

College Governance Committee Miramar College

May 10, 2016, Room N-206 2:45-3:45pm

**Notes – Submitted by Daphne Figueroa, Member & note taker – Approved 09/27/16**

**Call to Order 2:50 pm**

Present: Adrian Arancibia (Chair); Patricia Hsieh (Admin); Joyce Allen (Classified); Terrie Hubbard (Classified - proxy for Sara Agonafer); Olivia Light (Student); Daphne Figueroa (Faculty); Wheeler North (Faculty)

Guests: Marie McMahon (Faculty; Academic Senate President), Xi Zhang (Classified; Research & Planning Analyst), Daniel Miramontez (Admin., Dean of PRIELT); Naomi Grisham (Faculty; Transfer Center Director)

A. Approval of Agenda

**Motion to approve: 1<sup>st</sup> Joyce A., 2<sup>nd</sup> Terrie H. (proxy for Sara A.)**

The agenda was approved with 1 added item by P. Hsieh (#8, password for College Governance Handbook) and Minutes (02/09/16) – **\*Note: I think this was a typo in the agenda; it should have been minutes of 04/12/16.**

**Motion to approve the minutes of 4/12/16\*: 1<sup>st</sup> Olivia L., 2<sup>nd</sup> Joyce A.**

Discussion on Minutes – Patricia – asked for clarification of what Daphne volunteered to do with regard to supporting committee chairs. Daphne clarified that she would be happy to provide orientation to new committee chairs/co-chairs on CGC process & procedures, including handbook pages, duties, and the new assessment tool; Marie suggested a small task force might be appropriate. Daphne agreed and would be happy to spearhead the efforts in the Fall semester.

Patricia asked for clarification on the pilot assessment and whether or not CGC would complete this today.

What were the pending changes to the assessment instrument? Marie noted these were reassigned time & clerical assistance. It was clarified in an e-mail by Daphne to the committee that the CEC would pilot the instrument at their last meeting of the semester and CGC would review that pilot and our own pilot would be completed at today's meeting, as well.

**Minutes Approved; Patricia abstained.**

B. New Business:

1. Outcomes Assessment Committee [CGC Goal 2, 5](#)

Daniel noted that this is being proposed because of a need to better align outcome & assessment (O & A) with planning. It was recommended to put O & A subcommittee

under PIEC to mirror what is done in the School of PRIELT.

Patricia asked if there was a typo. Yes, it was noted that it should be 2, not 3, administrators. Patricia suggested changing the Dean of Matric. & Student Development to the VPSS and adding Classified representatives because it is a college wide function, thus it needs to be more comprehensive. She suggested that representation for instruction & student services should be added to the Classified membership.

It was noted to make sure it says subcommittee throughout (typo in “charge”).

Discussion of the charge followed. This subcommittee would support the development of the operational plan. Patricia questioned why we need this subcommittee. It was agreed that we need an additional reading and perhaps the subcommittee goals need to be streamlined (fewer goals), perhaps with a focus on #1 & #3, or at the most possibly 1-4. This subcommittee has a huge membership; how efficient will this be? The campus wide O & A Facilitator is not supposed to be the content expert. Wheeler reflected – as we go through our accreditation processes, we need to have the integration of O & A into the fabric of our governance processes. What do we do to show that the loop is closed? Is this the best way to show this? Daniel gave an e.g. of how it currently works; O & A facilitator is a resource person to all of the groups working on this (i.e. the Program Review/SLOAC committees for the three divisions).

**Decided to continue discussion next semester with Laura Murphy (campus wide O & A Facilitator) present.**

#### C. Old Business: 1. Research Sub-committee: Governance Committee Recommendation Reporting Form [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)

Daniel & Xi were returning to answer questions that CGC had from the last meeting, along with Naomi Grisham, member of Research Subcommittee and newly elected PIEC Co-Chair; this reflects the new scope that is an upgrade that goes along with revisions to our Planning process.

Patricia asked about the Classified Staff membership & suggested adding an instructional representative; Joyce concurred; it was noted that the college has grown, so we should keep a Student Services rep. as well as add an Instructional rep. It was suggested to add another admin. rep. Patricia did not feel that this was necessary; but it was agreed that it would be good to have an additional faculty in the transfer area; or at least instructional faculty at large. The faculty expertise should be balanced, so it would be preferable to have someone who teaches transferable level courses as the fourth faculty rep.

Daniel asked if there were any questions regarding the revised committee goals & activities. Marie reminded the group that we had discussed the need to keep the term

“committee procedures” because that is standard formatting. Adrian suggested that the recommendation should now be in good shape to move forward.

**Motion was made to move the recommendation forward. 1<sup>st</sup> – Daphne; 2<sup>nd</sup> – Olivia**

Discussion – Joyce asked why the dissemination process had changed. It was determined that this was to be consistent with the changes to the planning calendar. In fact, Daniel clarified that the wording should be changed to reflect what was just approved by CEC as the language for the Annual Planning Calendar. Patricia asked for clarification about how the PIO and Research Asst act as resource people. How will they know when they need to attend meetings? It was clarified that the Chair will ask them, as needed.

**Daphne amended her original motion to move the recommendation forward to the constituencies with the agreed upon changes reflected.**

**Motion carried.**

## 2. Discussion with College Planners regarding Committee Assessment Tools

Marie presented the CEC standpoint and noted that some fields can be filled in after the fact and that the act of filling in the form does require more connection to the CG handbook, helps to guide the committee chair, and if used to start meetings in the Fall this could be an “ice breaker”. Wheeler mentioned that this could be a “norming” or grounding exercise. Marie asked everyone to look at what is redundant. There was discussion of what it means to share accomplishments of the committee. Wheeler suggested that at this level the accomplishments are pretty generic – most committees could probably quantify what was done that was significant. Patricia suggested that committees could give specific examples and pointed out that the original fields were too difficult to fill in. The new form has more user-friendly fields. She asked about the terms “High; Medium; Low” and what happened to them, as they were not filled in. Adrian suggested that for CEC all items were considered high. Wheeler asked why Std. IV didn’t come up for CEC, since CEC actually implements college governance. It was noted that the type and level of analysis in which we are engaging is important because it highlights where the gaps are. Joyce pointed out that of committees put down what they actually do, then it will reflect out in a goal. So now we have suggestions and ideas so that we can clean up the assessment instrument so that it is ready for fall implementation. Marie highlighted the multitude of purposes that the assessment instrument can serve, some of which are: continuity, handing over the baton, etc. It is not just a “one off” document. Adrian suggested that we don’t necessarily have to complete the form at or by the end of the semester but rather use it to reflect after the semester ends. Wheeler suggested that using the assessment instrument can actually help in building the self study, especially with regard to college governance. Patricia

suggested that the assessment will help with the annual review of committee goals. She questioned the purpose of the H/M/L labels. Marie had suggested this to make the alignment with accreditation either high, medium, or low. Patricia pointed out there are other committees that want to pilot the form. Adrian pointed out that the “fields” on the form are problematic. Joyce pointed out that this is why we are doing this. It’s to see how we will use the form and how it can be improved.

**There seemed to be consensus to keep refining the form and continue discussing its use with additional pilots likely in the Fall.**

3. The Role of College Governance Committees in Accreditation - **Postponed**

4. Professional Development Chair on Miramar College – Finding a Committee  
**Postponed**

5. Staff Development –

There was a brief discussion that the CG Handbook page that was sent out by Marie is not the current page.

**Discussion of this item will continue at the next meeting in the Fall.**

6. Flex Workshop Proposals for College Governance Committee Chairs - **Postponed**

7. Proposed Changes to Student Services Committee – **Postponed**

8. Added item by Patricia: Password for CG Handbook –

It was decided that Patricia would ask Briele to coordinate a meeting with Daphne, Briele, Juli, Adrian, Wheeler, and Marie to pass along the knowledge regarding the process for ongoing revisions to the CG Handbook.

D. Committee Reports/Other: **None**

E. Next Scheduled Meeting: Fall meeting. Enjoy the summer break!

**Meeting Adjourned 3:50 pm**

**College Governance Committee Goals**

**San Diego Miramar College Governance Handbook (October 2013)**

The College Governance Committee will monitor, facilitate and, whenever necessary, evaluate the operation of the governance plan as outlined in this Handbook. The Committee will be responsible for the following:

1. Review governance issues for the campus and make recommendations if more than one committee should review an issue.
2. Interpret Title 5 as it applies to faculty, staff, and students.
3. Review and make recommendations regarding changes to the model as outlined in this Handbook.
4. Review and make recommendations regarding changes to this Handbook.
5. Provide an annual evaluation of the governance structure and its operating effectiveness.