

**District Academic Senate
Approved Minutes
Thursday, March 8, 2011**

I. Organizational Matters

A. Roll Call

Co-Chair Shoemaker called the meeting to order at 2:45 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: L. Gaskin, S. Kashima, R. Berlani		X

B. Order of the Agenda

A motion was made to accept the order of the agenda. (M/S/U – Hannigan/Kelly)

C. Approval of the DAS Meeting Minutes Dated 2/24/11.

The meeting minutes dated 2/24/11 were approved with the following changes to Item V. A (M/S/P - O'Neill/Ghodrat):

“Today, the DAS is to begin discussing the potential make-up of the highest level governing body. ~~Chancellor Hendrickson has expressed the expectation that a proposal for the new body be created by the DAS and be ready for implementation by the end of the spring 2011 semester. District Council/DBAC is waiting for input from the DAS on this matter in order to make a final decision by the end of spring semester.~~ The DAS also, at some time, needs to discuss the possibility of creating a district shared governance procedure document. The DC/DBAC merge essentially took place under a lack of *district-level faculty leadership to guide the discussion of this major District-level committee change.* ~~no such policy exists and therefore no official process guided the district level committee change.”~~

II. Oral Communication from the Public

None.

III. Information & Announcements

Co-Chair Shoemaker indicated that at the next DAS meeting a discussion will be agendized on district-level budget planning and the potential ramifications of the tax extension not going onto the ballot or being passed. Mr. Shoemaker explained that if taxes are not extended, the two colleges are planning to ask the Land Corporation (LC) to grant the district one-time funds in order for the district to embark on proper and

deliberative planning. The request will likely come in the form of a resolution supported by all the constituency groups, including the DAS. If the LC does not grant the district such funding, both colleges will likely undergo expedited program discontinuances in order to meet the state mandate of reducing FTES by 2,000. Mr. Shoemaker noted that the Board of Trustees has not made it clear what its stance is on the tax extension issue. He expressed disappointment as the BOT should provide a viewpoint on such an important matter.

IV. Old Business

A. District Council/DBAC Issue re: Shared Governance

At the last DAS meeting, the Senators discussed the reasons for the District Council (DC)/District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) merger, opinions on the current status of the merged body and ideas for the future. By the end of the spring 2011 semester, the DAS is expected to provide a recommendation to DC/DBAC. Today the Senators are expected to provide information on the district-level shared governance structures of other multi-college districts.

The following Senators were responsible for information on the following community college districts:

- Tony Jones & Janice Morgan: San Mateo
- Julie Mai: Peralta
- David Ryan: Chabot-Las Positas District
- Cathy Cox: Riverside
- John Hannigan: Los Angeles
- Thais Winsome: Los Rios
- Nancy Ghodrat: De Anza-Foothill
- John O'Neill: San Jose City/Evergreen
- Lance Shoemaker: Contra Costa

The Senators discussed the different districts and the make-up, membership and reporting structure of their district-level shared governance bodies and committees.

A discussion took place on the expectations of the DAS in regard to the issue surrounding the merger of DC/DBAC. Different opinions were expressed over how the DAS's 10+1 purview can and/or should be interpreted and also what is appropriate to expect of DC/DBAC if the DAS is unable to create a proposal by the end of the semester. It was agreed that the DAS cannot dictate to the DC/DBAC; it should instead propose a workable plan that has buy-in from all the constituencies.

The Senators discussed the problems that have resulted from the merger. It seems that the work that the work of DBAC has disappeared since merger; the majority of the meetings are information sessions, whereas DBAC was a body that discussed and made recommendations. Co-Chair Shoemaker added that the agenda items seem to have changed as well; the focus on budget issues has diminished. A suggestion was made that the agendas could be structured differently in order to allocate more time to discussion items. It was also suggested that an evaluation of the current structure must be done in order to understand what works well and what does not.

At this time, the following motion was made (M/S/ – Hannigan/Kelly):

“that the District Academic Senate moves that it should create a district shared governance task force to evaluate and recommend district shared governance structures and procedures specific to institutional planning and budget development. Such a task force will include shared governance representatives from the district constituencies.”

Before the motion was voted on, a discussion ensued. Senator Hannigan clarified that the task force would be expected to look retrospectively at DC and DBAC and also look at other structures in order to move forward.

It was noted that last spring a task force was constituted to create a proposal for the merged DC/DBAC body; how would this task force be different? Senator Hannigan responded that the difference would be this task force could provide adequate opportunities for input; Mr. Hannigan felt that the last task force did not do so. Other questions were asked about the potential task force. Would it be more appropriate for the DAS to create the proposal and then direct a task force to work on it? Or would that be a form of dictation? Will the proposal be jointly created by the constituencies but owned by the DAS?

It was realized that the motion made was premature given the lack of clarity on the issue at hand. Co-Chair Shoemaker proposed that the Senators come up with what they think the district shared governance body should look like and return to the next DAS with their ideas and suggestions. The idea was agreed upon and a further suggestion was made to invite those who sat on DC and DBAC in the past to speak about what worked/didn't work in the past and what works/doesn't work in the present.

At this time the motion stated earlier was voted on and failed.

B. Update on ACE/Senate Liaison Agreement

ACE President Roberta Berlani noted that she just recently received a sample LOU from the ACE counsel. Ms. Berlani recommended postponing this discussion until the next DAS meeting.

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 4:05 pm. These minutes are respectfully submitted by Academic Senate Secretary Lauren Milbourne.