



**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 24, 2011
APPROVED**

PRESENT: Laurie Lema (President), Beth McBrien (Vice President), Rick Godinez (San Ramon Campus), John Freytag (Corresponding Secretary), Milagros Ojermark (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), Doug Dildine (Part-time Faculty Representative) Maria Dorado (Counseling), Ann Patton (Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary)

ABSENT: None

GUESTS: Susan Lamb

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

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA OF JANUARY 24, 2012, AND THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 29, 2011, NOVEMBER 8, 2011 AND NOVEMBER 15, 2011.

It was MSC to approve the agenda of January 24, 2012 as amended. All in favor. Approved.

It was MSC to approve the minutes of November 8, 2011. All in favor. Approved.

It was MSC to approve the minutes of November 15, 2011 with corrections. All in favor. Approved.

It was MSC to approve the minutes of November 29, 2011. All in favor. Approved.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

3. COUNCIL COMMENT

Barber informed Council a colleague received an email over winter break that was alarming. The email contained a screed against liberals, African Americans, and Jews with offensive and disgusting language. It also stated they know where this instructor's office is located and said "there will be blood." Barber said his colleague contacted his dean and Police Services. The next day there was no response from Police Services in the form of a presence to protect the instructor. However, after contacting Police Services again, Chief Gibson responded and said the FBI has been contacted because it is a possible hate crime. Barber explained the correspondence had begun with someone identifying themselves as a student, requesting a letter of recommendation. The instructor responded he did not remember the student and asked for more information. The return response was the offending email. The sender had signed their name but they are not a student in the district. Lamb added that another instructor got a similar email. She said these types of things should always be reported to not only help protect the recipient but to keep records to track incidents. Lema said these kinds of incidences and this can come back to the Senate for future discussion.

Freytag said he has heard and is concerned that the Technical Services Manager has said the college will not support Macs and will not allow the purchase of new ones. Freytag said the reasoning is the costs to support Macs.

Freytag said he does not think the cost is that different to support Macs. And in light of IT requesting a lot of funding for IT infrastructure purchases, there should be funds allocated to support Macs. He said there should be more open-mindedness to allow faculty to choose the computer they are most comfortable using.

Gerken said his division has a lot of interest in technical issues such as the email transition, and would like a broader discussion perhaps including Percy Roper and Mojdeh Mehzadieh. Lema said this will be on a future agenda and we should begin with inviting our Technology Committee faculty representatives.

4. APPOINTMENTS

College Council

Beth McBrien

Scheduling Task Force

Donna Wapner

Statewide Course Numbering Task Force

Kristin Koblick

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

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lema welcomed Milagros Ojermark as the new Applied and Fine Arts representative.

Hess-Diestler announced the drama production of “The Skriker” directed by Ed Trujillo, is opening this coming Friday. She cautioned that the show is not appropriate for children.

Hess-Diestler told Council the Drama program does special productions of the shows for the high school outreach program and they are also available for DVC classes. Instructors need to contact Valerie House in the cashier’s office to make arrangements.

Hess-Diestler told Council the Theater Insights programs are scheduled the Tuesdays before opening night of the productions at 12:45 in the venue where the show is scheduled.

Orta told Council Spring Flex went well. She said we are starting a new tradition to use one Optional Flex day to have faculty talk about teaching and learning. She said there was a good turnout for the keynote speaker and there will be a DVD available of his presentation. His book is for sale in the bookstore, and a copy is in the library.

Orta announced upcoming Peer Evaluation training workshops on February 7 at 2pm, and February 17 at 4pm.

Orta said part-time faculty have a large Flex obligation this semester and she requested that all workshops that would fulfill Flex obligations be forwarded to her.

6. DVC BUDGET COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (Appendix A)

Lema reviewed the process for budget recommendations starting with the Integration Council reviewing Program Reviews and ranking requests within four categories, Human Resources, Technology, Equipment and Supplies, and Facilities. The IC report was submitted to the Budget Committee and the College Council. College Council reviewed the IC recommendations and asked for clarification in some areas. The Budget Committee reviewed the IC recommendations and made their budget allocation recommendations based upon the IC recommendations. The co-chairs of the three committees met to ensure clarity and transparency in the process. The Budget Committee recommendations came to the CC. CC reviewed them for recommendations to the college president. Lema said the Faculty Senate needs to review the CC report and discuss any concerns or questions. She shared the draft of the CC report with Council.

Budget Committee members Orta, Hanecak, and Goralka, and IC member McBrien commented on the committee processes for developing the recommendations. They said some of the IC recommendations were taken care of from other sources of funding and their decisions were all done by consensus.

The Budget Committee recommendations include \$3million to offset shortages in the next fiscal year that could be used for some personnel and/or to lessen schedule cuts.

Keating commented that the District never mentions the savings from retirements when talking about step and column increases. She has asked if they could look back over the last 10 years to get an average of the savings to include in future budget discussions.

Lema told Council the CC did discuss a need for a staffing plan.

Barber moved to endorse the College Council report and budget recommendations to the College president. The motion was seconded. All in favor. Approved.

Lema thanked the Integration Council and Budget Committee members for all their work on this process.

7. SCEDULING TASK FORCE SURVEY

Lema shared the Scheduling Task Force survey results with Council. She said about half of the recipients responded. She said the results were mostly positive but acknowledged improvements are needed. The survey indentified areas that need to be further discussed include consistency and timing of communication, task force membership and meeting protocol and whether or not the Task Force should become a permanent committee.

Keating said her department is concerned that unique classes that are funded through an application process could be cut if they have not had the chance to build up production numbers as it can take a few semesters. Lema said the STF agreed those classes will be given a couple semesters to succeed.

8. CLASS SCHEDULE DEVELOPMENT (Appendix B)

Lamb distributed a chart of the FTES goals and actual numbers for 11-12 and described how the schedule is being developed. She said if the ballot measure passes in November and everything stays stable we would need to cut 35 sections during the academic year. However, if the ballot measure does not pass, we will have already built our schedule and will have to go back and cut over 250 sections. She said we are taking a risk but we also are talking with the district to see how much they are willing to put in to help lessen the impact. She said at this time, as areas are developing their schedules, they are being asked to indentify 5% of their courses they could cut if needed.

McBrien told Council the Task Force is meeting on two Fridays in February and we will know a little more at that time how to proceed. She said they will probably be looking at a middle scenario to begin the discussions on what can be cut. However, the sections identified for possible cuts by the areas will not necessarily be cut. The Task Force will use the criteria they used last time. She said it will be important to have department input since they are the experts in their areas on what impact cutting certain classes could have.

Lema said disciplines should take a two year view in planning their course offerings in order to assist students. That will help students stay advised on when they will be able to take the course they need.

Holt asked Lamb the cost of an FTEF. Lamb responded for a full-time instructor they use the figure of approximately \$90,000, and for a part-time instructor approximately \$27,000.

Holt asked if the district could cover half of the potential cuts. Lamb said they could but the Governing Board has said they do not want the reserve to go below 10% so she does not know if they would. Lamb said we'll know better by next week what the District is willing to do.

Barber said he is concerned we encourage international students to come here because we get more money from them than resident students, but we won't have classes for them. Orta said if the plan is to increase non-resident students, we need to look at the classes that serve those students. Lamb said it has been recommended to take that into consideration when building schedules.

Lamb said we have to be cautious with our schedule as we don't want the other two colleges to out produce us and get funded before us. She said an email will go out soon explaining how and what the areas should identify for potential cuts in their schedules.

9. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Lema informed Council the Student Success Task Force report was adopted by the Board of Governors at their January meeting. Lema reviewed with Council some of the major revisions to the recommendations based on feedback. However, she said as it makes its way through the legislature, the recommendations could end up looking very different depending on how any legislative bills are written. For example, it was agreed not to recommend performance based funding but that could change through legislation. We should know more after February 24 when the draft bills are due. Lema said the BOG did have concerns with the fast timeline for the process, response, and implementation. They also were concerned with aligning resources with the recommendations. Lema said the State Academic Senate is working on responses and implementation guidance based on feedback they received.

Gerken added that FACCC in conjunction with the UF will be holding a forum for discussion of the recommendations. Flex credit will be available for attending the forum.

10. VP OF INSTRUCTION REPORT

Lamb informed Council the database developed for SLOs disappeared over the break but fortunately for the college, Robert Burns was able to rebuild it and back it up. Lamb gave kudos to Burns as well as Mario Tejada, and Lindsay Lang for making the system user-friendly and SLOs making the use of SLOs a more successful tool to use for student learning. Lamb said the ACCJC requires that by 2012 when the college makes its next report, needs to be proficient in SLOs. A list of courses that identifies incomplete SLO course work was given to the deans and department chairs. We need to get the SLO list resolved ASAP. She said there are also Title 5 updates that need to be completed.

Lamb said a couple divisions don't currently have SLO representatives. Each division should have two representatives to ensure continuity if one cannot participate for whatever reason.

Lamb informed Council she will be on an accreditation team at LA Harbor College. She said she will be trained on what the teams will be looking for. She said she does know they will be looking more closely at SLOs and Distance Education and will be given specific evidence addressing these accreditation standards.

11. ADJOURNMENT

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

*Respectfully submitted,
Ann Langelier-Patton
Administrative Secretary*

**College Council Recommendations to the College President
on 2011-2012 Resource Allocation**

January 27, 2012

PREAMBLE

As part of the college's response in 2009 to being placed on Show/Cause by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Diablo Valley College revised our governance structure to incorporate program review into the resource allocation process, and to implement continuous improvement.

This document contains the DVC College Council recommendations to the DVC President for the 2011-2012 budget resource allocations. These recommendations were developed according to the process described in the following narrative, and resulted from the work of participants throughout the college. Colleagues engaged in the program review process and served as representatives on the Integration Council, Budget Committee, and College Council, enhancing participatory governance. In addition, there has been extensive dialogue between the co-chairs of these committees to ensure a clear and transparent process.

We would like to thank the Budget Committee, the Integration Council, and their respective co-chairs for their time and work, and the Instructional Technology Committee for their expertise. We would like to

thank Ted Wieden for his guidance throughout the process, and Jeanie Dewhurst for her coordination efforts and her note-taking at numerous meetings during the process. And, we would like to thank all of our colleagues that contributed to various parts of this process.

The College Council will continue to examine, evaluate and make recommendations for the process in the next fiscal year. The College Council is committed to ensuring this process results in effective and transparent allocations that advance the mission of the college and serve the needs of our students.

2011-2012 RESOURCE ALLOCATION PROCESS

According to its charge, stated in DVC Procedure 1001.02, the College Council should “receive the annual plan for resource allocation from the Budget Committee for review and final recommendation to the college president,” and “receive and review recommendations from the Integration Council for allocation of designated college resources and make final recommendation to the college president, based on validated, prioritized program reviews, approved college-wide plans and initiatives, District/State mandates and requests from college-wide committees.”

In February 2011, the Budget Committee forwarded its recommendation to the College Council for the use of available funds in 2010-2011. Because of the dire and uncertain budget situation at the state, district, and college levels, the Budget Committee recommended that all available funds in 2010-11 be used to:

1. Establish a \$50,000 reserve under the purview of the College President to repair and replace broken equipment – unspent funds would roll over to the 2011-12 for this restricted purpose;
2. Add all remaining available funds to the college’s emergency reserve to cover any unanticipated costs related to midyear cuts, load bank payouts, vacation payouts, or property tax deficits – unspent funds would be used to help cover the expected budget deficit in 2011-12.

In late spring of the 2010-11 academic year, the Integration Council reviewed all of the program reviews and college-wide plans. From these the Integration Council developed its “Spring 2011 Planning and Resource Allocation Recommendations”, which were presented to the College Council on May 16, 2011. As mentioned above, there were no funds available for the Integration Council’s recommendations for resource allocation. Due to the lack of time for review in 2011-12, the College Council agreed to review these recommendations in the Fall 2011 semester.

The Integration Council again presented its findings at the August 29, 2011 meeting of the College Council, and the Council agreed to accept the report by consensus, and to continue to examine the report and provide feedback to the Integration Council. To fulfill this obligation, the College Council reviewed the report as a group over several meetings, and compiled a list of areas of strength, areas which needed clarification, and areas of concern, which it presented to the Integration Council at its December 2, 2011 meeting.

During the FA2011 semester, the Budget Committee determined that there was approximately \$4 million in onetime funds available for the 2011-12 annual budget plan, and that some portion of those moneys could be available to fund college needs based on program review and college plans. With this in mind, the Integration Council reviewed and updated its May 2011 report to include cost estimates (not included in the May 2011 report) and developed its “Integration Council Report to Budget Committee – Ranked Recommendations for Funding Allocations from the Integration Council Subcommittees”, dated November 18, 2011. The November ranked recommendations from the Integration Council for Human Resources, Equipment and Supplies, and Facilities were largely unchanged from those in the May 2011 report, and were based on the program review and college plan information from 2010-11. However, it was determined that the Technology recommendations needed more specificity and would benefit from updated information from the program review units. This

updated technology information was submitted to the Integration Council on November 11, 2011, and the Integration Council Technology Sub-Committee, in consultation with representatives from the college's Technology Committee, developed a new list of recommendations based on this new information.

As a critical piece of this complex resource allocation process involving three different governance committees, the co-chairs of the College Council, the Budget Committee, and the Integration Council met twice (November 3 and November 21) and the co-chairs of the College Council met with representatives of the Budget Committee and the Technology Systems Manager (December 14, 2011), in order to develop timelines, share concerns, gain expertise, and facilitate communication between the three committees.

The Integration Council submitted its updated report to both the Budget Committee and the College Council on November 18, 2011, and the Budget Committee incorporated its findings into its 2011-2012 Annual Budget Plan, submitted to the College Council for its December 12 meeting. The College Council reviewed the Integration Council recommendations at its November 28 meeting, and the Budget Committee recommendations on December 12, 2011, and developed its final 2011-2012 College Council Resource Allocation Recommendations to the College President on January 23, 2012. Constituency representatives took the recommendations to their constituencies for feedback, and presented that input to College Council on January 27, 2012.

COLLEGE COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

At its January 27, 2012 meeting, the College Council endorsed by consensus the Budget Committee recommendations for allocation of \$4 million in one-time funds as described in its "2011-2012 Annual Budget Plan". The College Council recommends to the College President that the \$4 million be allocated as follows (see Appendix ??? for details and explanations):

- \$3 million to offset the projected 12-13 deficit.
- Approximately \$1 million for college needs based on program review and college plans;
 - \$0 is allocated to Human Resources;
 - \$494,000 is allocated to Technology;
 - \$229,400 is allocated to Equipment and Supplies;
 - \$287,712 is allocated to Facilities.

Below are the specific allocation recommendations in the allotted categories:

HUMAN RESOURCES

Total Human Resources Allocation		\$0
---	--	------------

TECHNOLOGY

Area	Item	Estimated Cost
Business Services	Replace network printer for staff	\$500
Finance and Administration	Replace network printer for Business Office	\$1000
ART/ARTHS	Replace network printer for faculty and staff	\$500
Information	Replace six switches	\$36,000

Technology		
English/Social Science	Scanner	\$500
ASTRO	Printer for Lab	\$400
DVC Technology Committee, in coordination with the DVC Technology Systems Manager	TBD (see Appendix ??? for a description of the principles by which the funds are to be allocated)	\$430,000
Total Technology Allocation		\$494,000

EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

Area	Item	Estimated Cost
BIOOSC/NUTR/OCEAN	Supplies and equipment for lab classes	\$40,000
CHEMISTRY	Supplies and equipment for required courses	\$74,800
DENTAL LAB TECH	Hand pieces/drills, etc	\$4800
LIBRARY	Print and digital media	\$10,000
PE	Backboard for pool	\$400
PE	Equipment for activity class and worn out CTE equipment	\$84,000
PHYS	Equipment and supplies	\$15,400
Total Equipment and Supplies Allocation		\$229,400

FACILITIES

Area	Item	Estimated Cost
ADJUS	Exhaust hood in Planetarium	\$40,500
ESL	Install windows in LC 108	\$1350
DRAMA	Chair replacement/refurbishment	\$78,700
PE	Locker room repairs related to safety	\$7100
SPCH	Classroom sound-proofing	\$70,562
DRAMA	Replace lighting dimmer system	\$89,500
Total Facilities Allocation		\$287,712

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

There are five general concerns about resource allocation that are not addressed and need to be considered.

- The college needs seed money to continue developing innovative educational services to support student success in DVC transfer, career technical and basic skills programs.
- Funding for both current and additional faculty reassigned time positions should be included in the college resource allocation.
- Since there is no longer state funding for the college professional development program, funding is now a college responsibility. The college must decide what kind of professional development program it wants, and must commit the financial resources needed to support its professional

development program. Professional development expenses include faculty reassigned time, classified staff support, operational budget and professional development activities.

- There may be funding gaps due to unidentified expenses related to implementing the funding priorities established by the Integration Council. These gaps are expenses that will occur and should be included in the budget plan.
- The college needs to ensure that there are adequate resources to provide for a financial crisis situation.

In summary, these five general funding recommendations should also be considered by the college president.

In addition, the college should continue to develop and refine its resource allocation process. The following areas warrant specific consideration:

- The college needs to ensure that the resource allocation process includes appropriate and timely use of expertise (e.g. IT staff and Technology Committee for technology requests) in the development and validation of resource requests.
- The college needs to revisit timelines for resource allocation to ensure that all participants have sufficient opportunity to review materials, but also so that the process can be completed in a timely manner.
- The college should clarify whether a process for emergency replacement of non-functioning but necessary technology and equipment that may fall outside of the regular resource allocation process should be a governance or an operational function.
- The CC should further explore its role in the evaluation of the Budget Committee and Integration Council recommendations. It should clarify processes for determining whether to endorse the BC and IC recommendations in part or as a whole, in order to finalize the CC's recommendation(s) to the College President.

Scheduling Taskforce
 FTES – FTEF Projection for 2012-13
 1/20/12

	2011-2012 (August 17, 2011)	2011-12 (Trigger Tier 2)	2012-13 (Projected)	2012-13 (-5.56% Trigger Nov Ballot Measure)
FTES Goal	14,861.63 (R) 1,800 (NR)	14,635.28 (226.35 unfunded R-FTES) 1,800 (NR)	14,635.28 (R) 1,900 (NR)	13,821.55 (R) 1,900 (NR)
Total FTES Goal	16,661.63	16,435.28	16,535.28	15,721.55 (-813.45)
FTEF required @ 17.2	968.7	NA	961.35 (change: -7.35)	914.04 (change: -54.66)
SUMMER FTEF	79.93	NA		
FALL FTEF	436.19	NA		
SPRING FTEF	452.58*	NA		

*includes: ContractEd (Coded "X"), Gratuitous, Study Abroad

