DRAFT
MiraCosta College
Governance Organization Committee

Meeting Minutes

March 9, 2012

Members Present: Catherine Halmay, Christina Hata, Melanie Haynie, Donna Davis, Alketa Wojcik (for Pam Deegan), Louisa Moon, Sheri Wright, Beth Powell, Francisco Rodriguez, Sasha Tangherian, Bruce Hoskins, and Dick Robertson

Guests Present: Jim Austin, Gail Baughman, Sandy Comstock, Jim Julius, Catherine Halmay, Penny Skemp, Dana Smith, Jim Sullivan, Mario Valente, Mark Yeager

The meeting began at 3:02 p.m.

I. **Internal Committee Reviews and Recommendations**

The following are committee reviews and comments:

Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)

Survey results very strong, especially on leadership. Committee noted that while it had no recommendations for changes to committee structure, it would prefer not to do the hundreds of hours of work to prioritize faculty positions if in the end we are going to freeze hiring. Requested that the decision of whether to hire growth and replacement positions and how many to hire be made definitively before the committee begins to prioritize.

Budget and Planning Committee (BPC)

Survey results really nice, good endorsements of leadership. There was a recommendation to change the number of members from twenty-seven (27) to twenty (20), as follows: reduce from 12 faculty members to 9, reduce from 7 classified staff members to 5, reduce from 7 administrators to 5, and maintain 1 student. Reasons given were that the group was too big and hard to get into a circle facing one another; many initially joined to work on the master plan – now that is finished and some have less interest in budgeting aspects.

The group also discussed the following:

- Issue of the classified ratio and why there are still proportionally more faculty included, if we're not engaged in planning. It was pointed out that both budget development process and institutional planning process are in the 10+1 areas of faculty primary responsibility in AB 1725.
- BPC is both a governance committee and an advisory committee
- The addition of resource people to the committee and whether they can vote or not, and take part in the discussion outside of public comments. GO pointed out that there are no non-voting resource members of governance committees appointed by GO, so any resource members an individual council would like to appoint to attend would not be officially on the committee according to GO, but a council should feel free to ask any of its members to attend meetings of a particular committee (e.g. Dr. Rodriguez attends BPC regularly but is not a member).

Dick Robertson made a motion to approve the recommendation for BPC to change the number of voting members from twenty-seven to twenty (reduce from 12 to 9 faculty members, from 7 to 5 classified staff members, from 7 to 5 administrators, and maintain the 1 student). Christina Hata seconded the motion.

Seven Aye, Three Abstained, One Nay.

Courses & Programs (C&P)
Survey results excellent on leadership and functioning of the committee, in particular. No recommendations.

Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC)
Survey very positive. Faculty co-chairs' contributions very much appreciated. No recommendations.

Student Interest Committee (SIC)
Survey positive but low response rate. No recommendations.

II. **General College Survey**

Survey shows significant improvement over Fall 2010 survey in all areas, especially timely and effective decision making processes. Only question below 50% was on equitable distribution of workload. It was speculated that two factors contributed: a) difference in collegial governance duties of full and part-time faculty, classified staff, and administrators (so equitable distribution would not be appropriate), and b) full-time faculty perception that people who weren't on governance committees had significantly less governance work than those who were.

III. **Proposals for New Committees**

Technology Committee
The group received a proposal to establish a Technology Committee (TeC) and discussed the pros and cons, as well as what its purpose and composition. The following comments were made:

- Whether a task force needs to look at this, to separate what is operational and what is governance, and suggest more about the nature and composition of the committee
- No classified in proposed composition
- Large committees don't work well - so composition should be changed within the number proposed
- Need method to bring information together from disparate groups that are now functioning officially or unofficially around technology issues
- Faculty members currently have nowhere to go when a problem arises with technology that directly impacts pedagogy in the classroom or online
- Not sure that a technology committee comprised of all faculty will work, so the committee will need other stakeholders
- Should have classified rep on this committee – as we move to more online education we have to provide more support for students
- A lot of the problem seems to be due to a lack of communication between groups vs. need to create another group
- MOE is an ad hoc Academic Senate committee that could be disbanded if this is approved – this would take its place (transform into this) – so this is not an additional committee.
- the college clearly has governance and pedagogy issues related to technology

- Before you can define members of the committee – what is technical, what is advisory, what is governance side? What is the direction? We're not there yet.
- Faculty frustrated with technology – complete disconnect. People are walking away from AIS and using/bringing in their own equipment, programs . . . Get faculty, administrators, and staff at the table to work together that models and authentic engagement.

Composition of FITS:*

7 members (one of the faculty members will be chair of FITS and faculty co-chair of TeC

- The Faculty Director of Online Education (FDOE)
- Five full-time faculty with online, hybrid or educational technology experience (with appropriate representation from library, CTE, and GE areas)
- One additional faculty members

Composition of TeC:*

14 members, with faculty and administrative co-chairs

- The 7 FITS members
- One instructional dean as appointed by the VP of Instruction, or designee
- Two administrators, one of whom is the Dean of AIS (ex officio) or designee
- Three classified staff members, with experience working in a technical area
- One student appointed who is currently enrolled in, or has previously matriculated in, a distance education course here at MiraCosta College

[All members are chosen by their respective chair or president, with confirmation by their councils, if required according to council procedure]

*Committee composition as revised by GO Committee on 3-9-2012

Christine Hata made a motion to approve the creation of a technology committee as amended with the addition of three (3) experienced classified employees being added to the committee, and a reduction of one faculty, bringing the total number of members to fourteen (14). Bruce Hoskins seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

IV. <u>G.O. Change Recommendations for Improvements Based on Evaluation Results & Proposals</u>
Bruce Hoskins made a motion to change G.O. from an ad hoc committee to a standing evaluation committee that meets once a year. Christine Hata seconded the motion. All in favor. One abstained. The motion carried

The meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.