



**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING**  
**March 30, 2010**  
**APPROVED**

**PRESENT:** Laurie Lema (President), Keith Mikolavich (Vice President), Marva DeLoach (Library), Rick Godinez (San Ramon Campus), Jane Brecha (Math/Computer Science), Ralph DePew (Physical Education, Athletics and Dance), John Thomas (English), Craig Gerken (Physical Science/Engineering), Peter Churchill (Business Education), Catherine Machalinski (Biology and Health sciences), Becky Opsata (Applied and Fine Arts), Buzz Holt (Social Sciences), Barbara Hewitt (Representative-at-Large), Lisa Orta (Faculty Development Coordinator), Raine Dougan (Counseling), Doug Dildine (Part-time Faculty Representative), Len Grzanka (Part-time Faculty Representative), Ann Patton (Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary)

**ABSENT:** Absent (ASDVC)

**GUESTS:** Susan Lamb, Patrick Leong, Lupe Dannels

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

**1. APPROVAL OF THE March 30, 2010 AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2010.**

**It was MSC to approve the agenda of March 30, 2010, 2009 as amended. All in favor. Approved.**

**It was MSC to approve minutes March 23, 2010 with corrections. All in favor. Approved.**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- A. Lema announced the State Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session is in San Francisco. She told Council to consider attending because there are many worthwhile breakouts scheduled including ones on accreditation.
- B. Lema reminded Council to be aware of the other State Academic Senate Institutes including the Leadership Institute in June.  
Holt questioned if the Senate should be spending funds on these sorts of activities at this time. Lema responded that attending Academic Senate Institutes are important to maintain professional engagement. The Senate budget is provided for faculty to attend Senate sponsored events. These are the types of things the Senate budget is meant for. She said historically at the very least the Senate funds have been used to send the president and vice president to important conferences and institutes. She said sending other faculty to these activities helps develop faculty leadership and is beneficial to the progress of the college. Mikolavich added that he attended the Leadership Institute last year and it was an invaluable experience in connecting with colleagues from other colleges.
- C. Lema announced the Faculty Senate Lecturer is scheduled on Wednesday April 21 from 12:30-1:30 in the PAC, and on Tuesday, April 27 at 7:00 p.m. in the PAC with a reception following. She said all Council

members should try to attend one of the presentations.

#### **4. APPOINTMENTS**

##### **Textbook Task Force**

Marina Crouse

##### **District-wide Study Abroad Committee**

Maria Giuli

Scott MacDougal

##### **Graduation Speaker**

Glenn Appell

##### **Enrollment Management**

Julie Walters

Pam Hawkins

**It was MSC to approve all the appointments listed above. All in favor. Approved.**

#### **5. PART-TIME FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN GRADUATION**

There was no discussion.

**The question was called to approve the motion to include in graduation ceremonies a maximum of 15 part-time faculty who are teaching during the spring semester of the ceremony. Each division can forward one part-time faculty. The remaining three can be from any of the divisions.**

**All in favor. Approved.**

This motion will take effect for the 2011 graduation ceremony.

#### **6. FLEX**

Lema explained the focus of this discussion is a follow up to recommendations made at a previous Senate meeting. She said it is listed as an action item if Council chooses to vote on a motion and/or to recommend this to Consultation.

Council viewed the scheduled mandatory and optional flex days for 2010-2011. Orta asked Council for feedback on first, the Mandatory Days and second, for activities on Optional Days.

Grzanka suggested limiting the all-college activities to the morning.

Orta said she would like to know if the Mandatory Days should be scheduled for faculty or for an all-college activity.

Lema questioned whether or not we should continue to have as many meetings as in the past during all college-day Mandatory Flex day. Originally all-college day was designed to include members from the broader college community, including classified and administration. However, at last year's all-college event there were only a handful of classified in attendance. In addition the meeting content was somewhat redundant. Mikolavich said we don't need to overhaul the Flex days but we need to maintain boundaries since Flex activities are led by Faculty. Lema summarized she is hearing from Council there is a need to keep the Mandatory Flex day condensed, on time and without duplication.

Council agreed all-college activities should not be scheduled on the Optional days because faculty have numerous other instructionally focused activities they want scheduled on those days. Machalinski added the all college-days are not really useful and faculty want activities that are meaningful to their work. She also suggested much of the information they are given from administration during all-college Flex activities could be distributed on a CD or online to save time and money.

Lema asked Council to consider assigning Flex oversight to the Faculty Development Committee.

Machalinski said departments need to think about what types of activities they would like to have for their areas. Gerken said if Orta provided a long list of activities faculty have identified they want, that would boost the case for faculty led activities.

**DeLoach moved the Faculty Senate Council reaffirm the role of the Faculty Development Committee to be the oversight body for approval of Flex activities. Churchill seconded the motion. The question was called to approve the motion. All in favor. Approved.**

Lema asked the Council to make suggestions about how the College President could have an all-college day that is not during Flex.

She said the Mandatory Day will be discussed in Consultation.

## **7. PROGRAM REVITALIZATION AND DISCONTINUANCE PROCEDURE**

Vazquez explained this procedure addresses when programs are in need of evaluation of their viability. At this point either revitalization or discontinuance based on information in Program Reviews is decided. He said this process is different than program deletion. He reviewed the process flowchart with Council.

Hewitt asked if this process is a duplication of the Program Deletion Process.

Vazquez explained the deletion process would dovetail with this process if it is determined a program will be deleted. He said there are times a program might go straight to deletion. For example, if it is a one faculty program and that faculty member retires and is not replaced, the program would not be able to continue.

Lema said when a program has been identified in need of this process, how can we ensure the college is doing its share to assist the program in making improvements. Council agreed faculty from outside the program should be included in this process.

Lema told Council to gather feedback on this item and bring it to the next meeting.

## **8. VICE-PRESIDENT OF INSTRUCTION**

Lamb informed Council she sent out a memo to Department Chairs asking for feedback on the organization for the data that was received for Program Reviews. She said there will also be a comprehensive evaluation of the Program Review Process. She said Department Chairs and Division Deans will have an open meeting on April 16 to discuss the process. Lamb requested Faculty Senate form a Task Force to go over the feedback and make recommendations to the Senate. She suggested including those that worked on the Task Force to develop the Program Review Process with the addition of a few other key people.

**Holt moved to form a Task Force as Lamb requested. The motion was seconded.**

Lamb asked Council if she has the Senate's support to begin the discussions. Council agreed to support her request.

## **9. TASK FORCE ON SCHEDULING**

This item was not discussed.

## **10. TUTORING ADVISORY COUNCIL**

A working group comprised of members of the Tutoring Advisory Council (TAC) and interested parties met several times this semester to draft a proposed charge for the TAC. Ted Walker, as acting chair of the TAC, was present as the Faculty Senate Council reviewed the proposed charge. Council discussed the order of the bulleted items in the charge. It was suggested to reverse the order of the bulleted items as instructional support is currently under the fourth bullet and should be the main focus of the charge.

Ted Walker said the last point is the entire purpose for this committee and the first three are more action items. Holt suggested the last bullet be placed at the top as a mission statement.

Freytag said it is important the chair and co-chair appointments come to the Faculty Senate for approval. Council members said they have not received any feedback on the membership. Thomas requested this be brought back after Spring break to allow more time for feedback.

Walker explained the rationale for the proposed membership is to promote true collaboration across working groups. He said decisions concerning budget are no longer in their charge so it will allow for less conflict in collaboration. He said he thinks a smaller membership might function better than a larger membership. The group considered how classified can participate. They discussed allowing a division to select either faculty, classified or manager representative.

Grzanka suggested including students. Walker responded that they were not confident that students would attend regularly but they would be invited as advisors.

Lema said this will be on the agenda after spring break.

## **11. BUDGET**

Lema told Council she attended part of the Budget Committee meeting the previous week and the survey responses are completed. She said she asked Leivas if the results would be made public. Leivas told her he will send it to anyone that requests the survey results but since several responses name individual people, he is concerned comments will be taken out of context.

Lema recommended Council members request the results and then they could distribute it to their divisions.

### **Holt moved to direct the Senate President to request the surveys on behalf of the Senate and distribute it to the Senate.**

Lema said there were about 90 respondents but results were not broken out by constituency. Orta said we need to request that the results be broken out because it shows the perceptions of the constituencies. She said the Budget Committee cannot touch many of the areas that were mentioned in responses but it does help give a more global view.

Godinez asked if we can expand the charge of the Committee. Lema explained we had agreed during our accreditation work last semester that the college will change its budget allocation process. Over the next three years there are three stages of this process.

Dougan asked if the Budget Committee does not deal with the whole budget, why did the survey cover the whole budget. Lema said she thinks respondents saw the opportunity to comment on broader budget related issues.

Mikolavich said he asked Leivas to formally ask the Integration Council to be involved in the Budget Committee discussions.

## **12. INTEGRATED PLANNING**

Council viewed DVC Procedure 1010.01 Integrated Planning. Lema explained she met with Despina Prapavessi, faculty representative on the Integration Planning Committee, and they reviewed and revised the flowchart of the Integrated Planning process. She said the changes do not reflect a change in the process but rather their attempt to make the flowchart more clear. She said the original diagram still has some areas that are not clear. She said she thinks validation should be with Program Review in the box on the flowchart, and wondered why Program Review is off to the side. She also said the line between college plans and resource allocation goes both ways but it appears college plans have a separate connection to resource allocation. She said she it is unclear whether the annual reports are from the Program Reviews or something else. Council viewed the revised diagram. Lema said she realizes it still needs some work.

Dougan asked how the college plans fit in.

Lema gave an example that came up at a meeting she recently attended. There was a suggestion in order to save money that the college should update software rather than replacing faculty computers. Ben Seaberry informed the group it is actually more expensive to replace software on numerous computers than to replace them. This is an example of the College Technology Plan informing Integrated Planning. The Program Review content was used to help write the Technology Master Plan. Recommendations from the Technology Plan influenced the budget

allocation for faculty computers.

Lema stressed the need to continually reiterate and emphasize Program Review in the Integration Planning Process. She said student learning also needs to be reiterated throughout the process.

### **13. BASIC SKILLS**

Patrick Leong and Lupe Dannels told Council they put together a Task Force that is planning a 3-5 day student success institute. The institute is scheduled after Memorial Day, and may be held at SRC. They are calling for participation across campus. They want to get the word out to encourage attendance. Participants can receive upper division credits. They have also invited a reading apprentice program to the campus.

Lema told Council students with basic skills needs are enrolled college-wide in classes and are not limited to Basic skills classes. As a college we need to broaden the college wide conversation about basic skills.

Leong said they want to remind everyone they are looking for innovative projects to fund under the BSI project.

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

*Respectfully submitted,  
Ann Langelier-Patton  
Administrative Secretary*