

**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING  
NOVEMBER 29, 2011  
APPROVED**

**PRESENT:** Laurie Lema (President), Beth McBrien (Vice President), Rick Godinez (San Ramon Campus), John Freytag (Corresponding Secretary), Ed Trujillo (Applied and Fine Arts), Tom Barber (English), Marva DeLoach (Library), Theresa Flores-Lowry (Physical Education, Athletics and Dance), Katrina Keating (Math/CompSci), Buzz Holt (Social Sciences), Craig Gerken (Physical Science/Engineering), Peter Churchill (Business Education), Catherine Machalinski (Biology and Health Sciences), Lisa Orta (Faculty Development Coordinator), Nicole Hess-Diestler (Representative-at-Large)  
Maria Dorado (Counseling), Len Grzanka (Part-time Faculty Representative), Vanessa Prajitno, ASDVC Representative, Ann Patton (Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary)  
**ABSENT:** Doug Dildine (Part-time Faculty Representative)  
**GUESTS:** Bill Oye

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

**1. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 29, 2011 AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 8, 2011 AND NOVEMBER 15, 2011.**

**It was MSC to approve the agenda of November 29, 2011 as amended. All in favor. Approved.**

The minutes of November 8, 2011 and November 15, 2011 were not ready for review.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**3. COUNCIL COMMENT**

Keating said her department is frustrated there is only one available Optional Flex Day in January 2012. The other Optional Flex Day has been declared a focus day and faculty have been told they could not schedule any other workshops that day. She said there is not enough time to do all the workshops her department wants on the one day available so she is booking a workshop on the other Optional Day.

Keating is concerned the decision was made to have a focus Flex day and exclude other workshops on that day, without a vote of the Senate Council.

**4. APPOINTMENTS**

There were no appointments.

Lema informed Council if they take care of all pending items at this meeting, a meeting during finals week will not be necessary. Lema asked Council for approval to make appointments for Program Review Validation teams in the interim. Council agreed.

## 5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Hess-Diestler announced the DVC Drama Department production of “Stand and Deliver” is opening this Friday, December 2. She said it is the drama department’s contribution to addressing the achievement gap. It is only is running this weekend and next, and opening night is already sold out.

Lema said it was disappointing the dinner theater had to be cancelled because there were not enough tickets still available.

Hess-Diestler informed Council the first production of the spring semester is “The Skriker” directed by Ed Trujillo.

Lema told Council two faculty are needed to serve on Program Review Validation for both Administrative and Student Services Program reviews.

## 6. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (Appendix A)

Bill Oye reviewed the changes he made to the Academic Integrity Policy according to the recommendations made at the last Council meeting.

**Keating moved to approve the Academic Integrity Policy with the incorporated changes. All in favor. Approved.**

## 7. GE VOTE

Lema informed Council the results of the vote on the GE pattern were to be announced at this meeting but after she received several calls about the process, she decided not to count the votes until she discussed the issues with Council. She explained one issue that came up is the information packet was not attached to the ballot.

Machalinski said she was concerned it could affect the vote since the information was not included.

Holt commented that you can’t make people vote and you can’t insist on an informed electorate. Freytag said the information was communicated through email and it was done in the way it was thought to be intended. However, we need to be very clear in the future for elections. He said the question is, were the attempts to communicate the information adequate.

Lema reviewed the timeline for the information that went out.

Aug. 30 – Oct. 8 Faculty Senate Council and Curriculum Committee worked jointly on the GE information document which was reflected in the minutes. Minutes were widely disseminated.

Oct. 8th Information document as an attachment emailed to all faculty as high importance.

Nov. 10th Information document as an attachment emailed again to all faculty as high importance.

Nov. 14-15th Paper ballots were distributed to all faculty.

Nov. 18th A maximum of 10 ballots had been submitted.

Nov. 18th Paper copies of the GE document were distributed in faculty mailboxes.

Nov. 18 noon Information document emailed in the body of the email as high importance.

Nov. 23 Emailed all faculty a reminder of the GE vote deadline and included the ballot information in the body of the email as high importance.

Holt said since no one can think of an easy solution and we have spent a lot of time on this, we should count the votes.

**Holt moved to count the votes with no further delays. Motion seconded.**

Lema asked Council if how many responded will make a difference in whether or not we count the votes.

McBrien said that is a separate issue.

Freytag said the question is if faculty voted and were not informed. He said he was probably one of the first ten ballots returned as well as two other Council members ballots so that would mean there were seven votes that there is a question as to whether or not they were adequately informed.

Keating said we gave faculty ample chances and there is a point we have to put the onerous on the voter. However, she would consider a different position if the vote spread was within seven.

Hess-Diestler said this vote was a big issue and those that were not aware were not listening. She said the Senate Council kept our integrity throughout the process.

**Diestler called the question.**

Lema told council this needs to be an emergency item as it was not an action item on the agenda.

**It was MSC to make the motion to vote on proceeding with counting the ballots an emergency item. All in favor with one abstention.**

**All in favor with 3 abstentions to proceed with counting the ballots.**

Council agreed by consensus that all ballots received after the noon deadline are invalidated.

Lema said volunteers are needed to help count ballots.

## **8. SCHEDULING TASK FORCE (Appendix C)**

Lema shared with Council a draft evaluation questionnaire to evaluate the work of the Scheduling Task Force. She wants feedback from Council. Then after she and McBrien will finalize the language.

Holt questioned wasn't this supposed to be sent to all faculty.

Lema asked Council if are all the categories of respondents listed are accurate.

Holt thinks it should go to all faculty because their perception is important.

Lema asked for a straw vote on whether or not the survey should go to all faculty. The majority of Council said it should go to all faculty.

Gerken said whether or not it goes to all faculty or whoever else, depends on the content.

Orta suggested the demographics question should be at the end of the survey.

Lema reviewed the draft questions with Council.

1. The Scheduling Task Force adhered to the "values for scheduling" that was provided as a guideline to departments.
2. The schedule supported the Faculty Senate resolution to ensure that academic programs weren't discontinued.
3. The schedule supported the senate resolution to ensure broad curriculum offerings.
4. The schedule changes produced a schedule that best serves our students with the available funding.
5. The Scheduling Task Force work contributed to an increase in my understanding about factors that impact scheduling. (FTEF/FTES, Productivity etc.)
6. The Scheduling Task Force work contributed to a culture of establishing an iterative process concerning the development of the schedule of classes.

7. The process and the product of the Scheduling Task Force was better than across the board cuts proposed by the administration.
8. We should continue to use a Faculty Senate Scheduling Task Force in consultation with management to develop and recommend the schedule of classes.
9. How has the task force affected your department/area interface with administration concerning the schedule of your classes?
10. What worked best about the Scheduling Task Force process?
11. What should be improved in the process?
12. What were the strengths and limitations of the assigned task force membership?

Barber asked if the responses to these questions would help the task force do their job any better? Holt, who was a member of the Task Force said he does see it as helpful. He would like to find a better way to inform faculty about what the Task Force is doing as they are doing it.

McBrien said she does not think it would be helpful. If this is going out to give people a chance to say how they felt about the process, or to find out how much they know about the process is not really what the survey questions are asking. Her concern is this is not going to inform people and who is going to say something worked well if they lost classes. They will be responding with their feelings from their areas and not look at the college as a whole.

Machalinski said the survey should include information on how we did scheduling before the Task Force was formed if we send it to all faculty. She suggested separate surveys for those that were in on the process and one for all other faculty. She also said it should have fewer questions. Freytag cautioned Council that the survey was requested by the administration and he thinks this may be a way to gather evidence for accreditation to keep or eliminate the task force, so the survey should only have questions that focus on the information they want.

Holt agrees with the idea to have two surveys. He said the open ended questions should go to all faculty.

Orta said it should be clear on the survey who is requesting the information.

Council discussed which groups of people the survey should go to from the list included on the draft. Council agreed it should go to Scheduling Task Force Faculty, Scheduling Task Force Management, Faculty Senate Council, Department Chairs, Area Coordinators, and Division Deans.

Council then discussed how much information on the process should be included in the survey. Keating said we have to ask ourselves who is our audience? Is it those that don't pay attention or those that do and have issues with the process? We need to ask how we can make the process more transparent. She said the information should be available but not part of the survey.

Lema suggested we start with an internal survey and then determine if we need one to go out to all faculty.

Lema asked Council if they were ok with her working with McBrien, Godinez and Holt on the final survey.

**Machalinski moved to authorize Lema to work with Godinez, McBrien, and Holt on the final survey and send it out. Based on the survey results, the Council will decide if a survey should go out in the spring semester to all faculty Motion was seconded. All in favor.**

**Approved.**

## **9. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Orta explained to Council the budget for Staff Development in the last four years has spiraled down. She said we used to get money from the state and it was allocated to the constituencies based on a formula. The state cut the funding and the District started allocating money to the colleges for Staff Development and each college was to use the money as they saw fit. The funds were allocated out with the same formula we had been using. DVC has never had discussions

about the uses of the money. Then, the other two colleges were not spending their money so the Chancellor cut the allocations in half. At this time, DVC receives \$25,000. The Chancellor's intention was the money would be allocated out to the constituencies for Professional Development activities. However, last year, the money was used to pay her reassign time as the Staff Development Coordinator. So we now have a coordinator and no budget. She also said she did not find out about this year's budget until November 7.

Barber asked if we get any Professional Development money from the college. Orta responded that we don't but the other two colleges fund the Staff Development staffing out of their general budget.

Machalinski said we should write a motion that says if we are not funding the Staff Development Office like the other two colleges than we won't have Staff Development and the college will be out of compliance.

Freytag agreed we need a resolution but it needs to be thoroughly thought out.

Lema suggests Council put their thoughts into a resolution and finalize it in early spring.

## **10. VP OF INSTRUCTION**

The Vice President was not in attendance therefore there was no report.

## **11. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Lema distributed copies of an article from The Nation about philanthropists and technology in education.

## **12. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,  
Ann Langelier-Patton  
Administrative Secretary*

**DIABLO VALLEY COLLEGE**  
**ACADEMIC DISHONESTY REPORT FORM INTEGRITY POLICY**

Diablo Valley College is committed to creating an environment where student achievement is championed and celebrated. Because the college values academic integrity as an essential component of academic excellence, students are expected to be truthful and ethical in their academic work. Commitment to academic integrity is the responsibility of every student and faculty member at Diablo Valley College.

Faculty and students come from a variety of backgrounds and cultures, giving rise to different understandings of moral and ethical behavior. Faculty should clearly state well-defined standards to reduce uncertainty and clarify expectations.

Academic dishonesty is defined as: an act of deception in which a student claims credit for the work or effort of another person or uses unauthorized materials or fabricated information in any academic work. Academic dishonesty is a violation of the DVC 'Student Code of Conduct' and will not be tolerated. Academic dishonesty diminishes the quality of scholarship at Diablo Valley College and hurts the majority of students who conduct themselves honestly.

Acts of academic dishonesty include, but are not limited to, the following:

**CHEATING** – Unauthorized copying or collaboration on a test or assignment, or the use or attempted use of unauthorized materials;

**TAMPERING** – Altering or interfering with evaluation instruments and documents;

**FABRICATION** – Falsifying experimental data or results, inventing research or laboratory data or results for work not done, or falsely claiming sources not used; **fabricating or falsifying documentation to try to change a course grade;**

**PLAGIARISM** – Representing someone else's words, ideas, artistry, or data as one's own, including copying another person's work (including published and unpublished material, and material from the Internet) without appropriate referencing, presenting someone else's opinions and theories as one's own, or working jointly on a project, then submitting it as one's own;

**ASSISTING** – Assisting another student in an act of academic dishonesty, such as taking a test or doing an assignment for someone else, changing someone's grades or academic records, or inappropriately distributing exams to other students.

## ACADEMIC ~~DISHONESTY REPORT FORM~~ INTEGRITY POLICY

I. When an act of academic dishonesty comes to an instructor's attention, the following procedures shall be followed:

1. Collect evidence and document the incident,
2. Permit the accused student an opportunity to explain, and
3. Advise the student of possible penalties.

II. If there is clear evidence of a violation of the DVC Academic Integrity Policy, the instructor may:

1. Inform the student of the academic penalty which may include one or more of the following:
  - a. A reduced score on the assignment or exam;
  - b. A score of zero or "F" on the assignment or exam;
  - c. A reduced grade in the course;
  - d. An "F" in the course **for repeated or multiple violations of DVC Academic Integrity Policy within that course during a semester;**
  - e. Removal from class for one or two class days as outlined in the Education Code (section 76032) and referred to in the "Removal by Instructor" section of the Student Code of Conduct

2. Inform the student of the right to appeal the academic penalty, in cases of mistake, fraud, bad faith or incompetence. (Refer to the "Student Appeals for Grade Changes" procedure outlined in the DVC catalog for more information.) However, the removal from class (see 1.e. above) is not subject to appeal.

3. Inform the student of recommendations for further action which may include:
  - a. No further action, or
  - b. Disciplinary Review with Dean of Student Life, including education about academic integrity;
  - c. In the case of more egregious violations of academic integrity, a recommendation that the Dean of Student Life consider suspension **of a semester or more** or expulsion. (If the Dean does not follow a recommendation to suspend or expel the student, the faculty member will receive written notification of the reasoning. In the case of not following recommendations 3a or 3b, verbal notification will suffice.)

4. Send a "Report of Academic Dishonesty" form to the Dean of Student Life. The Dean will keep this report in a confidential file for three years. This will help identify repeat patterns of academic dishonesty, and generally a second offense will result in long-term suspension from the college. (If the Dean chooses not to assign long term suspension, due to extenuating circumstances, the faculty member will receive written notification.) This report may only be shared with the student to whom it pertains and with those within the college who have a legitimate educational need for the information as determined by the Dean. After serious consideration of the instructor's recommendation, the Dean will address violations of academic integrity in accordance with the Student Code of Conduct.

*Diablo Valley College gratefully acknowledges that it has freely borrowed, modified and used words, phrases, sentences, and ideas found in similar documents of the following educational institutions, listed in alphabetical order:  
CSU San Marcos \* Oregon State University \* Southwestern Oregon Community College  
UC Santa Barbara \* University of Charleston \* University of Colorado at Boulder \* University of Maine*

# ACADEMIC DISHONESTY REPORT FORM

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone/Ext: \_\_\_\_\_  
Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept./Division: \_\_\_\_\_  
Student(s) Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID#: \_\_\_\_\_  
Term & Year: \_\_\_\_\_ Reporting Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Academic Dishonesty (refer to the DVC Academic Integrity Policy for definitions of the following terms):

Cheating     Tampering     Fabrication  
 Plagiarism     Assisting     Other

Summary of the incident (include date, time, place, evidence; attach separate document if needed):

Check box if copy of evidence is attached to this report.

Student response if any:

Instructor's action(s):  Reduced score on assignment     zero or "F" on assignment  
 reduced grade in the course  
 "F" in course (for repeated or multiple violations within that course during a semester)  
 removal from class     other \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor's recommendation(s) for further action (if any):  No further action  
 Disciplinary Review including education about academic integrity  
 Suspension or expulsion     other \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*(Note: The student's signature is not an admission of guilt. The student's signature indicates that s/he is aware of the instructor's action or recommendation for further action, and that s/he is aware of the right to appeal action(s) taken by instructor as outlined in the DVC catalog in the "Student Appeals for Grade Changes" section.)*

Recommend copies for Dean of Student Life, Instructor and Student

Academic Integrity Policy And ADRF Rev 111711 (2) 090804  
<http://www.dvc.edu/org/info/policies/pdfs/ADRF.pdf>

## Appendix B

Below is the timeline with the information that was provided to educate faculty about the issues related to this vote and to assist them with this important decision.

Aug. 30 – Oct. 8 Faculty Senate Council and Curriculum Committee worked jointly on the GE information document which was reflected in the minutes. Minutes were widely disseminated.

Oct. 8th I emailed faculty the GE document. The email was listed as high importance and titled GE Vote, CCC Task Force on Student Success, UF & Senate Symposium.

Nov. 10th I emailed faculty the GE document. The email was listed as high importance and titled Vote on DVC GE Requirements.

Nov. 14-15th Paper ballots were mailed out to faculty.

Nov. 18th A maximum of 10 ballots had been submitted.

Nov. 18th Paper copies of the GE document were distributed in faculty mailboxes.

Nov. 18 noon Ann Patton sent faculty an email listed as high importance and titled IMPORTANT GE VOTE INFORMATION. The document was in the body of the email. It was not provided as an attachment.

Nov. 23 I emailed faculty a reminder of the GE vote deadline and included the ballot information in the text. The email was listed as high importance and titled GE Vote Deadline and Information.

The Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate Council joint GE vote ballot information document has been widely distributed to the faculty multiple times in multiple ways over the last 5 weeks. Although the ballots went out separately from the information document, there has been a concerted effort to get the word out and make the information available to faculty. Ultimately it is the responsibility of faculty to read their emails and mail, discuss the issues with their colleagues, curriculum and senate reps and then decide how they will vote.

---

**From:** Lema, Laurie

**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2011 1:41 PM

**To:** 02-All Faculty (Full Time)@DVC

**Cc:** Garcia, Peter; Lamb, Susan; Wieden, Ted; Organ, Wayne; Moore, A'kilah

**Subject:** GE Vote, CCC Task Force on Student Success, UF & Senate Symposium

**Importance:** High

Dear Faculty

PLEASE READ – THERE ARE VERY IMPORTANT UPCOMING DECISIONS THAT WILL IMPACT STUDENTS, FACULTY, DVC AND CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

**DVC GE AA REQUIREMENTS – A DVC Faculty Vote**

**DVC faculty must now decide to either adopt a DVC GE pattern with 18 units or a DVC GE pattern that may have more than 18 units.** In the event that the DVC faculty votes for a GE pattern that may have more than 18 units, a broader discussion as to what specific additional courses would be required will ensue. This vote will take place in November. Attached is a document developed jointly by Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate Council that outlines the current context and recent developments that contributed to this vote, the impacts of the vote and the DVC courses that meet the four general education categories.

If you have not yet begun conversations with colleagues in your disciplines and departments, I urge you to begin the conversation immediately. Your Faculty Senate Council representatives are knowledgeable about the issues concerning this vote and can be contacted to provide further information. If you are interested in expressing a position, concern or commentary about the GE vote, please write and submit an article for the next FORUM publication. Ann Patton will send out a notice with the next FORUM submission deadline and publication date.

**Laurie Lema**  
President, Faculty Senate  
Speech Professor

---

**From:** Lema, Laurie  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2011 4:05 PM  
**To:** 02-All Faculty@DVC  
**Cc:** Patton, Ann; Lamb, Susan; Moore, A'kilah; Organ, Wayne  
**Subject:** Vote on DVC GE Requirements  
**Attachments:** General Education At DVC Ballot Information.doc  
**Importance:** High

Dear Faculty

**DVC faculty must now decide to either adopt a DVC GE pattern with 18 units or a DVC GE pattern that may have more than 18 units.** In the event the DVC faculty votes for a GE pattern that may have more than 18 units, a broader discussion as to which specific additional courses would be required will ensue. Attached is the document (previously emailed to you October 8th) that was jointly developed by the Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate Council. The document outlines the current context and recent developments that contributed to this vote, the impacts of the vote and the DVC courses that meet the four general education categories.

If you have not yet made your decision about the DVC GE pattern, I urge you to immediately begin conversations with colleagues in your disciplines and departments. Your Faculty Senate Council representatives are knowledgeable about the issues concerning this vote and can be contacted to provide further information. If you are interested in faculty positions and commentary concerning the GE vote, read the last FORUM publication sent out via email from Ann Patton on Friday, November 4th.

Faculty will have two weeks to vote. Ballots will be placed in faculty mailboxes in the main mail room by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, November 14<sup>th</sup> and must be returned to the Faculty Senate Office by November 29<sup>th</sup> at noon. Ballot results will be announced no later than November 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Laurie Lema**  
President, Faculty Senate  
Speech Professor

---

**From:** Patton, Ann  
**Sent:** Friday, November 18, 2011 12:13 PM  
**To:** 02-All Faculty@DVC  
**Subject:** More info on GE ballots

The ballots for the GE vote should be in your mailboxes in the main mail room in Central Services. Please notify me if you did not receive a ballot.

The information packet for the ballot was emailed to all faculty on October 8, November 10, and again today, November 18. There will also be hard copies in your mailboxes by the end of today.

---

**From:** Patton, Ann  
**Sent:** Friday, November 18, 2011 12:09 PM  
**To:** 02-All Faculty@DVC  
**Subject:** IMPORTANT - GE VOTE INFORMATION  
**Importance:** High

**General Education At DVC: Fall 2011**

## Current Context

Students at Diablo Valley College currently have three ways to satisfy General Education (GE) requirements:

- 1) DVC general education
- 2) IGETC Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum
- 3) CSU California State University general education pattern

The following discussion pertains to the DVC General Education pattern (option #1 above) that is scheduled for reevaluation in 2011–12 as agreed to when it was adopted in 2008.

## SB1440 and District Requirements

Historically, District Governing Board policy required students earning Associate Degrees at the three district colleges to take PE, Health Science and American Institution courses in addition to the courses required by Title 5. With the passing of SB 1440 the District needed to reevaluate its GE requirements in order to grant SB 1440 compliant degrees.

After consultation with all three colleges, the District aligned its General Education requirements with Title 5. As per Title 5, GE courses are to be taken from the four major areas: A. Natural Sciences, B. Social and Behavioral Sciences, C. Humanities, D. Language and Rationality, for a total of 15 units. The remaining 3 units are to come from within these areas for a total of 18 units. (*Board Policy 4011. Approved Feb 23, 2011. See attachment for details on courses in these areas*) Students are no longer required to take PE, Health Science and American Institution courses to earn a DVC degree.

Additionally, the District agreed to allow each college to make local decisions regarding GE requirements for all degrees EXCEPT the SB1440 transfer degrees.

## SB1440

In 2010, California legislators passed SB 1440. This bill requires community colleges to develop and grant associate degrees for transfer (AA-T/AS-T) to students transferring into the California State University (CSU) system. Students completing general education and major requirements for these transfer degrees (AA-T/AS-T) are eligible to transfer with junior standing into the CSU system. All community colleges were to have at least two transfer degrees in place for students for the 2011–12 academic year. These “transfer” degrees can only use CSU GE or IGETC as GE patterns and disallow any additional local requirements.

## Question at hand

DVC faculty must now decide to either adopt a DVC GE pattern with 18 units or a DVC GE pattern that may have more than 18 units. In the event that the DVC faculty votes for a GE pattern that may have more than 18 units, a broader discussion as to what specific additional courses would be required will ensue.

CSU and IGETC GE, with no local requirements, will remain as options for the GE pattern for any major no matter the results of this vote. The DVC GE pattern will be an option for students for all degrees EXCEPT the approved SB1440 transfer degrees. Those degrees must have either CSU General Education or IGETC as their GE option.

## Impacts of the Vote

<i>A vote for “DVC GE pattern will be 18 units”</i>	<i>A vote for “DVC GE pattern may have more than 18 units”</i>
1 DVC’s GE requirements would match the State’s General Education requirements.	1. Allows discussion by DVC faculty of what requirements, if any, could be added to the DVC General Education pattern.
2. May facilitate the creation of degrees for high unit majors. e.g. Engineering, Chemistry.	2. Adding requirements to the DVC GE pattern will continue to impact certain high unit majors.
3. No further discussion of DVC GE at this time.	3. Will require discussion of and a faculty vote on additional course requirements.
4. Would be a <b>change</b> from past practice when more than 18 units were required.	4. Would be <b>consistent</b> with past practice where more than 18 units were required.
5. May increase the number of degrees earned by DVC students who have historically transferred without a degree.	5. Not likely to increase the number of degrees earned by DVC students.

- 6. Will comply with Title 5 and District policies
- 7. Students will have option of DVC, CSU, or IGETC general education.
- 8. All associate degrees require at least 60 units

**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**Vote for ONE:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ DVC GE pattern will be 18 units
- \_\_\_\_\_ DVC GE pattern may have more than 18 units.

**Attachment 1: DVC Courses in Categories A, B, C, D .**

**Comment: FYI - This attachment is presented as the areas referred to by Board Policy 4011 and coincides with Title 5.**

**A. Natural Sciences.**

Course requirement - 3-5 units Complete one course: Anthropology 115, 140 ; Astronomy 110, 120, 128; Biological Science 101, 102, 116, 117, 119, 120, 126, 130, 131, 139, 140, 146, 162, 170, 171, 205 ; Chemistry 106, 108, 109, 120, 121, 226, 227; Geography 120, 121, 140, 141 ; Geology 120, 121, 122, 124, 125 ; Oceanography 101, 102 ; Physical Science 112; Physics 110, 111, 113, 120, 121, 129, 130, 230, 231.

**B. Social and Behavioral Sciences**

Course requirement - 3 units. Complete one course:  
Administration of Justice 120; Anthropology 120, 125, 130, 135, 150; Early Childhood Education 124;  
Economics 101, 200, 220, 221; Engineering 130; Geography 130, 135; Health Science 127, 140  
History 120, 121, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136, 140, 141, 150, 151, 170, 171; Journalism 110;  
Political Science 120, 121, 151, 220, 240, 250; Psychology 101, 122, 130, 140, 141, 160, 190, 200, 220, 225, 230, 240;  
Social Science 110, 111, 115, 120, 123, 220; Sociology 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 131, 135.

**C. Humanities.**

Course requirement - 3-5 units Complete one course:  
Arabic 121; Architecture 155, 156, 157, 158, 160; Art Digital Media 214; Art History 193, 195, 196, 197, 199  
Chinese 121, 220, 221; Dance 201; Drama 139, 140, 141, 142, 180, 181; English 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 168, 170, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 180, 190, 252, 253, 262, 263, 272, 273; Film 140, 160, 180, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284; French 121, 220, 221, 230, 231; German 121, 220, 221, 230, 231; History 120, 121, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136, 140, 141, 150, 151, 170, 171; Humanities 105, 108, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 118, 123; Italian 121, 220, 221, 230, 231; Japanese 121, 147, 220, 221, 245; Music 110, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118; Persian 121; Philosophy 120, 122, 140, 141, 220, 224, 225; Russian 121, 220, 221 ; Sign Language 282, 283; Spanish 121, 220, 221, 230, 231, 250.

**D: Language and Rationality**

**Language and reasoning**

**A. English composition.** Course requirement - 3 units. Complete with a “C” grade or higher: English 122 ;

**B. Communications and analytical thinking.** Course requirement - 3-4 units .

Complete one course: Business 240, 250, 255; Computer Science 100, 105, 110, 255, 265;  
English 123, 126 ;History 122 ;Mathematics 124, 135, 135SP, 142, 181, 182, 183, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 292, 294  
;Philosophy 130; Psychology 145; Sociology 122 ; Speech 121 .

**C. Mathematics Comprehension.**

Complete one of the following courses with a grade "C" or higher, or transfer credit for an equivalent course from another accredited college or university. Business 240; Engineering 111; Mathematics 114, 120, 120SP, 121, 124, 135, 135SP, 142, 181, 182, 183, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 292, 294.

---

**From:** Patton, Ann  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2011 11:20 AM  
**To:** 02-All Faculty@DVC  
**Subject:** REMINDER-GE BALLOTS DUE TOMORROW AT NOON  
**Importance:** High

**IMPORTANT REMINDER:  
BALLOTS FOR THE VOTE ON GE REQUIREMENTS  
ARE  
DUE BY  
NOON TOMORROW,  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2011.**

**You must follow the instructions below for your vote to be counted.**

**1. After you have marked your choice, place your ballot in the envelope provided.**  
**2. Seal the envelope and place it in either the main mailroom or the Faculty Senate Office (FO-221) NO LATER THAN NOON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2011.**

**3. If you place the return envelope with your ballot in the main mailroom, the mailroom staff has been instructed to return it with the label provided to the Faculty Senate Office. Do not mark envelope.**

---

**From:** Lema, Laurie|  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2011 11:33 AM  
**To:** 02-Department Chairs@DVC  
**Cc:** Barber, Tom; Churchill, Peter; DeLoach, Marva; Diestler, Nicole; Dildine, Doug; Dorado, Maria; Flores-Lowry, Theresa; Freytag, John; Gerken, Craig; Godinez, Rick; Grzanka, Len; Holt, Buzz; Keating, Katrina; Lema, Laurie; Machalinski, Catherine; McBrien, Beth; Orta, Lisa; Patton, Ann; Trujillo, Ed  
**Subject:** GE Vote

Hi Department Chairs

I hope you had a wonderful Thanksgiving holiday.

As you are aware the due date to vote on the DVC AA GE requirements is Tuesday, Nov. 29 at noon. Please encourage faculty in your department to vote on this important matter. Thank you.

**Laurie Lema**  
President, Faculty Senate  
Speech Professor

---

## Survey Monkey Questionnaire

Please check one:

- Scheduling Task Force Faculty
- Scheduling Task Force Management
- Faculty Senate Council
- Department Chairs
- Area Coordinators
- Division Deans

### Survey Questions

The Faculty Senate Scheduling Task Force seeks your feedback concerning the schedule of classes they developed, their process, membership composition and the future of the Scheduling Task Force. As you answer the following questions, please keep in mind that the administration “owns” the schedule while faculty recommends the schedule.

Please respond to the following questions using the scale provided.

- 13. The Scheduling Task Force adhered to the “values for scheduling” that was provided as a guideline to departments.**  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
- 14. The schedule supported the Faculty Senate resolution to ensure that academic programs weren't discontinued.**  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
- 15. The schedule supported the senate resolution to ensure broad curriculum offerings.**  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
16. The schedule changes produced a schedule that best serves our students with the available funding.  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
- 17. The Scheduling Task Force work contributed to an increase in my understanding about factors that impact scheduling. (FTEF/FTES, Productivity etc.)**  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
- 18. The Scheduling Task Force work contributed to a culture of establishing an iterative process concerning the development of the schedule of classes.**  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
- 19. The process and the product of the Scheduling Task Force was better than across the board cuts proposed by the administration.**  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know
- 20. We should continue to use a Faculty Senate Scheduling Task Force in consultation with management to develop and recommend the schedule of classes.**  
Strongly Agree Agree Slightly Agree Neutral Slightly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

**Open ended questions:**

- 21. How has the task force affected your department/area interface with administration concerning the schedule of your classes?**
- 22. What worked best about the Scheduling Task Force process?**
- 23. What should be improved in the process?**
- 24. What were the strengths and limitations of the assigned task force membership?**

**Next steps**

**Other topics to consider.....** Transparency?

**Determine Survey Timeline** - Survey deadline - Dec./Jan?

**Evaluation Review** - The survey results would be reviewed by the taskforce in collaboration with the Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate Council will make recommendations to management concerning future scheduling taskforce work and membership.