in the revised CGH, a committee member is a position that has the authority to vote.  Page 16 - Will keep this to maintain clarity and reference. This remains in the CGH.  Page 22 - Will keep membership- critical for area/division expertise i.e. facilities master plan and program review.  Page 29 - The faculty membership is broad in order to be robust and allow for equity in participation.  Page 31 – Leaving these VPs on this committee gives a reasonable balance of representation for all the divisions across campus. Will remove redundancy.  Page 33 – Similarly, leaving the VPs on this committee gives a reasonable balance of representation for all the divisions across campus.  Page 46 – Changed the language to make it more logical.  Page 53 - This number of faculty (with both designated and at large positions on this committee), has been deemed very important in order to bring in all areas of expertise with respect to teaching online. This is also a very important issue for the current situation we are facing and will be important in future issues that effects for online courses. |
| Technical suggestions • Throughout the document, replace the word “will” with the word “shall” or “must” if the intention is that it’s a requirement (for example, page 9 end of second paragraph). Or keep the word “will” in cases where it’s just implying futurity. • Page 8, 3rd bullet point: This is phrased like an information item as opposed to an action that the chair/co-chairs are responsible for. Recommend moving it to a different part of the document or rephrasing it as a duty of the chair/co-chairs. • Page 8, 10th bullet point: Recommend rephrasing to “…one committee meeting per academic year in order to…” • Page 9 first paragraph: Recommend rephrasing to “…and committing to equity, civility…” in order to be grammatically consistent. • Throughout the document, be consistent in the terms “constituency body,” “constituency group,” and “constituent group” – the appendix seems to indicate they are all the same thing. If so, then we should use the same term throughout to avoid confusion. Or if they are different things then each term should be defined in the appendix. • Page 15, “Governance” section, last bullet point: Recommend starting with a verb to be grammatically consistent with earlier bullet points. • Page 17, “Purpose/Charge” section: “clearinghouse” is one word. • Page 25, “Classified Professionals” section: Recommend listing the word “Designee” three times to be consistent with other committee membership listings. • Page 44, “Committee Responsibilities,” 1st bullet point: Remove “277D Courses” as these are probably going away as a result of recent changes in state curriculum regulation. | Category: Editorial | **Action:** Both Duane Short and Laura Gonzalez performed editorial readings and made technical and grammatical recommended changes and those were incorporated. |
| Curriculum Tech Review Subcommittee We think the Curriculum Tech Review Subcommittee should continue to exist under the new governance structure. The subcommittee is an important part of the curriculum development process and has a significant amount of work (about 20 curriculum reviews per month). We recommend the subcommittee composition, procedures, etc. reflect what is listed in the current governance handbook.  Maximum Term Duration We recommend changing the membership term duration for members of the Curriculum Committee to six years with a limit of two consecutive terms (maximum service 12 years) unless designated by position. Curriculum has a lot of regulation, policy, and procedure involved with it – much more than probably any other committee at the college. It takes several years for committee members to become familiar with this body of law and regulation and so if we keep cycling people off the committee after two or four years we lose that newly-established body of knowledge. This is the reason why Miramar as well as many CCC campuses has a published expectation of a minimum of six years of service on the Curriculum Committee. We recommend continuing that expectation but limiting service to two consecutive terms just like other committees.  “Curriculum Coordinator” Position It seems like this is one of the newly-designed “chair positions by designation and for which there is reassigned time” described on page 12. We’re fine with this; we just want to point out that the position is usually called “Curriculum Chair” throughout the state. Also, we think on page 12 it should be clarified that these reassigned time chairs are considered “positional assignments.”  Responsibility for Programs at Miramar It seems like maybe in this new governance manual the Curriculum Committee is being tasked with overseeing Miramar’s instructional programs, but it’s not totally clear to us whether or not that is the case. In the past, overseeing instructional programs was the responsibility of the Instructional Program Review/SLOAC Committee. Paulette tells us that the IPR/SLOAC Committee no longer does that, and instead they have more of a Taskstream-related clerical role. Paulette also said that she believes the intention was for the Curriculum Committee to take over responsibility for instructional programs.   We’re fine with taking on this new responsibility. However, we think it would be helpful to clearly state the responsibility in the “Committee Responsibilities” section of page 49. Something like “Coordinate the establishment and discontinuance of instructional programs and maintain the organizational structure of curriculum within those programs” would probably work.  Committee Membership In the committee membership section of page 49 we recommend listing “English Subject Matter Expert” and “Mathematics Subject Matter Expert” as additional faculty members (like in our current membership). Much of the committee’s work is related to determining basic skills needed for success in courses (for example, state-mandated advisory and prerequisite validation) and so these positions are really helpful for that content. In fact, it’s difficult to see how this committee and also the Tech Review Subcommittee could effectively function without these two positions. They should probably be designated as “positional assignments” since they’re on the committee by virtue of their expertise and not as representatives of any constituency group. (This and the six-year terms are the things we feel most strongly about.)  CurricUNET Reference -  On page 49, “Committee Responsibilities,” 1st bullet point: We recommend changing “CurricUNET” to “the curriculum management system.” The district office is evaluating a replacement system for CurricUNET and so we probably shouldn’t list it here in case it changes.  Communicating Curriculum Changes -  On page 49, “Committee Responsibilities,” 2nd bullet point: We recommend removing this bullet point entirely. This seems like an onerous reporting requirement since the committee processes literally hundreds of curriculum changes each year. All changes are already recorded in the minutes and in CurricUNET so they’re available to anyone to see. Also, the Chair of Chairs could always just request any needed clarifications or special reports.   “Program Modification/Improvement” -  On page 49, “Committee Responsibilities,” 4th bullet point: We recommend removing the part that says “Program Modification/Improvement” since programs are routinely modified via curriculum changes but in a way that would not constitute a significant program change. We process maybe 20-60 changes to degrees and certificates each year, which we assume is what is meant by the reference to “program modifications.” (For example, we processed 11 of these at the last meeting.) It seems onerous and unnecessary to hold all of those changes until the initiating faculty member has sent their program through the Program Viability process.   It also seems like this requirement could lead to some violations of state regulation if faculty members decide not to submit their programs to the Program Viability process. For example, recent changes in state law obligated us to revise some degrees and certificates that did not meet new regulations regarding total units. These changes might never be approved if the committee was not allowed to review them because a faculty member decided not to submit their program to Program Viability. As a result, we would have fallen out of compliance with the law.   Assuring Discipline Faculty Concurrence - On page 50, 3rd bullet point at top of page: We recommend removing this bullet point entirely. The intention is sort of unclear, but it seems like it contradicts the district AP governing the curriculum approval process…. The way the curriculum approval process works is that the discipline faculty initiate curriculum proposals. The department chair and dean review those proposals in CurricUNET at an early stage in the approval process and are supposed to ensure that they are discussed thoroughly at the discipline/department level. The proposals don’t come to the Curriculum Committee until later in the approval process. At that point the committee reviews and either approves or disapproves them. In other words, the discipline faculty are the ones who send proposals to the committee; not the other way around. | Category: Committee | **Response:** Tech Review work is currently in the Curriculum Committee charge and can be accomplished through Workgroup process.  **Response:** Terms are an important part of any governance structure to ensure equity and diversity of voting members. It also allows the committee workload to be equitably shared among constituency members across the campus. However, any and all campus members are welcome and encouraged to attend and participate in any governance committee or meeting at any time. In addition, once a member has termed out, they can be added as a member again after a break of one year, pending vacancy on the committee.  **Action:** Change language to be Curriculum Chair in alignment with other positions throughout the state.  **Response:** The Curriculum Committee is charged with the evaluation of all courses and programs per district and state guidelines. However, whether or not a new program is formed or an existing program is discontinued needs broader input from additional groups. The Program Viability Review process would be housed in the Grants, Initiatives and Program Viability Subcommittee of the College Council.  **Action:** Add language such that if there are not math and English faculty seated as voting members, they are included as ex-officio.  **Action:** Accept “the curriculum management system” in place of use of the CurricUNET reference.  **Action:** Remove bullet and add language to provide periodic summaries.  **Response:** Remove language; issues surrounding “modification/improvement” will be resolved with language edited in the Program Viability Review process (currently being revised in Academic Affairs).  **Action:** Delete wording in bullet starting with “in order to ensure”. |
| Proposed changes to DIEC committee structure: The approach of treating DIEC as a committee that needs members from all schools is that it makes clear, this is not about "equal parts", but instead about equity.   This means that schools like Liberal Arts may have more representation precisely because they have a more diverse faculty in terms of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and class. Furthermore, the DIEC is a committee focused on issues that specifically involve identity, class, ethnicity, racialization, law, and sexuality. For this reason, we need to have discipline experts on these topics in order to address how best to lead the campus into working towards equity. The area expertise required to teach issues of equity and diversity are legal, sociological, cultural, and historical by nature and are precisely going to have an over-representation of these fields. Many committee members are extremely passionate and committed to the goals of diversity, inclusion, and international education. This is one place that many faculty and staff from impacted groups see as a safe space on campus.  Second, member terms and chair terms should be left open. Further, DIEC chairs must be members of the committee for 5 years before becoming chair.   This committee is not a committee where members just show up every month and write their names on a roster sheet. As committee members, individuals are expected to organize and support events at various times during the week. It literally becomes a labor of love for members as they are dedicated towards the goals of the committee. For this reason, the terms become punitive in that they punish those that are doing the most for the DIEC and the campus with regard to diversity. Many of the members of the committee Please eliminate the term limits for members and chairs.   Lastly, I would really encourage you to think about how important it is to consider that this committee's longtime leadership provided institutional memory as to how the past administration had abused the processes of shared governance regarding International Education. Without stable and consistent leadership, this institutional memory would've been manipulated by administration.  However, I would encourage you to require that committee chairs must be members of the committee for 5 years prior to serving as chairs. Again, this is to instill a consistency in leadership and to maintain institutional memory.  Please consult the DIEC with any changes at their meetings and you will find that the group is quite proud of their accomplishments and structure.  Proposed Changes to Honors Structure - I would like to be explicit and clear, Honors is not a shared governance committee. This is a District Program that is not included in shared governance models at City or Mesa.   Furthermore, I do not understand how responsibilities were created without meeting with the committee. I do think this reads as an attempt to delineate something that is not part of the shared governance structure. |  | **Action:** Will add 4 at-large members for broader diversity;  **Response:** Chair terms and limitations are consistent throughout the governance structure to promote equity and opportunity, especially for those who have been traditionally excluded from membership or chair ship.  **Response:** Terms are an important part of any governance structure to ensure equity and diversity of voting members. It also allows the committee workload to be equitably shared among constituency members across the campus. However, any and all campus members are welcome and encouraged to attend and participate in any governance committee or meeting at any time. In addition, once a member has termed out, they can be added as a member again after a break of one year, pending vacancy on the committee.  **Response:** Member positions will be rotated such that the entire voting membership will not be removed in a single year, ensuring that institutional memory and experience will be maintained.  **Action:** Remove Honors Committee but outline direct connection between the Honors Coordinator, campus, and District to ensure appropriate recommendation and vetting through Academic Senate. |
| The Academic Success Steering Committee made the following suggestions:  a) The addition of an Academic Senate representative to the Faculty column . b) The addition of another student representative. c) Remove the 277D course in the Committee Responsibilities. d) Adding an administrator as co-chair of the committee – *managers requested not to co-chair Academic Senate Committees.* The above recommendations came forth from members' comments and discussions during the May 15, 2020 Academic Success Steering Committee.  e) Add one SEEM Committee representative as an Ex Officio Advisor. |  | **Action:** Recommendations from the ASC steering committee were incorporated into the ASC committee page. |
| Chairs: Add Assistant Chairs and Program Directors/Coordinators as ex officio -  Academic Affairs: ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMM. (P 20)(VERIFY) Change membership to include 3 student designees (per the request/recommendation from ASG)  Include Articulation Officer as ex officio | Category: Committee | **Action:** Add Assistant Chairs and Program Directors as ex-officio.  **Action:** Total 3 student designees and include AO as ex-officio. |
| As the College Governance Committee seeks to restructure our campus committees, please see attached rationale & feedback regarding international education remaining an integral component of the Diversity/International Education Committee (DIEC). As Acting Co-Chair of DIEC, I've Cc'd the ongoing Co-Chairs of DIEC, Adrian A. & Terrie H. & my current Acting Co-Chair, Jae C. Please let us know if you have any questions or need any further clarification. | Category: Committee | **Action:** International Educational portion would be operational. |
| DIEC discussed the new College Governance Handbook. DIEC members were in favor of changing and increasing the membership of the committee to 3 students, 5 classified professionals, 10 faculty members and 2 administrators. There was strong support for this change. | Category: Membership | **Action:** Adjust membership as recommended. |
| DIEC discussed the make up for the committee and term limits. The majority of DIEC faculty members were opposed to a mandate that faculty be designated from various schools, but instead were in favor of allowing faculty to serve and be on the committee regardless of what discipline or school they represent. There was also clear opposition to term limits from various members, (although some were not in favor, some were in favor**).** | Category: Term limits | **Response:** To ensure equity of representation, school designations will remain but 4 at-large positions will be included as well. |
| DIEC discussed the proposed integration of “Equity and Inclusion” as a responsibility of the DIEC. The proposed change involves a potential name change for DIEC. Although there is support for the concepts of equity and inclusion, before changes are made to increase additional committee responsibilities to DIEC, more information and discussion are needed concerning the Student Equity Plan, the role in gathering, reviewing, and assessing data to identify and mitigate potential equity gaps, and regarding work to provide evidence in the areas of Accreditation Standard I-IV. | Category: Committee | **Response:** Diversity, Equity and Inclusion need some level of coordination and leadership of efforts in our governance structure and this is the logical place. |
| Comments below are from the Management Group, there should be more comments coming....  1. We should consider creating a Student Success and Equity Committee that has a focus on integrating three major initiatives â€“ Student Equity, Guided Pathways and Basic Skills. They scope of influence from a policy/procedure standpoint would impact ASC and other academic interventions, but the actual work of the ASC would be considered operational. This would potentially allow us to eliminate 3 â€“ 4 existing committees  2. Remove manager co-chair for DE Committee, SEEM/Academic Success. These are all Academic Senate committees. It is not appropriate to have a dean to co-chair.  3. We would like to recommend the removal of Gants, Initiative and Program Viability for now. And let this be one of charges that the new College Council take on when the new structure is approve. The content of this committee was never vetted by the CIA sub group.  4. Environmental Sustainability Committee: we don't think they need a dean on this committee. Maybe someone from facilities/grounds.  5.Technology Committee: Needs an instructional dean on committee  6. Curriculum Committee: This committee is the one that should be looking at program changes and repackaging. Program viability and discontinuous.  7. ASC/Success in English, ELAC, and Math Committee: Should include more representation of student services. | Category: Committee | **Response #1:** This will be investigated further and considered for implementation after the first year assessment.  **Action #2:** Remove manager Co-Chairs are recommended.  **Action #3:** Subcommittee was brought forward at CIA and no issues were raised. Edits and changes should occur now, as with other proposed committees. Managers are editing language of committee charge.  **Action #4:** Change administrator on Environmental Sustainability Committee from dean to administrative designee.  **Action #5:** Add Instructional Dean to Technology Committee.  **Response #6:** Curriculum committee will look at program initiation and discontinuance from the curriculum perspective but the broader discussion regarding college-wide impact will occur in the Grants, Initiatives and Program Viability Subcommittee.  **Response #7:** Unclear if representation suggested is faculty or classified. |
| First, thanks for your dedication to and transparency in this process!!!  As Chair of the ESC, I have a few comments/questions:  Under "Committee Responsibilities":  1) The first bullet includes "These reports should include and data and inputs from external and community sources." I am not sure why this is required. I think it's a great idea, but to include it in the purview of an on-campus committee seems to push our focus beyond what it was created for. This seems like something that would be more in league with what the District-wide Sustainability Committee would do. If you have information or points of view to share, I am definitely open to them.  2) It might seem contradictory, but we think it's important that the ESC "Act as a representative for campus sustainability issues to interested parties" both on and off campus. Again, I'm open to discussing this. Perhaps we could keep the first bullet as it is and add this to the end of the second bullet: "both on and off campus."  (Thank you for adding the third bullet :)  3) Can we please add a fourth bullet, "Represent Miramar College on the SDCCD Sustainability Committee"? |  | **Acton:** Accept and add 4th bullet. |
| CGC Committee Members,  One last minor but important issue with the DIEC committee structure that needs to be clarified, that needs to be corrected. One chair is a faculty member and the other chair can come from either faculty or from classified professionals. It is not one faculty member and a classified professional. It is one faculty member and the second chair can be either faculty or classified. The committee has functioned this way since its inception. | Category: Chair Committee | **Response:** Recommendation for co-chairs from different constituencies provides diversity of perspective from different constituencies. |
| "The note taker either shall be an elected member of the Committee, to serve for the term of the semester as note taker and as a voting member; or shall be provided by the Administrator assigned to the committee"  Administrators do not have staff to provide note taking at meetings. Given the number of meetings that administrators attend, the use of their staff to take notes would be a full time job for the staff and take them away from their contractual duties. Also, any faculty member receiving reassign time for a committee should be responsible for taking notes. By making this an "or" statement, any non-administrators on a committee could simply refuse to take notes and then the responsibility would fall onto the administrators who, again, do not have the available staff to do so. | Category: Committees | **Response:** Most committees will have the ability to elect a note taker; in the absence of a volunteer, the administrator will assign one. However, some committees with high levels of clerical need will require a designated administrative support and will be so noted in the Handbook (i.e. College Council). Committees may reevaluate after a first-year assessment to see if there needs to be additional support or a designated clerical member. |
| The Honors Committee is not a genuine committee. It is a District program that has campus representatives. It is not part of our campus governance. |  | **Action:** Remove Honors Committee but outline direct connection between the Honors Coordinator, campus, and District to ensure appropriate recommendation and vetting through Academic Senate. |
| We should consider creating a Student Success and Equity Committee that has a focus on integrating three major initiatives â€“ Student Equity, Guided Pathways and Basic Skills. The scope of influence from a policy/procedure standpoint would impact ASC and other academic interventions, but the actual work of the ASC would be considered operational. This would potentially allow us to eliminate 3 â€“ 4 existing committees. | Category: Committees | **Response:** Comment will be investigated further and considered for implementation after the first year assessment. |
| Remove Manager Co-Chair for DE Committee, Academic Success Committee and Seem Committee. These Committees are Academic Senate Committees, so it is inappropriate the have a manager co-chair and report to the Academic Senate. | Category: Committees | **Action:** Remove manager Co-Chairs are recommended. |
| 1) Recommendation that the College Council rather than the College Governance Committee design the new Grants, Initiatives, and Program Viability subcommittee. The proposed GIPV subcommittee seems haphazardly designed and far too encompassing to allow the college to balance proactive innovation with thoughtful dialogue.  2) ASG recommendation for an additional student to this committee. | Category: Committee | **Response #1:** The Grants, Initiatives and Program Viability Subcommittee was created to fill a gap in the college structure and governance and was designed to improve integration and alignment of new/changing grants/initiatives/programs with the College’s mission and Educational Master Plan, as well as provide a level of support for grants on campus.  **Response #2:** Addition of a student member to this committee. |
| Professional Development Committee  The Professional Development Committee met on Friday, September 11th 2020 and we have suggestions for changes in the Mission statement that is in the new proposed Governance Handbook.  The Committee would like to add the underlined area:  *Develop and promote a professional development program which supports the educational mission of the Institution to include activities that enhance and improve the college atmosphere and cultivate a positive culture on campus; oversee the disbursement of professional development funds for faculty, classified professionals, and administrators.* |  | **Action:** This recommendation has been incorporated into the CGH for the Professional Development Committee. |
| These are comments from the Chemistry Department:  (1) PRI(E?) was not expanded to allow for taskforces to do research reports and no mention of ability to form taskforces. (2) Is creating a timeline for committee assignments even possible?  (3) Program viability looks out of place, but no real place to go  (4) Should CCAP and high school be written into Enrollment Management Committee?  (5) Have district people agreed to serve on BRDS and Facilities? Should they be expert guests, instead?  (6) Why are leads not on the GPS committee?  (7) Do we have a 3-year marketing plan or is it a charge that one be created?  (8) Was the guiding philosophy always to have more faculty on committees?  (9) Term limits, especially on Curriculum, are an issue  (10) Academic standards - 2 evaluators from district? Are they Miramar or district? DSPS should be permanent member vs. Expert that comes in. Why is this the only place where there's a C(T?)E designee?  (11) Distance Ed/Honors biannual review of metrics - metrics should be at campus level, not course level  (12) Articulation officer should be a voting member wherever he/she sits on a committee. |  | **Response #1:** PIE (?) includes language: “Committee retains authority to form taskforces and workgroups related directly to committee charge”  **Response #2:** Yes, the President’s office will maintain membership records and assist with the rotation of member seats in coordination with the constituency leaders.  **Response #3:** TheProgram ViabilityProcess will be housed in the Grants, Initiatives, and Program Viability Subcommittee.  **Response #4:** CCAP and Enrollment Management are included in the overall charge.  **Response #5:** District representatives are appointed by the district as part of their responsibilities.  **Response #6:** The Steering Committee is meant to guide the efforts but doesn’t include all individuals working on the project.  **Response #7:** Yes we have a 3 year marketing plan.  **Response #8:** No, the guiding philosophy was not to always have more faculty on committees, but faculty have a contractual obligation to serve and legal responsibilities and rights to make recommendations on 10+1 so frequently they have more members.  **Response #9:** Terms are an important part of any governance structure to ensure equity and diversity of voting members. It also allows the committee workload to be equitably shared among constituency members across the campus. However, any and all campus members are welcome and encouraged to attend and participate in any governance committee or meeting at any time. In addition, once a member has termed out, they can be added as a member again after a break of one year, pending vacancy on the committee.  **Response #10:** Evaluators used to be campus but now district. DSPS can serve as an ex-officio. There are not faculty designees from each school, but the needs of academic and technical education both should be represented.  **Response #11:**  **Action:** Add language to include campus-level.  **Response #12:** Articulation officer is a voting member if there is a designated seat on the committee. |
| Page 14 and other areas with regard to the use of the word shall versus will, and using one term or the other consistently. |  | Traditionally, [**shall**](https://www.lexico.com/definition/shall) is used with first person pronouns (i.e. I and we) to form the future tense, while [**will**](https://www.lexico.com/definition/will) is used with second and third person forms (i.e. you, he, she, it, they).  However, when it comes to expressing a strong determination to do something, the roles are reversed: **will** is used with the first person, and **shall** with the second and third. |