



**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 27, 2011  
APPROVED**

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

**ABSENT:** ASDVC Representative (TBD)

**GUESTS:** Obed Vazquez

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

**1. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 27, 2011 AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2011.**

**It was MSC to approve the agenda of September 27, 2011. All in favor. Approved.**

**It was MSC to approve the minutes of September 20, 2011 with corrections. All in favor. Approved.**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**3. COUNCIL COMMENT**

Trujillo informed Council it is Beth McBrien's birthday.

Orta cautioned Council that many faculty are not opening their emails and it can reflect negatively in their evaluation if their mailboxes remain full.

**4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Godinez announced he is getting married this coming Saturday.

Orta announced the following upcoming workshops.

The Computer Science area is holding a faculty workshop to identify computer skills their students need to have for their classes.

The Library is holding a faculty workshop to help with research assignments for students.

There will be workshops coming up on the Whistling Vivaldi project.

Keating announced the UF is hosting a fundraiser for Assemblywoman Susan Bonilla. Bonilla is also on the State Educational Task Force. Keating said more information will be in the next issue of Table Talk.

**5. APPOINTMENTS**

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

Dorrie Mazzone replacing Toni Fannin

### **Study Abroad Selection Committee**

Ruth Miller

### **Online Education Advisory Task Force**

Karen Edwards replacing Tina Levy

### **Portal/Email Work Group** (Asked --Opsata, Becky; Burns, Robert; Keating, Katrina; Franco, Dennis)

Laurie Lema

Becky Opsata

Katrina Keating

### **Budget Process/Procedure Work Group** (Asked --Hanecak, John; Orta, Lisa; Goralka, Ray; Keating, Katrina; McBrien, Beth; Machalinski, Catherine; Churchill, Peter; Young, Tish; Freytag, John)

Lisa Orta

Beth McBrien

Catherine Machalinski

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

## **6. HONORARY DEGREE** (Appendix A)

Lema told Council she compared the proposed policy for honorary degrees with the CSU policy and what struck her is the need for confidentiality. She pointed out in our proposed policy the recommendations would go to College Council and that would not be confidential because it is a public body. She suggested we could model a process similar to CSU where we have a committee with oversight from the Faculty Senate Council and that committee would make recommendations directly to the college president.

Holt asked why are we discussing this when the frequency of this situation is so rare. Keating shared that she was at a conference where an honorary math degree was awarded to the actor from the TV show "Numbers". She said it was the only secondary education degree he has received and it meant a lot to him. She said this is an important procedure and it should be in place even if we only use it every thirty years.

McBrien asked if the Board could adopt the policy even if faculty objected.

Lema said she will work with FSCC to ensure faculty concerns are addressed. In addition, degree requirements are an academic and professional matter. An honorary degree is a valid degree and thus would fall under academic and professional matters.

Freytag reminded Council that who actually confers degrees has been an issue at this college and it should be clarified for this policy.

Dildine said the discussion should be where our proposed policy is different from CSU and why.

## **7. GE VOTE** (Appendix B)

Council received the latest version of the GE vote document shortly before this meeting. Lema told Council Vazquez informed her the GE vote should take place in early November which gives plenty of time for the catalog regardless which way the vote goes.

Council reviewed the changes based on their recommendations on the last version of the document.

Council discussed and recommended further changes. Freytag recorded the changes directly into the document.

When asked about who has the final say in the document Lema reminded Council the Curriculum Committee makes recommendations to the Senate Council who has final approval.

**Holt moved to approve the document with the changes recommended at this meeting. The motion was seconded.**

Hess-Diestler reminded Council not every detail needs to be in the document as there will be forums to discuss and clarify the issues.

**The question was called. All in favor. Motion approved.**

Holt cautioned Council that this is being done because a lot of students are not getting AA degrees. However, we don't need to worry about our top students, it is those students at the bottom in the achievement gap that we need to be concerned with.

Trujillo asked if there is a general feeling on how the vote will go. Keating responded she anticipates Math and Science will support the 18 units requirement. Machalinski said there are groups that feel very strongly one way or another but there is a group in the middle that could swing the vote either way.

Lema asked Council if the winning vote will be a simple majority? Council agreed it should be a simple majority of 51%. Lema said this vote will be a paper ballot to ensure an accurate count.

Machalinski expressed a concern with part-time faculty having a vote on this matter. She said in her division part-time faculty are often not as fully aware as full-time faculty of the issues and implications and follow the full-time faculty when they vote.

Lema said as she understands the bylaws, they stipulate part-time faculty have a 1/3 vote in the election of Senate officers. She said the agenda committee will review the bylaws and bring the discussion back to Council.

## **8. VP OF INSTRUCTION**

Lamb was not present.

## **9. UF MEETING**

Lema asked Council what feedback they received on the topics for the proposed collaboration with UF for a meeting.

Churchill said he did not receive any input from his division.

Grzanka said he would like to discuss the tendency to ask part-time faculty to do work they don't get paid for.

Lema reminded Council there will be one meeting for full-time faculty, one for part-time faculty, and one for both.

Trujillo wants to discuss the increased scrutiny and requirements for reporting things such as hours-by-arrangement. He also would like to discuss the relationship of the Dean of Student life and Division Deans when dealing with issues such as harassment or other unacceptable behavior.

Machalinski said she would like to discuss the potential impacts of including part-time faculty in decisions such as the GE vote. Freytag added that we are far below the full-time/part-time faculty ratio of 75% and that needs to be part of the conversation.

Hess-Diestler said she is getting concerned because she has seen and felt an increase in the amount of non-compensated work faculty are being asked to do. She said she took on a task and was paid a stipend but when she was done she figured out she was paid the equivalent of about \$1 per hour.

Flores-Lowry said she would like to discuss the need for additional release time for coaches.

McBrien said she would like to discuss load for Department Chairs. She said it is now counted toward teaching load which takes away the incentive to serve as a department chair.

Grzanka said they need to discuss the lack of IT support. Lema said she not sure it is a union issue but would note it.

Keating told Council the UF wants to discuss the issues that "crossover" Senate and union purviews.

Lema said there is a need to have a coordinated approach to getting more full-time faculty hired. She said part of the reason faculty are overworked is the lack of enough full-time faculty.

Holt said it seems the Senate and the Union work together well but wondered if there are any issues between the groups that should be discussed.

Keating said when discussing full-time hiring, the new budget model that puts the hiring decisions at the colleges needs to be part of the conversation.

Machalinski said budget needs to be in the discussion for every perspective.

## **10. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Lema reported the College Council is reviewing the college operational committees' recommendations for changes to their charges and memberships. She said the College Council so far has approved the recommended changes to the Workforce Development Committee including the removal of the VP of Instruction as a member and adding the Dean of CTE, reducing the number of faculty from ten to six and they will be selected from disciplines rather than TOP codes, and added that Academic and Professional matters will be referred to the FSC. She said the College Council approved a change to the IT committee that allows them to select their own co-chair. Lema informed Council that Garcia announced at the College Council that the Enrollment Management Committee is on hiatus this year.

Lema told Council she would like to discuss protocol for Senate Council meetings and how they can make it a constructive and positive experience for presenters, and what Council can expect from presenters. She said Council tends to go right to critiquing the information presented rather than looking at the global reason they are presenting and how the document supports their goals.

Trujillo added that presenters need to be clear what their objective is and what they expect from Council.

Churchill said part of the problem is Council members often sit on several committees and they have heard the presentation before so they have already developed a response when they come to Council.

Freytag stressed that the first thing we ask of presenters should be their objectives.

Holt commented that some documents do need to be intensely critiqued.

Machalinski said often Council does not receive the documents until they are at the meeting and have not had a chance to note critiques ahead of time. She said it is also a problem sometimes when agenda items are marked for action at the first reading.

Orta said they need to look at if what they are coming to Council for is appropriate. Such as, are they asking for approval when they just need endorsement, or are they asking for endorsement when it is just disseminating information or asking for feedback.

Freytag said it comes back to preparation by both the presenter and the Council members.

Trujillo said we should define information only, acknowledgement, endorsement, support, feedback, and approval.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

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

*Respectfully submitted,  
Ann Langelier-Patton  
Administrative Secretary*

**AWARDING OF HONORARY DEGREES****1. Policy**

- a. Honorary degrees shall be awarded by the individual college awarding the degree, upon approval of the Governing Board of the Contra Costa Community College District.
- b. Honorary degrees shall be awarded at commencement exercises. The degree shall be conferred by the college President.
- c. Colleges should confer no more than one honorary degree per academic year.
- d. The College Council should be consulted in the selection of nominees for honorary degrees. The final recommendation comes from the college President to the Chancellor.
- e. Any member of the college community may propose a candidate for an honorary degree; however, letters of endorsement for a nominee should not be solicited, as that activity could place the Board, the Chancellor and the colleges in a difficult position if the Board does not approve the nomination.
- f. All nominations shall be kept in the strictest confidence prior to submission to the Governing Board.

**2. Purposes for Which Honorary Degrees May be Conferred**

- a. To recognize excellence and exceptional achievement in significant areas of human endeavor, which reflect the mission, goals, objectives and ideals of the college and District.
- b. To honor meritorious and outstanding service to the college District, to the campus individually, to the communities the college serves, to the State of California, to the United States, or to humanity at large.
- c. To recognize men and women whose lives and significant achievements should serve as examples of the Contra Costa Community College District's aspirations for its diverse student body.

**3. Criteria for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees**

- a. Honorary degrees may be awarded to recognize achievements in all parts of the world.
- b. Nominees for honorary degrees must be distinguished in their respective fields, and the contributions of persons nominated should be widely recognized. Nominees must have demonstrated intellectual and humane values that are consistent with the aims of higher education and with the highest ideals of the nominee's chosen fields.
- c. Service or benefaction to the college does not in itself justify the awarding of honorary degrees. However, nothing in this criteria shall preclude nominees who are benefactors of the college.

**4. Limitations on Eligibility**

Honorary degrees shall not be awarded to the following:

- a. Incumbent Governing Board members;
- b. Current or former employees of the college or District;
- c. Anyone who has already been awarded an honorary degree by a college within the Contra Costa Community College District.

**5. Procedures for Selecting Honorary Degree Recipients**

Each college within the District should develop its own procedures for selecting honorary degree recipients within the guidelines established herein.

The utmost care must be taken through all steps of the procedure to ensure confidentiality prior to submission to the Governing Board. A breach of confidentiality could seriously embarrass the Contra Costa Community College District, the college, or the nominee.

Historical Annotation:  
Adopted 4/30/03 as Board Policy 1014; renumbered to Board Policy 1018 and distributed on 10/18/10

**Draft - General Education At DVC: Fall 2011 – Sept 21, 2011 1**

**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. The passing of SB 1440 the District needed to reevaluate its GE requirements and 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.

### After the Vote

<i><b>If you vote for DVC GE pattern will be 18 units...</b></i>	<i><b>If you vote for DVC GE pattern may have more than 18 units.....</b></i>
1 DVC's GE requirements would match the State's General Education requirements.	1. Allows discussion by DVC faculty of what should be added, if anything, in the DVC General Education pattern.
2. Fewer GE requirements might allow students in some high unit majors (Eg. Engineering, Chemistry) to earn a degree while also fulfilling transfer requirements.	2. GE requirements for high unit majors would continue to impact students. Eg. Students in areas such as Culinary Arts, Administration of Justice, Addiction Studies, and Dental Hygiene would continue to receive certificates instead of degrees.
3. No further discussion of DVC GE at this time.	3. Will allow for discussion of the merits of additional courses, if any, and a vote of faculty to add or not add, specific courses to the DVC GE pattern.
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 allow students to simultaneously pursue a degree, along with CSU or IGETC certification.	5. Would be <b>consistent</b> with past practice where students typically do not pursue a degree, along with CSU or IGETC certification.
6. May increase the number of degrees earned by DVC students.	6. Not likely to increase the number of degrees earned by DVC students.
7. Will comply with Title 5 and District policies 8. Students will have option of DVC, CSU, or IGETC general education. 9. All associate degrees require at least 60 units	