

District Shared Governance Council (DSGC)
October 6, 2008
Minutes

Members Present: Co-Chair Patty Dilko, Linda Allen, Connie Beringer, Lessandro De Sousa, Darne Duckett, Megan Eznekier, Mauricio Flores Hernandez, Jeanne Gross, Ulysses Guadamuz, Ray Hernandez, Teeka James, Adolfo Leiva, Virginia Medrano Rosales, Martin Partlan, Marsha Ramezane, Stephanie Samuelsen, Laura Saxton

Members Absent: Diana Bennett, Jing Luan

Others Present: Barbara Christensen, Brittany Piccolotti, Richael Young

The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m.

Review and Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Martin Partlan and seconded by Linda Allen to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 15, 2008. The motion carried, with one abstention and the remainder of those present voting "Aye."

Public Comments

None

Confirmation of Future Meeting Dates

Patty Dilko reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule, and reminded DSGC members that there are normally two meetings in May.

Process for Evaluation of Delineation of Functions

Dr. Dilko reminded Council members that the "Proposed Process for Evaluating Delineation of Functions" was discussed at the last meeting and they were to take it to their constituencies for review. Because the September meeting was held later in the month, Teeka James and Martin Partlan said they have not yet been able to present the information to their constituencies. Adolfo Leiva and Linda Allen said they presented the proposed process to their constituents and there were no disagreements. Jeanne Gross reported that she communicated the information via email and has received no response to date.

Ray Hernandez said the Skyline Academic Senate talked about the process for discussing whether a shared function is working and, if not, who is responsible for changing the primary and secondary functions. Ulysses Guadamuz asked if each campus will submit a report for the Delineation of Functions Review Committee to review. Dr. Dilko said the issue of accountability is held at the institution level through accreditation and other methods. The purpose of the proposed process is only to identify who has which responsibilities between the District and the Colleges, similar to an organizational chart; it does not include how well the functions are being carried out. The discussion at the campuses is to be whether the designation of responsibilities is accurate.

Dr. Dilko said DSGC will vote next month on the Proposed Process for Evaluating Delineation of Functions.

Board Policy (Rules and Regs) 2.09 Revision (Taskforce)

Dr. Dilko said that last spring, DSGC was given the first part of the language change proposed by the taskforce, regarding the process of consensus building and voting. The second part deals with the delineation of functions.

Ulysses Guadamuz suggested adding a new item under number (4) of the proposed revision, to state an additional purpose of the Council as follows: “(4.h) review any changes, additions, or subtractions that would affect minimum conditions under Ed Code 70901.b.1.A-E.” Barbara Christensen said that most of the minimum standards are in Title 5; the District receives updates to State law and these are the basis for changes. Mr. Guadamuz commented that the District could go beyond the required minimum standards. Dr. Dilko said any further changes would be included in (4.g) which states that the Council is to advise the Board on policies that directly affect faculty, staff and students and that other policies will be brought to DSGC as information items.

Mr. Guadamuz asked if the District administrator listed as Council Co-Chair in (6.e) is the same person listed as the appointment from the District Office chosen by the Chancellor in (6.b). Ms. Christensen said it is the same and she will clarify the language to read: “(6.e) Council Chair: The Council will be served by co-chairs, namely, the District Academic Senate President and the District administrator appointed by the Chancellor in (b.) above.”

Teeka James said AFT recommends the following language changes in number (5) of the proposed revision:

1. Current: “Consensus building involves polling of appointed members to determine if general agreement has been reached. . .”

Recommended: “The DSGC makes decisions democratically by polling appointed members to determine if general agreement has been reached. . .”

2. Current: “A recommendation will be forwarded to the Chancellor when a simple majority of members (50% plus 1) present are at any one of the levels. Any member of DSGC can submit a brief rationale for their vote which will accompany the recommendation to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.”

Recommended: “A recommendation will be forwarded to the Chancellor when [a simple majority (50% plus 1) of members present is] or [2/3 of members present are] at any one level. Any member of DSGC can submit a brief rationale for his or her vote which will accompany the recommendation to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.”

Dr. Dilko recommended that items (9) and (10) have parallel construction; currently the proposed policy lists policies and procedures that have or will have a “significant effect” on students but does not provide a list for faculty.

Ms. Christensen will make the changes as recommended above.

Connie Beringer noted that in number (3), the current policy states that faculty, staff and students are ensured the opportunity to express their opinions at the [district] level, while the proposed revised policy specifies the campus level. Ms. Christensen will change the language to include both the District and campus levels.

Regarding number (5) on consensus building and polling appointed members, Richael Young said the Associated Students at College of San Mateo believe the proposed new model is too different from the current model. Since only a simple majority at any one level would be required to forward an issue to the Board, the students believe that one or two groups could dominate. Dr. Dilko pointed out that any group can forward a written dissent to the Board. There was extensive discussion among Council members regarding the optimal model, including different percentages that should be required at any level to move an issue forward. After this discussion, a straw poll was taken to determine how many Council members

avored requiring a vote of 50% plus 1, two-thirds, or three-fourths. The vote was split between 50% plus 1 (9 votes) and two-thirds (7 votes). The Council agreed to bring these two options to their constituencies. The Council also agreed to bring back their recommendations and to come to a decision at the November meeting. Dr. Dilko said the decision can be revisited in one year. Teeka James said the final vote on accepting the proposed revisions should still follow the current model (a. through e.).

District Strategic Planning Update/Presentation

Dr. Dilko reported that Skyline and Cañada have had final public forums on the District strategic planning document and one is scheduled at College of San Mateo. The final draft is being developed. It will go to the Board of Trustees for first reading in November and will subsequently go to the Board and to the DSGC for final approval.

Closing Remarks

None

Agenda Building

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3:38 p.m.