

**District Academic Senate
Unapproved Minutes
Thursday, March 17, 2011**

I. Organizational Matters

A. Roll Call

Co-Chair Shoemaker called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

Senators	A	P	Senators	A	P
Cox (Ext. 5165) MC		X	Morgan (Ext. 5397) MC		X
Ghodrat (Ext. 2442) WVC		X	Oliver (Ext. 5247) MC		X
Hannigan (Ext. 2629) WVC		X	O'Neill (Ext. 5082) MC		X
Jones MC		X	Ryan (Ext. 2488) WVC/Blasberg		X
Kelly (Ext. 2546) WVC		X	Shoemaker (Ext. 2436) WVC		X
Maia (Ext. 2507) WVC		X	Winsome (Ext. 5217) MC		X
Guests:			Guests: J. Lucas, D. McKay		

B. Order of the Agenda

A motion was made to accept the order of the agenda with the understanding the Item IV. B. will be removed and reagendaized. (M/S/U – Oliver/Kelly)

C. Approval of the DAS Meeting Minutes Dated 3/8/11.

The meeting minutes dated 3/8/11 were approved with the following addition to the guest list: Roberta Berlani. (M/S/U - Winsome/Oliver)

II. Oral Communication from the Public

Guests Jack Lucas introduced himself as a Board of Trustees member and guest Dianne McKay introduced herself and explained that she will be the MC Academic Senate President 2011-12.

III. Information & Announcements

Co-Chair Cathy Cox reported that she will be attending the Academic Senate for CA Community Colleges (ASCCC) regional Area B meeting on Friday, March 25, 2011. Any concerns or feedback on the resolutions scheduled for discussion at that meeting should be forwarded to Ms. Cox.

IV. Old Business

A. District Council/DBAC Issue re: Shared Governance

At the last DAS meeting of 3/8/11, the DAS Senators were directed to come up with what they think the district shared governance body should look like and return to today's meeting with their ideas and suggestions.

The discussion began with the distribution and explanation of the charges and memberships of the former District Council (DC), the former District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) and the current combined membership of the merged body of DC/DBAC. It was noted which individuals served on both bodies and who represented administrative services, classified, faculty and students. Ms. Cox explained that the

faculty representation on DBAC was originally the two Academic Senate Presidents, the ACE President, and a faculty member who came from the College that the ACE President did not. There were questions regarding the existing requirements of a classified SEIU representative on DC and DBAC; it was unknown whether the SEIU contract requires a seat on DBAC.

The Senators began discussing their ideas for the district shared governance bodies. The following suggestions/ideas were shared:

- Two bodies are needed; one to handle district shared governance matters, and the other to handle district budgetary matters. The constituencies represented could be the same for both memberships, although the actual individuals representing those constituencies could be different people. It was also suggested to have an equal number of reps per constituency and include faculty union representation.
- Some felt that no labor discussions should take place in either body. An ACE representative could potentially cut off discussions about future strategic planning based on what is currently in the contract. Some felt a voting seat for ACE should be included on both bodies. On the budgetary body, increased union representation could be beneficial as labor issues and strategic planning are so entwined that they simply cannot be divorced. ACE provides a perspective that many faculty are not able to provide because most faculty are not schooled in contract language. To remove the union voice from these bodies could prove very divisive and if the ACE rep were an ex-officio member, their voice could go unheard. Others disagreed with this and felt that a non-voting union representative could be beneficial to discussions as it could foster union buy-in and provide unique perspectives on future ideas. The union can have a tremendous impact regardless of whether it maintains a voting seat or not. It was suggested that perhaps a faculty seat could be designated to an ACE Council member, but that the position itself be designated as a representative of faculty. That way the interests of that voting seat are wholly faculty related.
- A voting seat for SEIU is required (by SEIU contract language) for DC, but there are other classified unions besides SEIU; it was suggested that the Classified Senate be responsible for deciding whether they want their classified representatives also be representatives of the various other unions.
- As separate bodies, DBAC was an advisory body on budgetary matters and DC made policy recommendations; currently, the merged group is more of an informational session. Such a body is not representative of the participatory nature of shared governance. If there is to be one body, it was suggested that it be charged with formulating processes and policies that are then sent to the Board of Trustees (BOT) for approval. If there are to be two bodies, the scope of DC be strategic planning, daily policy development and reviewing BOT agendas. Maybe the two groups can have separate agendas but the same members. Decisions could be made faster if the members of both bodies are the same. However, different people on the bodies provides more voices.
- It was noted that because the purpose of the District is instruction, shared governance recognizes faculty primacy in several areas. Therefore, perhaps

faculty representation should be weighted on a district shared governance body. However, such membership could upset both Classified and Administration as it could appear to be minimizing their participation. It was pointed out that even if there are an even amount of people on a body, that does not necessarily equate equal influence from each constituency. Political climates will change; we must ensure that faculty have a prominent voice.

A motion was made (M/S/U – Winsome/Jones) that the proposed structure for District-level shared governance bodies being considered by DAS be:

For District Council:

- Four faculty (one of these faculty positions would be guaranteed for ACE, one would each be appointed by each College's Academic Senate, and the fourth faculty member would be appointed by the Academic Senate from the college that currently does not host the ACE president)
- Three students (one from each college, with the additional one perhaps alternating each year from both colleges)
- Three classified (one appointed by each college's Classified Senate, plus one spot guaranteed for SEIU person)
- Three administrators (to be chosen by the Administrative Services Council)

For a Budget Advisory Commission:

- Consist of the same number and types of positions as the District Council, although the actual people who serve in those positions could be different from those that serve on District Council.

It was noted that both Academic Senates are agendaizing discussions on the DAS's role in item 10 of the Senate's 10+1 purview ("Processes for institutional planning and budget development.") The intent is for the Academic Senates to provide guidance on this issue to their District Senators and that such guidance will be discussed at the next DAS meeting.

B. Update on ACE/Senate Liaison Agreement

This item will be reagendaized for discussion.

VI. Publications

None.

VII. Future Agenda Items (In no particular order)

- A. Development of District Shared Governance Procedures
- B. Course Repeatability Policy
- C. Local Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency re-assessment

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm. These minutes are respectfully submitted by Academic Senate Secretary Lauren Milbourne.