

DVC COLLEGE COUNCIL MINUTES

Monday, April 26, 2010
Community Conference Room
 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the College Council of Diablo Valley College will have a meeting on Monday, April 26, 2010. Public testimony will be invited in conjunction with the Council discussion on each item. All meetings are held in locations that are wheelchair accessible. To request accommodations for disabilities or for further information, please contact College Council Chair Bill Oye at (925) 685-1230, ext 2445, or by email at woye@dvc.edu.

I		Organizational Items
	1.1	Call to Order: Bill Oye. The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m.
	1.2	Attendance In attendance: Bill Oye, Dennis Franco, Nicolas Holmes, Laurie Lema, Kathryn Abajian, Kevin Horan, Jocelyn Iannucci, Glenn Appell, Michael Almaguer, Donna Floyd, Judy KleinFlynn Absent: Nancy Ryanen-Grant, Courtney Crewe, Judy Walters, Lindsay St. Hill, Aleksandr Levin, Francisco Hinojosa Guests: Sue Handy, Sue Rohlicek, Chris Leivas, Mohamed Eisa, Ray Goralka, Brian Donovan
	1.3	Adoption of the Agenda It was moved (Lema) and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented with the caveat that if guest presenters arrive early, the item on the agenda will be addressed. There was consensus approval.
	1.4	Approval of the April 12, 2010, minutes It was moved (Lema) and seconded to approve the minutes as written.
II	2.1	Public Forum <i>This time is reserved for members of the public to address the College Council. A limit of five (5) minutes per speaker and fifteen (15) minutes per topic shall be enforced.</i> None
III		Officer Reports
	3.1	Chair: Bill Oye. No report
IV		Action Items – Second Reading
	4.1	Integration Council Recommendations Bill Oye read an opinion from Nancy Ryanen-Grant submitted as a minority report. Ryanen-Grant explained why she could not approve or recommend forwarding the Integration Council Recommendations in its present form to the

	<p>President. A question was asked if feedback from a member is given as an individual or as a constituent group. Oye explained that this Council is not set up to vote as constituent groups. Each individual member has a vote. Ted Wieden pointed out that staffing is identified and addressed in Accreditation Standard III A6. Oye shared some of his concerns on the Integration Council Recommendations. He hopes that the revised program review process will show a clearer tie to the unit requests within individual program review reports. Sue Handy explained that much of what is included in the Integration Council (IC) Recommendations is to preserve what the college already has. IC identified common themes and critical needs. Laurie Lema shared that Faculty Senate has reconvened the original instructional program review task force to look at what worked and what didn't. Jocelyn Iannucci shared that Classified Senate had a spirited discussion about the recommendations but would not block the process.</p> <p>It was moved (Iannucci) and seconded to forward the Integration Council Recommendations to the President along with the minority report. There was no consensus.</p> <p>Council members discussed the definition of a minority report. This will need to be resolved at a later date.</p> <p>It was moved (Lema) and seconded to forward the Integration Council Recommendations to the President. There was consensus approval.</p> <p>Oye stated that a minority comment can move forward without a vote from the College Council. Oye will forward the document from Ryanen-Grant and include comments from himself to the President.</p>
V	Action Items – First Reading
	None
VI	Discussion Items
6.1	<p>Budget Committee Recommendations</p> <p>Ray Goralka and Chris Leivas presented the Budget Committee recommendations. Leivas explained that the College is faced with some pretty unique situations: a new governance process; the District's new budget allocation formula; and formally linking program reviews to the budget process. Leivas explained that all Budget Committee meetings were open. While reviewing college operating funds, it became apparent that accounting records show where the money is allocated, but not where the money is spent. This will need to be corrected. This will make it easier to determine the amounts used for tutoring and other expenses. The budget reduction recommendations presented today are based on operating funds only. Leivas explained that operating funds expanded under the new District allocation model to include Buildings & Grounds and International Education. The Budget Committee initially made a recommendation of 10% across-the-board cuts with the continuance of the 2% reduction from 09-10 year. They attempted to find targeted cuts to address the remaining funds needed. It was difficult to determine those targeted cuts. The Budget Committee tried to find a way to honor recommendations from Integration</p>

	<p>Council. The co-chairs from the Budget Committee and Integration Council met a several times to make sure there was uniform information. In the end, Budget Committee recommendations were: 10% across-the board with an additional 1.35% for instruction and student services, an additional 7.15% for college-wide support services, and an additional 12.2% for administration. Also included is the assumption of a 15% reduction in employee benefits for hourly and part-time faculty. Units making the reductions will need to say how their program review was used in the decision-making. A brief statement will need to be sent to the Accreditation Liaison Officer to serve as evidence that decisions were made with dialogue, program review, and alignment with mission statement. The Budget Committee was thanked for its hard work.</p> <p>Oye reminded Council members that this is a discussion item today. It should be shared with constituent groups prior to the May 10 meeting when it will be an action item.</p> <p>It was moved (Holmes) and seconded to reinstated the agenda. There was consensus approval and agenda 4.1 was addressed.</p>
6.2	<p>Workforce Development Committee Revision Lema stated that there is another small change to the reporting relationship. She will email to Dewhurst for posting. Item 6.2 will be addressed at the May 10 scheduled meeting</p>
6.3	<p><u>Academic & Professional</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DVC Procedure 4001.01 – Standards of Scholarship (Academic Probation and Dismissal) • DVC Procedure 4001.02 – Grades • DVC Procedure 4001.03 – Unit & Enrollment Guidelines • DVC Procedure 4004.01 – Attendance <p>Item 6.3 will be addressed at the May 10 scheduled meeting.</p>
6.4	<p>Internal Evaluation Process Debrief Item 6.4 will be addressed at the May 10 scheduled meeting.</p>
6.5	<p>External Evaluation Process – Mohamed Eisa Mohamed Eisa was present to explain the best process to follow to send out a committee-wide evaluation survey to the campus community. Oye reviewed the external questions for College Council as stated in the Accreditation Show Cause Report. Eisa recommended combining all college-wide committee external questions into one survey and send it out both electronically and by paper. Eisa shared that the returns from the electronic surveys have not been as good as the paper surveys. After receiving the questions from the committees, his office will combine the questions and rewrite them to be answered using the Likert scale. The questions will be placed as statements rather than questions. Oye suggested having a comment box for each committee, rather than one box addressing all campus committees. KleinFlynn asked if there’s a way to survey the respondent where they got their information. After discussion, it was agreed that Dewhurst will notify all committee to develop 3-5 questions to be used in the survey and send them to her by the end of Thursday, May 6. Eisa would like members of College Council to pilot the survey.</p>

		<p>Council members discussed whether the survey should include all college-wide committees or just the four new governance committees. After discussion, It was moved (Lema) and seconded that we include the four major college-wide committees, Institutional Planning, College Council, Budget Committee, and Integration Council in this year's external review survey as one all purpose survey. There was a friendly amendment to have the ALO, Ted Wieden, look over the proposal, and if he feels that it is consistent with our accreditation requirements, the four major governance committees' survey will be completed this year with the understanding that we do the remaining committees next year. Iannucci asked for a couple of minutes to caucus. After the caucus, there was a vote with consensus approval.</p> <p>Lema expressed concern about including both electronic and paper copies for the survey. What would prevent anyone from taking the survey twice? Eisa feels that if the survey is done in paper, it will enhance the response rate. In general, the electronic survey is easier to handle. After discussion, it was moved (Horan) and seconded to send hard copies of the survey to Buildings & Grounds and the Custodial Department. There was consensus approval.</p> <p>Council members discussed what response rate would provide the best results. It was moved (Horan) and seconded to have a goal of a 10% response from each constituent group. There was consensus approval.</p> <p>Surveys will be sent to ASDVC for response.</p>
VII		Information Items & Reports
	7.1	DGC – standing item
	7.2	Accreditation Update
VIII		Announcements
IX		Future Agenda Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional May meeting for Council Evaluation – May 17
IX		Adjournment

**Next Meeting: May 10, 2010
Community Conference Room**