



**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 7, 2010  
APPROVED**

**PRESENT:** Laurie Lema (President), Keith Mikolavich (Vice President), Marva DeLoach (Library), Rick Godinez (San Ramon Campus), Katrina Keating (Math/Computer Science), Peter Churchill (Business Education), Tom Barber (English), Catherine Machalinski (Biology and Health sciences), Steve Ward (Physical Education, Athletics and Dance), Becky Opsata (Applied and Fine Arts), Buzz Holt (Social Sciences), Craig Gerken (Physical Science/Engineering)  
Nicole Hess-Diestler (Representative-at-Large), Doug Dildine (Part-time Faculty Representative), Len Grzanka (Part-time Faculty Representative), Ann Patton (Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary)  
**ABSENT:** Lisa Orta (Faculty Development Coordinator), Counseling Representative (TBD), ASDVC Representative (TBD)  
**GUESTS:** Susan Lamb, Raine Dougan

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

**1. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 7, 2010 AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 24, 2010.**

**It was MSC to approve the agenda of September 7, 2010. All in favor. Approved.**  
**It was MSC to approve the minutes of August 24, 2010 with corrections. All in favor. Approved.**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**3. COUNCIL COMMENT**

A. On behalf of the Applied and Fine Arts Division Opsata requested the Council reopen discussion on DVC Procedure 4004.01 Attendance which includes a provision about Field Trips. She explained this procedure states students have to notify their instructor one week in advance which is not enough time. In addition, Opsata explained that instructors in some disciplines design tests that would be time consuming to administer as a make-up because they include multi-media. These types of tests cannot be taken at the make-up testing center and would require faculty to spend an exorbitant amount of time re-creating them. The make-up testing center cannot accommodate giving these types of tests. She said her division recommends extending the notification requirement period and developing a common request form. Opsata distributed to council a sample form. She requested the procedure be placed on a future FSC agenda.

B. Gerken said his division wants more clarity on what the Box2A process will look like.

C. Dildine said he wanted to make people aware and give his support on behalf of faculty (especially on behalf of online instructors) on the need for expediency in upgrading WebAdvisor to allow faculty to make drops online and submit census rosters electronically. Lamb added this is being worked on and an upgrade should be available in the spring.

**4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

A. Ward announced the Hall of Fame Induction Dinner is scheduled on February 23, 2011. He said it is a really nice affair and there are often past honorees in attendance who have gone on to some prestigious careers.

D. Lema announced Dr. Walters Retirement Reception is scheduled on September 28 at 3:30.

E. Lema announced the Dinner Theater is scheduled on October 15 for the opening night of *Cabaret*.

F. Lema thanked those Council members who turned in donation cards for the Faculty Senate Voluntary Fund and The Legal Defense Fund. She encouraged all Council members to do the same.

G. Lema announced she needs help finding representatives for the Tutoring Advisory Committee from the areas of Biological and Health Sciences, Business Education, Math and Engineering, and SRC.

## **5.APPOINTMENTS**

### **Institutional Planning Committee**

Judy Myers, English

### **Tutoring Advisory Committee**

Kellie Conde – Counseling/Student Support Services Division

Maria Giuili - Social Sciences Division

### **Student Learning Outcomes Committee**

Claudia Martinez - Applied and Fine Arts Division

Kristen Colchico – Biological and Health Sciences

### **DGC**

Tedmond Munoz - SRVC Rep

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

## **6. ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP REPORT**

Mikolavich started the discussion with some general comments. He said he tried to read the report from an outsider's perspective, from the accrediting commission's vantage point given the show cause judgment, our response to the show cause, our subsequent probation status, and our response to our probation. From this perspective, the report successfully outlines the **flurry of activity** this campus has been engaged in to address some outlying, mainly decision-making and planning issues.

Mikolavich said he recalls the commission's visit to the newly formed Integration Council in fall 2009 before it put the college on probation status, and he distinctly remembers the commission being both impressed with its scope and very cautious about its ambitious goals, suggesting that it would be a difficult effort to sustain. The report seems to confirm this as competing efforts (see below) went into our so-called planning efforts. We need to clarify our processes for input, define what we mean by input, and explain the basis of privileging some input while ignoring other input, and explaining *why* some input is privileged and why other input is ignored. In other words, the decision making needs to be less arbitrary seeming or the flurry of activity will soon become absurd and unsustainable.

Mikolavich said while quantitative data from the college-wide survey is alluded to in the report, he sees no incorporation of qualitative data, individual written comments which would better tell DVC's story. He remembers the advice we received on writing the show cause report emphasized getting across our story, which should come from anecdotal as well as qualitative evidence.

Opsata said this is the second time she has read the report since the August 3<sup>rd</sup> draft, and it has greatly improved.

Lema reminded Council our task is to assess the follow-up report for accuracy or if anything is left out. College Council is tasked to accept or not accept the report after it has been disseminated and widely reviewed by the college community.

Freytag said in Recommendation 1 under Resolution of the Recommendation, the last sentence in the last paragraph is not entirely accurate regarding significant progress on the Strategic Directions Action Steps. He said the progress should be clarified.

Mikolavich said in Recommendation 3 under Resolution of the Recommendation, paragraphs 10 and 11 where it describes the process used for staff reduction is confusing.

Mikolavich said in Recommendation 7 under Resolutions, the third bullet under paragraph 2, there were specific comments about committees made in the surveys. He feels the response is problematic because the draft Follow-up Report states there were no specific comments in the surveys about committees which is inaccurate. The survey results were used as though there was group consensus within the college committees about changes to the charge, function and membership proposals. Mikolavich said this paragraph ignores what actually happened in the Integration Council.

Keating commented the survey did not provide any place to make specific recommendations for committees so she added comments in other sections of the survey.

Lema added that she double checked the survey comments and there were specific comments made about committees and agreed with Keating said, comments were in a general survey comment area.

DeLoach said some survey respondents could have been talking about more than just the college-wide committees and that could skew the conclusions.

Hess-Diestler questioned why it matters to include a statement that a high number of respondents felt “welcome” at the Budget Committee meetings.

Freytag commented in regards to Recommendation 8, the original report talked about the “fairness” of funding between the colleges and he does not see that in this report. He asked if it is because everyone feels the new budget model is “fair”. Machalinski added that she thinks maybe the report should include an explanation that the new budget model is not being followed exactly for the first few years due to the FTES that DVC is “giving” to CCC to help them adopt to the new budget.

Lema said she will take these comments back to College Council.

## **7. INTEGRATION COUNCIL REPORT**

Mikolavich told Council the Integration Council met the previous Friday and they discussed the changes to the charge of the IC but they have concerns about their input to the process for making the changes. He said he realizes we need to trust each other and there are timeline issues but we should have processes in place for these decisions. He said many of the IC members feel their charge has been reduced. They thought it was a central body but the proposed charge changes that. He suggested the charge should include language that suggests the importance of Program Review in all planning processes on campus, and centrality of the IC doing the analysis of Program Review so that when it makes recommendations to the Budget Committee and the College Council it will keep the Integration Council’s integrity. He said it is the only body on campus that is a dialoguing body where faculty, classified and managers come together. He said he thinks the decisions that were made over the summer appear to undermine the charge of the IC.

## **8. COLLEGE COMMITTEE HANDBOOK**

Lema said the discussion concerning the IC leads into will move from item 7 into the item. She suggested Council begin the discussion about the proposed College Committee handbook changes with global observations about the proposed changes.

Freytag asked if the decisions on the proposed changes were based on the college-wide survey or based mainly on the committees’ self-assessments. Lema responded the committee self-assessment survey was given more weight. Mikolavich added that President Walters told him they first looked at the Accreditation Standards, then the committees’ self-assessment surveys results, and then the college community survey results.

Gerken said it seems that much of the IC charge was moved to Integrated Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. He said he is concerned we are taking a committee that guarantees all constituencies can contribute their perspective and transferring much of their charge to a body that is more narrow in its experience.

Mikolavich suggested the IP and IE be sub-committees of the IC. This would keep the integrity of the IC and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee could then make more informed decisions. He said it could also eliminate the

perception of too many committees. Machalinski said we are still doing things the same way we always have such as over the summer work when faculty are not on campus, and lack of process. She said it is not ok and maybe this occurrence should be in the report. She said the process for working on the handbook should start over and include more people.

Mikolavich said there has been some acknowledgement that a mistake was made and he agrees, but thinks we can work on what has been done. He has heard some say not following a process is undermining our accreditation but he thinks we can adopt a process from now on.

Machalinski said she understands the reason there was a rush is because of Accreditation but we should not be pushed. She said she does not believe we would lose accreditation if this is not completed by the accreditation deadline.

Opsata said the changes make the IC into a ranking body and that was not the original intent.

Holt said this sort of thing isn't any different than when he started teaching 35 years ago. And because history keeps repeating itself, faculty have to always be vigilant and ready to defend their rights and liberties.

Lema confirmed she is hearing this body is concerned about process and asked what they want from this meeting.

Lamb said she is hearing what people are saying but she has been through accreditation training and cautioned the accreditation is serious and she asks that people keep that in mind.

Gerken suggests we approach this not as a document that was just handed down but that we have been asked to make recommendations and should proceed forward.

Churchill asked, do we make a stand and say stop changing things when faculty are not here. That could cause an adverse reaction from the commission. He asked if the changes are so bad that we cannot go forward with them.

Mikolavich said we do have to think who and what is threatening our accreditation.

Freytag said he thinks the changes are significant and need to be addressed. He asked how do we constructively respond at this point? He pointed out we can rewrite it ourselves but it is a lot of work.

Machalinski suggested to propose a task force to work on this.

Lema presented some options for how to proceed including forming a task force, having each committee be responsible for its review and recommendations, or both. Freytag suggested before they form a task force, Lema and Mikolavich should meet with Walters and Wieden to discuss possible solutions.

Lema reminded Council the committees will operate under their original charges until there is agreement on any proposed changes.

Lema took a straw poll of the Council on what direction they should take. Lema asked the Council to identify their preference for one of the following:

1. Don't respond to the proposed Committee Handbook changes but rather develop a process first.
2. Respond to the proposed changes and later develop a college process to review the survey results and determine how to use the results to determine committee changes.
3. Work on developing a process agreement in conjunction with working on the proposed changes to the Committee Handbook.

The straw poll majority supported not working at this time on the proposed college committee handbook changes but rather to develop a process first.

## 9. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

There was no discussion.

**The question was called to approve the motion to endorse the action steps defined in the motion to support the Senate selected strategic directions for 2010-12. All in favor. Approved.**

## 10. SEARCH FOR THE NEXT DVC PRESIDENT

Lema explained she asked Freytag and DeLoach to develop a list of desirable qualifications based on the discussion at the previous Council meeting. Freytag said he and DeLoach started with reviewing the minimum qualifications to determine what should be included in the desirables beyond the minimum qualifications. He said next they reviewed the list of four key values the Council selected at the last meeting and wrote them into desirable qualifications for a starting point to this discussion.

Council reviewed the following desirables:

The Faculty Senate wants a president who has

- 1) taught at the collegiate level for at least five years (full time?)
- 2) a demonstrated respect for and understanding of the *role of the Faculty Senate*, in particular the 10+1 academic and professional matters that are under its purview;
  - how do we measure this?
- 3) a keen understanding of the accreditation process and demonstrated ability to orchestrate a sustainable effort to continually improve the institution;
  - knowledge of and experience with the accreditation standards and processes
- 4) a commitment to *collaboration* with and between faculty and staff
- 5) Budget experience: understanding of how “big” budgets work,

Grzanka said they should know how to increase revenue sources through fundraising and marketing.

Dildine said in light of the new budget model we need someone who can be like a CFO.

Machalinski said she does not think sustainability is a priority for desirable qualities. In response to Dildine’s comment, she said we don’t need a budget person necessarily but we want someone with an understanding of budgets.

Lema reminded Council we won’t be able to find someone who has all of these desirable qualifications equally, however, we can look for the most significant qualities that we believe the college needs.

Hess-Diestler asked why faculty should include collaboration with and between staff in their recommended desirables. Lema responded that they should be included because all constituencies need to have an understanding of faculty roles.

Lema confirmed Council’s support for the following desirable qualification. Faculty wants a president that has been a faculty member with teaching experience; has an understanding of the Academic Senate purview; can help lead the college with ongoing accreditation work; has a collaborative focus; and has experience and understanding of how large budgets work.

**Hess-Diestler moved to endorse these five desirable qualities and empower the faculty representatives on the hiring committee to work on them for presentation to the Hiring committee. Motion was seconded.**

**The question was called. All in favor. Approved.**

## 11. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Ward, Opsata, Freytag, Holt and Gerken reviewed the following proposed procedures and reported to Council.

### C&I 4002 Attendance

Opsata said she is not happy about out of state trips not being paid by the district but otherwise they endorse the proposed changes.

**It was MSC to approve. All in favor. Approved.**

### SS 3024 Open Enrollment

Ward asked if Admissions and Records can actually monitor and enforce this.

Lema recommended it include faculty approval before the dean. She said that is the current practice. Council agreed.

Gerken said he thought it was not possible for a student to enroll simultaneously in two of the same sections.

Lamb clarified it is a new state regulation aimed mainly at non-credit classes. She said the system is set up to prevent this in credit classes.

**It was MSC to approve SS 3024 with the recommended changes. All in favor. Approved.**

### BP 3022 Open, Multiple and Overlapping Enrollment

Hess-Diestler explained this would prevent a situation such as when an instructor is teaching varying levels of a course at the same time, a student cannot be enrolled in more than one level at a time.

**It was MSC to approve BP 3022. All in favor. Approved**

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

No report.

## **13. FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS**

Council began reviewing the Senate Bylaws for changes and updates.

Keating said they do not include a definition of a quorum for the Council but does include it for the Senate standing committees. She said it also does not include how many votes carry a motion in the Council.

Lema suggested the minimum amount of an expenditure out of the Senate Voluntary Fund should be increased from \$50 to \$100. Council agreed.

Lema said she will note these suggestions and they will continue reviewing the bylaws at future meetings.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,  
Ann Langelier-Patton  
Administrative Secretary*