

District Shared Governance Council (DSGC)

April 7, 2008

Minutes

Members Present: Co-Chairs Jing Luan and Patty Dilko, Jeremy Ball, Connie Beringer, David Feune, Sebastian Grillo, Ulysses Guadamuz, Jane McAteer, Martin Partlan, Stephanie Samuelsen, Richael Young

Members Absent: Carla Campillo, Noel Chavez, Georgia Clark, Jeanne Gross, Teeka James, Charles Jones, Adolfo Leiva

Guests Present: Barbara Christensen, Harry Joel, Dan Kaplan, Nick Kapp

The meeting was called to order at 2:25 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Approval of the minutes of the March 3, 2008 meeting was postponed because a quorum was not present.

Public Comments

None

Code of Ethics Update

Patty Dilko reported that Skyline faculty have worked on a proposal and will forward it to Cañada and CSM faculty. There is no other progress to report.

Ulysses Guadamuz said classified staff have begun the process; a draft will go out and he will report progress at the next meeting.

Richael Young reported that Cañada students have approved the Student Code of Ethics; CSM and Skyline students approved it earlier.

Jing Luan noted that this is an item that must be completed in a timely manner because accreditation requires it. Ms. Dilko said that if faculty does not approve a new statement by May, they have committed to accept the statement already in existence. Connie Beringer suggested that all statements be ready for review at the May 19 Council meeting.

Dan Kaplan asked if AFT has been asked to vote on a statement; Ms. Dilko said it comes through shared governance where AFT is represented.

Barbara Christensen asked how long the statements are and if there will be four separate policies. Ms. Dilko said there will be one policy with subsections from the groups. Ms. Christensen suggested that, in order to be consistent in length with other policies, one general policy could appear in the Rules and Regulations with a notation of where the different groups' subsections are published. Nick Kapp expressed concern that people could make changes to policies stored elsewhere. Jing Luan and Barbara Christensen agreed to look further into the issue and make a recommendation.

Rules & Regulations 2.09 re: A-E Consensus Building

Sebastian Grillo said he asked that this item be on the agenda because of students' concern that there is currently no way to inform the Board of Trustees that a no vote on an issue is recommended; if consensus is not reached, the item does not go forward with a recommendation from this body to the Board. Therefore, students believe that if they vote "E" their voices will not be heard at all. Richael Young agreed, using the issue of the parking fee increase as an example.

Nick Kapp noted that, unlike a majority/minority vote as used by the Supreme Court, a consensus model promotes conversation, change and accommodation. Jeremy Ball suggested the Council look at models from other multi-college districts and re-evaluate what the Council wants to use. Dan Kaplan said he was a member of the Shared Governance Council when the model was put in place. He believes it works well as it encourages discussion with an impetus to convince people who do not agree to change their minds. Jing Luan said the model currently used is confusing, i.e. what is the difference between A and B, and what is D really saying. He suggested a review of the language and logic behind it in order to reduce the complexity. Barbara Christensen suggested the decision points could be (1) I agree; (2) I agree with some reservations; and (3) I do not agree and want to submit a minority opinion. In that way, the issue would still go forward to the Board.

Patty Dilko said there are sometimes urgent issues that cannot be tabled and where the Council cannot wait for consensus to be reached. Jeremy Ball said that on the College Councils, the person to whom a recommendation is being made is usually present to hear the discussion, and that is lacking with this body. Connie Beringer said the Chancellor believes his presence might inhibit free discussion.

Jing Luan emphasized the importance of keeping in mind the purpose of the Council. The Council's role is to advise the Board of Trustees. The Board needs to hear from the Council and it is not responsible to hold things up because an issue becomes about the vote rather than the substance. Connie Beringer said every constituency needs to come to consensus as to the role of the Council.

Barbara Christensen said that besides the voting model, the entire policy is not well constructed; text needs to be changed and reordered. There is also some change in wording in the Education Code and Title 5. Ms. Christensen suggested forming a subcommittee to author a potential alternative policy for Council members to take to their constituencies. It was agreed that members of the subcommittee will be: Barbara Christensen, Jing Luan, Harry Joel, Richael Young, Teeka James (nominated by Dan Kaplan), and a member to be named by Ulysses Guadamuz. The proposed new policy will include both majority/minority and consensus based voting options for discussion at the constituency level.

District Strategic Planning Update

Jing Luan said the Strategic Planning Taskforce has been working on environmental scanning documents and will soon be given a set of planning assumptions. The Colleges will receive the planning assumptions as well and they will be discussed at forums at the campuses. The planning assumptions will then be taken to the Board of Trustees for initial review in August and for approval in the fall.

An initial set of strategic directions will be ready for distribution in August, and will be reviewed at the Colleges in the fall.

Jeremy Ball said a glossary of terms would be useful; Patty Dilko said a glossary will be included when the documents go out.

Proposed District Policies, Rules and Regulations Review

Jing Luan said the review is a very involved task which involves compliance issues with Title 5 revisions. Paula Anderson is working on Chapter 6, and Ms. Anderson is also working with Carlene Gibson on Chapter 7. The Vice Presidents have asked to meet with Ms. Anderson to discuss Chapter 6. The Vice Presidents, Ms. Anderson, Ms. Gibson, and Barbara Christensen will meet to clarify the proposed revisions to Chapter 7. Patty Dilko will also be present at this meeting and will relay the information to the Senate presidents. After review by the Vice Presidents, the proposed revisions will go to the Chancellor's Council and then the District Shared Governance Council. In July, the Board of Trustees will be asked to approve all Title 5 revisions in Chapters 6 and 7.

Richael Young asked why Chapters 6 and 7 were chosen to be reviewed; Patty Dilko said it is due to the Title 5 changes in these chapters. Ms. Dilko also noted that the accreditation commission recommended that the District review all Rules and Regulations.

Closing Remarks

None

Agenda Building

Future meetings and code of ethics will be topics on the next agenda.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:45 p.m.

The next meeting will be on May 5, 2008.