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| Date | Feedback/Input (Round #3) | CGC Responses and Recommendations |
| 12/7/2020 21:10 | The final draft evaluation in regards to term limits responds with the following, â€œAlthough some still oppose having any term limits, all College Governance Committees have always had terms limits...â€  Is that true? Where is it stated and when was it practiced? Or, is this simply an assertion made on a misinterpretation or confusion with â€œterm of serviceâ€, which has been well established for most committees? There is a difference between an explicit term of service (1 year, 2 year, etc) versus putting a limit on sequential terms. Clearly there is plenty of opposition against term limits for many good reasons. The suggested CGC responses to the opposition seems to be a growing list of exceptions. Which in itself, obviously suggests term limits are probably not necessary nor beneficial. Creating unnecessary boundaries limits and discounts experience in the guise of increasing equity and diversity. The latter can more easily be achieved by the addition of any new interested member to any committee any time. | Yes, terms and term limits exist in our current CGH (page 42).  After discussion of the pros and cons and intent of terms/term limits (i.e. to increase diversity and inclusion on governance committees) the following recommendation was made:   * Members are appointed for a 2-year term with the ability to hold 2 consecutive terms (total 4 years of service). * After 2 consecutive terms, the seat on the committee will be up for re-appointment by the appropriate constituency group. If no other member is available, the constituency leader can re-appoint the same member for 1 additional term. |
| 1/27/2021 12:10 | Iâ€™m sorry for giving this feedback so late, but it just occurred to me over winter breakâ€¦.  I believe thereâ€™s been some disagreement about the idea of everyone rotating committees every 4 years. On the one hand, it makes a lot of sense to get new input and perspectives in committee work. Itâ€™s also great to ensure people get experience in a variety of committees. On the other hand, some committees have a lot of complex or technical work that benefits immensely from the institutional memory and expertise of long-serving committee members.  My suggestion: Instead of requiring each person to rotate committees periodically, we could require each committee to rotate a portion of its membership periodically â€“ for example, each committee would rotate 30% of its membership every two years or something like that. Ideally this would be done by volunteers from each committee who are ready to rotate. But in cases where there arenâ€™t enough volunteers, then there would be some kind of priority system â€“ for instance, the most senior people (based on hiring date) would get their preference.   I think this suggestion would meet â€“ at least partially â€“ all of our goals: It would ensure each committee gets new input and perspectives every two years. It would facilitate people getting experience in a variety of committees, particularly for those who were hired more recently. And it would allow some members to remain on committees in order to maintain institutional memory and technical expertise.   I understand this is supposed to be anonymous, but Iâ€™d be happy to discuss this idea more if you want to contact me at my anonymous | It is important to look at the intent of rotation. The point and intention of it is to ensure that not all committee members leave the committee at the same time, and that there is also opportunity for turnover with new members and new ideas. There is a need and value in institutional memory and expertise of committee members.  After discussion, the following recommendation was made:  College needs to consider a rotation cycle that will work out numerically and achieve the desired result of staggered membership. Options such as:  Each committee would create a grid to record membership term times, and keep track of the rotation of its own committee membership. At year 1 (the start of the rotation cycle) some membership terms will be a different stage of the term limits, thus some members may have longer term limits than others in year 1 (when governance committees begin the rotation cycle).  When the committees are first staffed with memberships leading up to fall 2021, a portion of committee members will be given a 1, 2 or 3 year term for rotation set to start from the original appointments of the committee. This will then determine when the rotation cycle begins to create the staggered rotation configuration. |
| 1/29/2021 16:14 | I would like to see all shared governance committees vote formally by membership. I have been on several committees where the chair would say things like "I think we all agree" or "let's conduct business by consensus". This method might limit input from those who may have opposing positions on issues and reduces dialogue overall. I believe that consensus may be appropriate for workgroups and task forces, but committees should follow formal voting practices. | In the current CGH, all committees will operate under the Brown Act and as such should be voting formally on recommendations.  Within the committee page for each committee in the current CGH draft, there is a “Committee Procedures” and under that heading there is a bullet point stating “Committee Approval Process: Vote”.  This practice of calling for and officially recording a committee’s vote is especially necessary when committees have any type of fiscal responsibilities. Taskforces are not Brown Act bound and have more leeway on their voting methods.  The “new” draft CGH also has all committees under the Brown Act. To improve common understanding and function. It is recommended that the current draft of the CGH also:   * Provide more clarity on Brown Act, specifically the need to record individual votes of members. * Require Chair/committee training that includes Brown Act and Roberts Rules of Order. Specifically list the areas of Roberts Rules that will be applied.   All committees (including Senates) should follow Brown Act for optimal transparency, inclusion, and process.  In Appendix A: Rules and Tools (p 65 of current CGH draft) there are two sections that address how to conduct effective meetings that meet the requirements of law. They are Meeting Rules of Engagement (p 65 of current CGH draft), and Meeting Management Tools (p 66 of current CGH draft).  More specific and direct language referencing the Brown Act, and specific portions of Roberts Rules of Order can be included. |
| 1/30/2021 8:58 | Are the membership term limits a good idea for curriculum committee since the need for expertise on that committee is required? I assume this has been discussed so if it has, please ignore.  Tenure and promotion committee is Professional advancement Committee now, just clarification. And since operational, no need for term limits of committee members or description of who the members are? Should there be a definition of process/procedures for this committee since they have specific outcomes from the processes for reporting to the president or since this is written in the contract, maybe just refer to the CBA?  In the meeting rules of engagement, there should be a statement/reference to BP 7150 CIVILITY AND MUTUAL RESPECT. I realize this is stated earlier in the guiding principles, but it should be referenced later as well.  Should there be a reference to the use of Robert's rules of order being used? as well as Brown Act compliance? some of the actions of these are written, but I think it may be good to define that these are being used as guidances for committees.  And for the Academic Senate a reference to the bylaws so that a person reading knows that there are defined bylaws of the senate.  Maybe after moving through the whole document...in the appendices, having a list of all the Board policies and guidances that direct shared governance on our campus would be good. They are sprinkled throughout the document, but it would be good to have these in one spot to reference. | Curriculum committee does have an increased knowledge component and learning curve. A separate term length designation could be made for this committee.  Professional Advancement Committee still requires appointment of faculty, and therefore should have a term length and limit in accordance with other committees on campus. These are not longer-term or permanent appointments. The only restrictive condition on this particular committee is that the faculty member serving on it must be tenured.  Enhance the reference to BP 7150 in the new CGH.  See recommendations (above) in regarding language in current draft of CGH in Appendix A: Rules and Tools (p 65). More exact language referencing the Brown Act, and specific portions of Roberts Rules of Order cab be included.  Include language to reference and make others more aware of the Academic and Classified Senates Constitution and Bylaws.  Consider adding a list of BPs and APs as a reference. |
| 2/1/2021 6:19 | The Grants, Initiatives, and Program Viability Subcommittee does not have a charge/purpose description.  Which committee is this a sub-committee of? | The new draft CGH has separated the charge of the Grants, Initiatives and Program Viability Subcommittee into two different groups.   * Grants & Initiative is a subcommittee of College Council and has specific charge and purpose: The Grants and Initiatives Sub Committee is an Ad Hoc Committee that will support the College Council by serving as a venue for discussion of new grants and initiatives that are deemed by the College Council to have a potential campus-wide impact on facilities, personnel, and/or fiscal resources. The Committee's primary purpose will be to provide an impact report of new grants and initiatives as assigned by College Council and serve as a facilitator of the grants, processes, initiative development and integration. * Program Viability is subsumed under the Program Review and Outcomes Assessment Committee. |
| 2/1/2021 13:20 | I suggest that the Academic Success Committee and the SEEM committee be merged. Having served on both, I see lots of overlap in membership and tasks. It would be very good to each group to have "inside" knowledge of what the other is doing, which would be be accomplished de facto with a merger. | This suggestion has merit, and recommend it go to Academic Senate for consideration, as both committees report to the AS because they encompass several academic and professional matters. Recommendation to consider this after a round of CGH evaluation. |
| 2/5/2021 15:28 | A thought I have is for there to be an AFT representative on the College Council. If I am correct City College has an AFT spot on its President's Exec Council. My thinking is that presently, Shared Governance relies on folks on its committees who also just so happen to be active in AFT to speak to AFT matters. Perhaps a more official AFT presence can be helpful to the governance process. | At this point, the recommendation is not to add an official AFT member to this committee, but to include a standing invitation and/or agenda line item for AFT representatives to speak to any potential union issues at College Council. |
| 2/5/2021 15:59 | Miramarâ€™s governance structure should accommodate policies and responsibilities defined at the District level. Remove Honors from the following sentence: Chair positions by designation and for which there is reassigned time (e.g., Coordinators for Honors, Curriculum, Guided Pathways, etc.) shall be selected following an application process that is developed in consultation between the College President and the Academic Senate President.  Honors can be listed as an operational group. Remove Honors from the governance chart in alignment with other operational groups. Honors can report regularly to Student Services. | The Honors Committee is being further explored in order to get more information. A time timetable shall be set up in terms of gathering information to determine the most appropriate position for this group in the governance structure. |