

---

**FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL MEETING****MAY 19, 2015****APPROVED**

*In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act and SB 751, minutes of the DVC Faculty Senate Council record the votes of all committee members as follows: Members in attendance will have their votes recorded including names of members voting in the minority or abstaining is recorded.*

**PRESENT:** Laurie Lema (President), John Freytag (Corresponding Secretary), Beth McBrien (Vice President), Peter Churchill (Business), Theresa Flores-Lowry (Kinesiology), Maria Dorado (Counseling), James Magee (Math/Computer Science), David Vela (English), Marva DeLoach (Library), Milagros Ojermark (Applied and Fine Arts), Catherine Machalinski (Biology/ Health Sciences), Craig Gerken (Physical Sciences), René Sporer (SRC) (Via Skype), Valerie Colber (Part-time Faculty)

**ABSENT:** Buzz Holt (Social Sciences)

**GUESTS:** Andy Barlow, Ted Wieden, Rachel Westlake, Peter Garcia, Laura Burns, Marina Crouse, Keith Mikolavich, Katrina Keating, Keri DuLaney-Greger, Joe Hickey

**1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA OF MAY 19, 2015 AND THE MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 2015 AND MAY 12, 2015.**

**It was MSC to approve the agenda of May 19, 2015. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Flores-Lowry, Dorado, Vela, Machalinski, Magee, DeLoach, Ojermark, Gerken, Sporer, and Colber. No nays. No abstentions. Approved.**

**It was MSC to approve the minutes of April 28, 2015. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Flores-Lowry, Dorado, Vela, Machalinski, Magee, DeLoach, Ojermark, Gerken, Sporer, and Colber. No nays. No abstentions. Approved.**

**It was MSC to approve the minutes of May 12, 2015. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Flores-Lowry, Dorado, Vela, Machalinski, Magee, DeLoach, Ojermark, Gerken, Sporer, and Colber. No nays. No abstentions. Approved.**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Marina Crouse, UF representative said the UF feels the proposed governance structure will benefit the college but there needs to be more discussion regarding the details.

Peter Garcia said to let Julie Catalano know if the changes to the governance structure are approved. She will then schedule six forums, including a couple at San Ramon. These are conversations about the general state of the college. He said there will probably be 20 minutes scheduled for input and 40 minutes for feedback and Q&A.

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Machalinski said this is her last Senate Council meeting as well as DeLoach and Gerken, and she brought cupcakes.

**4. ELECTION RESULTS**

Lema announced the election results for Faculty Senate President, Vice-President, and changes to the constitution. All three received an overwhelming majority of the vote. Beth McBrien is the FSC President Elect. John Freytag is

the Vice-President Elect. Their terms will beginning July 1 this year and go through June 30, 2017. With the passage of the proposed changes to the constitution this body will now be known as the DVC Academic Senate.

## 5. APPOINTMENTS

### Academic Senate Corresponding Secretary 2015-2016 (finishing vacated term)

Peter Churchill

**It was MSC to approve the appointments listed above. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Flores-Lowry, Dorado, Vela, Machalinski, Magee, DeLoach, Ojermark, Gerken, Sporer, and Colber. No nays. No abstentions. Approved.**

## 6. RESOLUTION ON GOVERNANCE

Council representatives reported the feedback they received on the proposed governance structure and the position their division is taking.

Ojermark said she heard from one department in her division and what they said is they think this process is too rushed and they would like more discussion before a vote. She said they felt it is good for the college to review our governance structure but they are overloaded at this time of the semester and don't have time to consider the research in making this decision.

Machalinski said she also heard concerns about the rushed timeline especially at this time in the semester. She said she explained to them we are supposed to open up the entire budget for discussion of priorities to make distribution equitable. She said their concern is that they are still waiting for their allocation out of the one-time monies.

Machalinski added that she does not think this structure lessens the number of committees or reduce membership. She said we really need people to show up for meetings and they need to be committed to the work of the committee but they do need to have relevant expertise. She said there should be reassigned time for those that are serving on committees but this has not been brought up in these discussions. She said one more concern is that a lot of the power in this structure is concentrated in one or two committees.

Churchill said he got a couple comments that basically said let's go forward and see how it works.

Dorado said she received many responses from Counseling that said they feel this addresses issues with redundancy in our process. They also mentioned how difficult it is to fill a lot of the committee positions within our current structure. She said there were also concerns that the decision is too rushed and would like to see some forums in the fall for more discussion. And they were concerned that there would be too much decision making in the College Council. She said they were comfortable to go forward if there is a way to evaluate the structure early on so we can change course if needed. They had questions about the membership of the Program Review committee-. Dorado said there were some comments about including Student Services more in governance.

Vela said English discussed it quite a bit through email and a minority had concerns about what we have already heard, it's too rushed and power is too concentrated. But the majority was positive and looks forward to the change. They think it will be an improvement from the current governance structure.

DeLoach said she personally contacted all Library faculty and there was one person that did not respond but the rest are ok with it but do have some concerns. No one said no.

Magee said Math is a big division so the responses were quite varied. He said those that have been involved in governance and have seen the process from the inside and said emphatically yes to the change. There were others that have been on the outside of the process and had concerns similar to what we have heard. One was about the committees that we will be losing. He said one response he received said they agreed with the goals but the devil is in the details and they did not see enough details to determine whether they support this or not. It will become clearer when we see which committees will become workgroups and which will be disbanded or combined. They said if they were forced to make a decision at this time they would say yes.

Flores-Lowery did not get much feedback from her division but what she did receive was in favor of the change if it will improve efficiency. A couple others said they did not feel it is the right time in the semester to make this decision. She said she would like to know if this will reduce the numbers of committee seats to fill.

Gerken said of those he heard from said they trust him to make the right decision but they commented that it is the wrong time in the semester to be doing this. He said another concern is that they are not sure the proposal for College Council is the best choice. He said he understands we are moving to have expertise on committees but people have different definitions of what is expertise. He also said he does not see the number of committee seats

reduced with the proposed structure. However, a lot of committees will become workgroups so they will be more focused on their task and it could increase those willing to participate. But for example the Budget Committee has a steep learning curve so the college needs to work at developing the expertise needed. He said he also heard concerns that the Research and Planning group is too prominent in the structure. Gerken said most he heard from were generally in favor of the change.

Sporer said SRC was interested in the discussion going forward which is what we are voting on. To actually change anything it would have to come back to the governance committees. She said voting on this at the end of semester gives a unique opportunity as there can be discussions in the summer and have something to bring back in the fall a clearer picture. She said although the people they hear from are generally on extreme ends of the viewpoints, the unspoken word says they are in favor and want to see how it goes. Sporer said this can only help San Ramon because there are so few faculty there to fill the spots they have on committees.

Colber said she got a lot of responses and a lot of questions including if the groups will be Brown Act; why aren't part-time faculty represented on the College Council and some other committees. She said they also expressed concern that this decision is being made so fast. She said part-time faculty felt the information that went out was not sufficient to make a decision.

Machalinski commented on Sporer's statement that we are only voting on moving forward with a discussion. She pointed out the resolution reads that ... "these proposed governance changes will be implemented in Fall 2015".

Sporer asked if the resolution could be amended. She does not think we should vote on a structure that does not yet exist. Lema reviewed the resolution resolves that

"The Faculty Senate Council supports the following about College Council:

- College Council remains the college-wide governance body;
- the charge of College Council is to address the strategic plan directive, goals and values;
- the charge of College Council is to ensure that college wide discussions and decisions are facilitated, transparent and timely;
- the membership will continue to include all constituencies, with the addition of co-chairs from the group that ranks program review requests and the group that oversees research, evaluation and planning (3 college Vice Presidents, Faculty Senate President and Vice President, Classified Senate President and Vice President, ASDVC President and Vice President); and
- College Council will work with the Faculty Senate Council to reduce redundancy of college committee work with Faculty Senate committees;

The Faculty Senate Council supports the following for college wide structure:

- the development of a Research, Evaluation and Planning Committee to support the college's use of data in decision-making; and
- maintain the functions of the IC with the work of Program Review reading, validation, ranking resource requests in the context of college wide goals through broad program and college-wide dialogue;

The Faculty Senate Council supports:

- strengthening the role of the Faculty Senate in hosting college-wide conversations on the 10+ 1 Academic and Professional Matters;
- ensuring collegial consultation is understood and practiced in a timely and ongoing manner;
- a review of its senate committees' charges to ensure focus on the strategic plan and goals;
- a review of its senate committees' charges to reduce redundancy of college-wide committees;
- strengthening the coordination of joint efforts between the ASDVC, the Classified Senate and Faculty Senate;

The Faculty Senate Council endorses these proposed governance changes to increase student success through inclusive excellence, in the spirit of continued improvement of institutional effectiveness, and

The Faculty Senate Council endorses these proposed governance changes be implemented in Fall 2015 and to be evaluated not later than two years thereafter."

Lema said there are details to work out and those will be part of the conversation next year if the Council decides to support the proposed model.

Machalinski wants to know more about the membership and charge of the Research, Evaluation and Planning Committee. Lema said that will be the first conversation next year.

Lema reviewed with Council a draft of the goals and suggested composition of the Research, Evaluation and Planning Committee. She said this will come back to the Senate as it is a 10+1 item.

Keith Mikolavich said we need new people to step up to help this work as it seems to always be the same people and they are getting burned out.

Crouse asked what will happen to the committees that will be changing at the beginning of the fall semester. Will they begin their work while we are working out the details or will they wait until after the details are worked out? She is concerned that writing Program Reviews will begin and we don't have the process finalized yet. She said also there has to be a place where we are actively creating new leaders and she does not see that in this proposal. Lema said the Governance work group brought up leadership throughout much of their discussions and the need to make leadership part of our Professional Development work.

McBrien clarified that in the fall, the College Council membership would change and then they will start identifying strategic plan goals.

She said other committees would not be eliminated yet. They will do a self-evaluation before any decisions are made about changing any of them. She said it would be helpful to inform people of this so they don't think everything is a done deal.

Churchill told Council the Governance work group put a lot of time into this proposed model and we have to trust that they were thoughtful and kept in mind what is best for the college. He said it belittles their work when we start tearing it apart and he does not think this is a power grab.

Peter Garcia reminded Council the proposal says we are going to redefine College Council. The history and the regulations around governance where the President and the Senate come to some kind of mutual agreement, keeps the College Council from moving away from the agreements made with the Senate. He said one method would be to form a task force to look at the best configuration of the College Council and make a recommendation to the Senate. Then a dialogue between the college president and the senates is where we involve governance and they will be represented on College Council.

Andy Barlow said we will need early and continual evaluation of the structure and reminded Council it is not cast in stone.

**Sporer moved to approve the proposed governance structure for the college. Churchill seconded the motion. The following members all voted aye: McBrien, Freytag, Churchill, Flores-Lowry, Dorado, Vela, Magee, DeLoach, and Sporer. Machalinski, Gerken, Ojermark, and Colber voted nay. No abstentions. Approved.**

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,  
Ann Langelier-Patton  
Administrative Secretary*