



**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING
MAY 5, 2015
APPROVED**

In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the DVC Faculty Senate Council record the votes of all committee members as follows: Members in attendance will have their votes recorded including names of members voting in the minority or abstaining is recorded.

PRESENT: Laurie Lema (President), John Freytag (Corresponding Secretary), Beth McBrien (Vice President), Maria Dorado (Counseling), Peter Churchill (Business), Theresa Flores-Lowry (Kinesiology), James Magee (Math/Computer Science), Buzz Holt (Social Sciences), David Vela (English), Milagros Ojermark (Applied and Fine Arts), Catherine Machalinski (Biology/ Health Sciences), Craig Gerken (Physical Sciences), René Sporer (SRC), Valerie Colber (Part-time Faculty)

ABSENT: Marva DeLoach (Library)

GUESTS: Andy Barlow, Keith Mikolavich, Ted Wieden, Cheryl Wilcox, Tina Dodson, Charlie Shi

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA OF MAY 5, 2015 AND THE MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 2015.

It was MSC to approve the revised agenda of May 5, 2015. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Dorado, Flores-Lowry, Vela, Machalinski, Magee, Holt, Ojermark, Gerken, Sporer, and Colber. No nays. No abstentions. Approved.

Holt requested his comments on IT be expanded. The minutes of April 28, 2015 will come back for approval at the next meeting.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

2. COUNCIL COMMENT

Dorado said the Education Planning Program was extremely slow throughout the previous day and has continued into today. She said it has been taking her about 35 minutes to log a student into three classes. She started doing them on paper but when they don't log them into the program, the college does not receive funding for those completed Ed Plans. She now has to go in and log all those classes that she did on paper. She said today they got a report from their dean that IT was communicating with the program vendor, Ellucian and they said they are attempting to fix it and currently updating their program.

Sporer said she has been hearing from students that Web Advisor is VERY slow and they are having a lot of trouble getting what they need. She said some students that have been at the college a while said they are used to it but, Sporer said that should not be the situation.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lema reminded Council the Faculty Lecturer Marcia Goodman will be presenting her lecture this week on Wednesday evening at 6:00 pm and again on Thursday at 12:30. It will be in the BFL CCR.

Flores-Lowry announced the DVC Men's swim team won 2nd place at the state meet and the women's swim team won third. One of the men's team members, Brandon James broke a state record and got MVP. She said also the DVC Softball team is 31-9 and they are now going to the Super Regionals.

Gerken announced that his department hosted a couple high school classes the previous Friday for information and demonstrations. He said they invited students from Mount Diablo and Ygnacio Valley. He said also they hosted the Expand Your Horizons event the previous week for middle school girls in science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

4. APPOINTMENTS

None.

5. PROGRAM REVIEW

Lema reviewed with Council the proposed changes to the Program Review documents recommended by the Program Review Task Force. She explained the changes include rearranging some of the sections and noted there is greater continuity in what is asked for between all of the categories of Program Review. If approved there will be five categories for Program Review. They will include Students Services, Instructional, Administrative Unit, Hybrid (Counseling and Library), and Hybrid for Interdisciplinary programs (Puente, Umoja, etc.). Lema said the proposed changes have gone out to the Integration Council, Counseling, Library, and Puente for feedback.

McBrien suggested the Council wait until after the next Integration Council meeting before voting on the proposed changes. Lema asked Council to take a close look at the documents so they will be ready to make a decision at the next meeting so they can be used in the fall.

Gerken asked where the information is on the timelines. Lema said each year comprehensive reviews will be done by 25% of the areas that are required to do Program Reviews. Lema said she worked with Westlake on lists of which areas will do them in which years. She said Westlake looked at the workload for deans and decided to take this to the Deans group for recommendations.

6. FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL BYLAWS

There was no discussion. It was MSC to approve the proposed revisions to the Senate bylaws. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Dorado, Flores-Lowry, Vela, Machalinski, Magee, Holt, Ojemark, Gerken, Sporer, and Colber. No nays. No abstentions. Approved.

Lema informed Council of a small correction to language in the Senate Constitution. Article V Section 1. B. reads "The chair of each Standing Committee shall file with..." was changed to "The chair of each Standing Committee shall submit to...". And in Article V Section 1.D. the words "mission and philosophy" were removed. Council was in agreement with the changes and the Constitution will now go out for a vote of the Senate as a whole.

7. VPI REPORT

VPI could not attend – item postponed.

8. PRESIDENT'S REPORT ON COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

Lema told Council a group that included herself, John Freytag Beth McBrien, Keith Mikolavich, Mario Tejada, Lupe Dannels and Andy Barlow met four times to discuss College Governance and it's structure.

Lema shared what they are recommending for revisions to the governance structure and decision making workflow. She said they established some principles for their discussions and proposals. They agreed we need to make sure we focus on strategic plan work, decisions are data-driven and outcome based, committees need to have expertise based membership, and we want to make sure the Academic Senate and its committees are a key part of the college governance. Lema said the Governance Workgroup asked the question is our governance structure working for us or are we working for it.

Lema said the proposed changes are designed to reduce the amount of work and to be more effective.

She explained that College Council with its current structure and mission, is not integral to the work being done on advancing the goals of the Strategic Plan. Consequently the Governance Workgroup has proposed redesigning College Council to make it more effective and to become the only college-wide governance committee.

Proposed membership will consist of the college president (ex officio), ASDVC President and Vice-President, the Classified Senate President and Vice-President, the Faculty Senate President and Vice-president, and three (3) VPI, VPSS, VP Business and Finance, the two co-chairs from the proposed Research and Evaluation group, and the two co-chairs from the Integration Council. It is also proposed to rename the IC as the Program Review group for clarification about their function.

The College Council will be transparent when setting outcomes, and will be looking at institutional effectiveness. The College Council will “own” college plans, which means they will make sure they align with the Strategic Plan and will hold the college accountable for implementing these plans. College Council will not be charged with writing the plans. That is a broader college activity. Lema emphasized 10+1 academic and professional matters and the faculty’s purview of these items will not change. The Faculty Senate’s role should be strengthened with the change to College Council. Lema said College Council would also be charged with reviewing the entire college budget. These changes are designed to reduce silos and keep governance work focused on the college’s mission.

Andy Barlow told Council all the functions of the current model will be covered but the framework for how conversations take place will go from “Noah’s Ark” committees to outcomes based while focusing on what we are trying to accomplish for the college. He said the ranking of resource requests will be about the impact it will have on our strategic goals. Academic Senate will be much more at the center of college governance and as a counterweight to College Council.

Lema explained currently the Program Review timeline and ranking process is trying to address too many functions of the college. There are maintenance of effort issues for facilities, technology (excludes replacement cycle), equipment, supplies, HR, and mandates. In this model issues that need immediate attention including safety, ADA, HR issues, and mandates emphasizes the responsibility of management to address in a timely manner these issues. Safety, ADA, and HR shouldn’t have to go through the Program Review ranking process. The Program Review group will report to College Council by administrators overseeing those areas each fall. The timeline of the Program Review cycle will go from May to May. There will be an evaluation every year to see what roadblocks there may be and to close the loop in the Program Review process.

They will look at the outcomes of the annual evaluation and vet the outcomes through the college governance groups.

Mikolavich said the governance workgroup agreed we’ve had problems with communication because we have so many college committees.

Mikolavich said we need to have a certain amount of trust and also the process needs a safety valve. It gives the college president less room to make decisions in a non-transparent way. He said at this time we have a very transparent president but who knows what we could get in the future.

Lema explained under the proposed model we will have work groups instead of a lot of committees. They will not fall under the Brown Act which can be restrictive, but they will still be open and transparent.

Sporer asked what committees will be eliminated. Freytag said the work groups will have goals and all the current functions will be covered but it is too early to say what committees will be eliminated or reconfigured. Barlow added that the College Council, Academic Senate, Classified Senate and ASDVC will be the only governance committees and the rest will be work groups or sub-committees.

Holt said he thinks this proposal includes a lot of players and will diminish the key role of faculty. Wieden said the Academic Senate will still have a direct line to the college president and the board as it states in the Ed Code. This is the Academic Senates opportunity to host the conversations. The Senate’s recommendations will go to College Council who will communicate with other bodies about what they will do to meet the goals that have been set. Wieden noted that the Classified Senate is offering two workshops to classified so they will understand their roles in helping the college grow FTES.

Gerken said he does not see how this streamlines the work. Lema said we have not figured out many of the pieces still but will make every effort to make the process more efficient and not so burdensome on individuals and the work groups. Gerken responded that he thinks all this does is reduce participation.

Lema said it should not, and she gave the example of the inclusiveness and widespread participation in the Strategic Plan writing process.

Magee said he sees a sort of conflict of interest in this model. He said the Faculty Senate President was part of the group making this proposal but also is promoting it to the Senate Council. He said he would like to hear from the College President about the process and recommendations. Lema will invite him to the next meeting. Freytag reminded Council accreditation tasked us with evaluating our governance structure and processes and this Senate approved a resolution to do an evaluation of our college governance. So this group had the initial conversations and is now bringing a recommendation out to the college for vetting and feedback.

Mikolavich understands some trepidation since this is a big move. We could have just kept going as we were but we all know it is too much work and not very efficient.

Colber asked if a part-time representative could be on the College Council. Wieden explained the senate president and vice-president are on the College Council and represent all faculty – full-time and part-time.

Sporer commented that she was on an accreditation standard writing team and trying to describe our governance structure was a nightmare because it is so convoluted. She said this proposal is much cleaner and easier to understand and we need to give it a chance. She added that having work groups and not committees could encourage more people to participate since it won't be as big a commitment as being on a committee. The work groups would have a clear task or goal and will disband when the work is done.

Churchill said trying to change a large body's organizational structure is very difficult and he agrees with Magee that the college president should address the senate about this recommendation.

Barlow said this is probably the only time in our careers that we have the opportunity to change our culture and move the college towards a unified focus. He said the group that developed this proposal always came back to asking if the college president is going to lead this process.

Lema said at this time they are looking for support for the proposed College Council charge and membership, and the need for a research group.

Gerken said he would like to see a through line on how this impacts the workload. He said there needs to be a lot of effort to get buy-in.

9. UNIFORM EMPLOYMENT SELECTION GUIDE-EQUIVALENCIES

Lema reviewed with Council language proposed by FSCC in the Equivalency section of the Uniform Employment Selection Guide. The proposed changes clarify the guidelines and align it with regulations.

Council was in agreement with the proposed changes. Lema will bring it back to FSCC to bring it to the Governing Board.

10. NEXUS REPORT

Cheryl Wilcox, Nexus Coordinator, said this year the cohort had 9 new faculty. There were 7 in the fall and 2 in the spring. She said usually they join the next year's group for a year but since next year's group is so large she is proposing some changes. She said the 2 spring hires will continue.

Wilcox told Council, mentors are supposed to attend the Nexus meetings but not all of them do. Next year we will have 28 new hires so it will be difficult to find mentors for all of them. And mentors are not supposed to be part of a new hires evaluation team and this is a problem in small departments.

She proposes mentors be tenured faculty who are knowledgeable and have been participating in college-wide governance.

Following is the job description she proposes:

- Participate in one (fun) 2-hour Nexus meeting with lunch during Fall Flex week, meet the new cohort and mentee, and exchange contact information.
- Meet at least three times with the probationary faculty member during the course of the fall semester. One meeting should be before the evaluation process begins, and one meeting should be during the evaluation process. One meeting should be a "take your new faculty to work" day, where the new faculty member attends a campus-wide committee meeting with the mentor. A brief written summary, including the date and times of each meeting should be prepared and signed by both mentor and mentee. I suggest these meetings count as 1.5 hours of Flex for both faculty members.
- Meet at least twice with the new faculty member in the spring semester, at times to be determined by the mentor/mentee pair. Again, a brief written summary of meetings would be required, which would count as 1 hour of Flex credit.

- Participate in an end-of-year celebration with the cohort and say something nice about your mentee.

Vela said he's not sure this would allow community building. Wilcox said the new faculty would still spend a lot of time together but a meeting of all the mentors and mentees would be unwieldy. And she is trying to make being a mentor more doable for tenured faculty.

11. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Tina Dodson the Workforce Development Manager, told Council a Workforce Development Plan is required every 5 years. She explained last summer they did research and analysis to hire a consultant to help write the plan. She said they hired one that has a template for a plan and understands our college and goals. She said they started with looking at the last plan and also looked at the other District College plans to make sure they were aligned with those. She reviewed the planning process they used. First they gathered plans, data, interviews, etc. They had three stakeholder meetings. There were two for internal stakeholders and one for external stakeholders. As they were drafting the plan they vetted it at every step with the internal stakeholders.

Charlie Shi, Workforce Development Committee member said they developed a vision statement to project what a successful Workforce Development Program should be. They developed the mission statement to align with the college's mission statement.

And they developed guiding principles for making decisions about strategies that support their goals.

Dodson reviewed the following three goals they developed.

Goal 1: Develop and maintain responsive programs and curriculum that are data-driven, co-developed with industry partners and ensure success and career readiness for all students.

Goal 2: Increase alignment, coordination, and accessibility of WD/CTE programs and services with internal and external partners to ensure student success.

Goal 3: Evaluate and enhance existing college resources and infrastructure to support WD/CTE efforts to be innovative and responsive to industry while increasing student learning and success.

Dodson then reviewed with Council the implementation grid including assessing what we did and what we said we were going to do. She commented that the last plan was during a recession so this plan will look different.

Dodson said the data they gathered will be posted on their web page. She distributed copies of the full report and a survey of students to the Council. Lema thanked them for their work and said they should come back next year and report on their progress on their goals.

12. COLLEGE COUNCIL REPORT

Lema reported that College Council looked at DVC Procedure 1017.01 Reviewing the Mission Statement. College Council proposed revisions that line up with writing our strategic plan and what we have to do for accreditation. Also requests for reviewing the Mission Statement will go to the College Council instead of the Institutional Planning Committee.

It was MSC to approve the proposed changes to DVC Procedure 1017.01. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Dorado, Flores-Lowry, Vela, Machalinski, Magee, Holt, Ojermark, Gerken, Sporer, and Colber. No nays. No abstentions. Approved.

13. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,
Ann Langelier-Patton
Administrative Secretary*