

DVC COLLEGE COUNCIL MINUTES

Monday, September 13, 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, September 13, 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 Dennis Franco at (925) 685-1230, ext 2296, or by email at dfranco@dvc.edu.

I	Organizational Items
1.1	Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Dennis Franco at 2:04 p.m.
1.2	<p>Attendance Dennis Franco, Bill Oye, Becky Marr, Judy KleinFlynn, Laurie Lema, Ann Patton, Katerina Schreck, Michael Almaguer, Stacey Shears, Nancy Deason, Nancy Ryanen-Grant, Glenn Appell, Donna Floyd</p> <p>Guests: Ted Wieden, Mohamed Eisa, Sue Handy</p>
1.3	<p>Adoption of the Agenda It was moved (Lema) to adopt the agenda as presented</p>
1.4	<p>Approval of the August 23, 2010, minutes It was moved (Lema) and seconded to approve the minutes as presented.</p>
1.5	<p>Amend adopted minutes of May 17, 2010 Dennis Franco explained that there was a request to bring back the minutes from the College Council May 17 meeting.</p> <p>It was moved (Ryanen-Grant) and seconded to amend the May 17 minutes previously adopted. There was consensus approval.</p> <p>Nancy Ryanen-Grant explained that the minutes in agenda item 6.3, Internal Evaluation, did not reflect the comments from Judy KleinFlynn. She apologized for not reading the minutes prior to the last meeting. She proposed new wording.</p> <p>After discussion, it was moved (Lema) and seconded to include the first two sentences of the proposed revision and delete the last sentence. Oye asked to have a couple of grammatical corrections. Franco asked for consensus.</p> <p>Council members discussed the importance of including all discussions in the minutes or just the action items. Glenn Appell shared that if anyone wants something added to the minutes, they can request that the minutes reflect the comment.</p>

		<p>It was moved (Shears) and seconded to allow the last sentence to remain in the revised language. There was no consensus. At this point, Ryanen-Grant agreed to have the last sentence removed.</p> <p>It was moved (Ryanen-Grant) and seconded to not include the last sentence in the revised minutes. There was consensus approval.</p>
II	2.1	<p>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></p> <p>There was no public forum.</p> <p>It was moved (Oye) and seconded (Deason) to suspend the agenda order and move to agenda item 7.1, College-wide Survey. There was consensus approval.</p>
III		Officer Reports
	3.1	<p>Chair: Dennis Franco None for the day</p>
IV		Action Items – Second Reading – Decision
	4.1	None
V		Action Items – First Reading - Consensus
	5.1	<p>2010-2011 Objectives for Strategic Directions This was presented as a discussion item at the August 23 meeting. It was moved (Lema) and seconded to accept the objectives towards the College’s Strategic Directions and forward to the College President.</p>
	5.2	<p>Accreditation Follow-Up Report Lema shared that the Faculty Senate Council felt that the improvements made to the follow-up report since the August 3 version are significantly improved. The general impression was positive, but there are a few things that need addressing. The consensus of the Senate felt that there is a need to clarify and define “input”. The general observation is there is a lot of evidence that is quantitative rather than qualitative. It is important to remember to tell the DVC story. Lema shared specific suggestions on revisions.</p> <p>Judy KleinFlynn shared several observations. When talking about expenditures, she asked that there also be a mention of the reductions that were made. Bill Oye suggested including the student services program review summary template as an example of the reductions document. Stacey Shears gave several examples of work towards achieving the College’s strategic goals. Nancy Ryanen-Grant questioned the work completed by the president, senior dean of curriculum, and executive assistant during the summer on the Committee Handbook. She felt this is the responsibility of College Council. Wieden explained that this work was completed in order to meet the timelines of the September 8 CCCCDD Governing Board meeting. Franco explained that information on committee charge has been received from the individual college-wide committees. A recommendation was</p>

	<p>made to add in the report that the changes to committee charge and functions were made based on survey results, committee annual reports, committee feedback, and comments from the Accreditation Show Cause visiting team.</p> <p>It was moved (Lema) moved and seconded to extend the meeting until 4:00 p.m. There was consensus approval, but Katerina Schreck, Nancy Deason, and Glenn Appell were unable to stay longer.</p> <p>Donna Floyd agreed to have a conversation with the president on how decisions were made with regards to staff reductions.</p> <p>It was moved (Lema) and seconded (Shears) to accept the Follow-up report, with the recommended changes, and forward to the president with clarification that the wording in the paragraph on decisions on personnel reductions will be finalized. Wieden explained that the intent is to follow up with recommendations given at the meeting today, follow up with Floyd and the president, and have Don Averill take one more look at the report. He agreed to place this draft on the U:Drive for the Council to see. Wieden pointed out that Laurie Lema, Ann Patton, and Katerina Schreck need to sign off.</p> <p>There was consensus approval. Ann Patton shared that Classified Senate has not yet met and may have additional comments.</p>
5.3	<p>DVC Committee Handbook</p> <p>Ryanen-Grant asked that the changes the college-wide committees recommended be placed on the U:Drive for further discussion. It was moved (Ryanen-Grant) and seconded to table the discussion on the changes to the committee charges and functions and any voting on the committee handbook. There was consensus approval.</p> <p>Lema requested to talk about the process for committee changes. There is a need for increased transparency and broader feedback in the beginning of the process. Oye shared that it is the role of College Council to have a dialogue about new committees and the continuation of existing committees. After discussion, it was moved (Lema) and seconded to form a task force of the co-chairs of the four governance committees, and inviting Ted Wieden, to review the college-wide survey results, committee annual reports, committee recommended charges, and the Accreditation Visiting Teams Report and report back to College Council at its September 20 meeting. The meeting will be open to all. Katerina Schreck is invited.</p> <p>Franco requested a consensus vote. There was no consensus. Ryanen-Grant stated that she would prefer to wait and see what the college-wide committees have recommended for their charges. She feels that it is College Council's charge to review the committees' charges and functions. Oye pointed out that as long as the task forces' input comes back to College Council, it will fulfill the Council's charge.</p> <p>After discussion, it was moved (Patton) and seconded (Floyd) to make the Lema motion an emergency item.</p>

		<p>Franco called for another consensus vote. Again, there was no consensus. Therefore, Franco called for a simple majority vote. There were 10 ayes and one nay to form the task force. It was agreed that results of the task force will be sent to Council members prior to the Monday, September 20 College Council meeting.</p> <p>Lema offered to have the Faculty Senate pay for food using its voluntary funds.</p>
VI		Discussion Items
	6.1	<p>College Council Charge It was moved (Floyd) and seconded to table the College Council charge discussion.</p>
VII		Information Items & Reports
	7.1	<p>College Council Survey Report (Mohamed Eisa) Mohamed Eisa, dean of Planning, Research, and Student Outcomes, shared the highlights from the college-wide committee survey. This survey was conducted in May 2010. Committees completed both external and internal evaluations. The survey was designed with 4 major sections: general evaluation of all committees with six questions; focused evaluation of the specific work of some committees; open-ended comments; and demographic data. The Likert Scale was used for 9 of the questions which included 35 items. Specific questions were asked on 8 of the 16 college-wide committees. Lema suggested rephrasing the question if one felt welcomed at a committee meeting. There were those who were confused by what "felt welcomed" meant. Another suggestion made was not to combine questions as in those who attended and those who felt welcomed. Eisa shared that a committee goal should be to receive a high committee rating with high agreement on the rating. Eisa explained that College Council, in terms of the quadrants, has a low rating and a low standard deviation. Oye pointed out that none of the college-wide committees rated a 1. All committees were rated at least a 3. Oye suggested that if a response is , "I Don't Know", the respondent cannot then finished the section. Eisa pointed out that there were only two questions out of 35 where staff and managers disagreed in the responses. Faculty and managers had only 8 questions were there was no agreement. Ryanen-Grant asked for a copy of the PowerPoint presentation. Council members thanked Eisa for the presentation.</p>
	7.2	<p>August 2 memo on ACCJC Commission Action on Policies The memo and supporting documents were distributed.</p>
	7.2	DGC – standing item
VIII		Announcements
IX		Future Agenda Items
		•
IX		Adjournment: 4:17 p.m.

Next Meeting: September 20, 2010
Community Conference Room