

MINUTES OF THE POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE DEL MAR COLLEGE DISTRICT
January 20, 2004

The Policy Review Committee meeting of the Board of Regents of the Del Mar College District opened in the Isensee Board Room, Harvin Student Center, Del Mar College East Campus, 101 Baldwin, Corpus Christi, Texas, at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 20, 2004, with the following present:

From the Committee:

Mrs. Olga Gonzales, Chairperson; and Mrs. Dorothy Spann.

From the Board:

Dr. Haysam Dawod, Mr. Bill Martin, Mr. Gabe Rivas, and Mr. Guy Watts
(11:30 a.m.).

From the College:

Mr. Jose Alaniz, Acting President and Vice President, Business and Finance; Dr. Rosie García, Interim Vice President of Learning and Academic Affairs; Mr. José Rivera Vice President of Student Development and Community Learning; Ms. Claudia Jackson, Assistant to the President for Community Relations; Ms. Barbara Kimball, Assistant to the Vice President for Business Services; Mrs. Vickie Natale, Dean of Administrative Services; and other administrators, faculty, and staff.

From the Attorney's Office:

Mr. Stephen Hilmy.

Others:

None.

CALL TO ORDER/QUORUM CALL/MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mrs. Olga Gonzales, chairperson of the Policy Review Committee, presided and called the meeting to order. With a quorum present, she requested a moment of silence and asked that the Arriaga family be remembered during this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – 5 minutes

Mr. Mike Anzaldúa, faculty member in the English department, expressed his support of the proposed dispute resolution provision in the draft employee grievance policy.

Dr. JoAnn Luckie, assistant dean of Student Services, expressed her support for the inclusion of mediation through the Dispute Resolution Center in the draft employee grievance policy, and encouraged Board approval.

No one else signed up or requested to address the Committee.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (#1)

Mrs. Dorothy Spann made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Gonzales, to approve the minutes of the January 13, 2004, Policy Review Committee meeting as presented, and the motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCE POLICY (#2)

Mr. Jose Rivera reminded the Committee that the Grievance Policy Review Committee was still reviewing the policy. He reported that the Committee would make a recommendation to the College president to include procedures for informal mediation discussion, listed as Administrative Policy A5.44.6.1, which were being presented at today's meeting for comments from the Board. Dr. Haysam Dawod and Mr. Bill Martin stressed the need to include a specific time frame, to replace "in a timely manner" within A5.44.6.1.2. Mrs. Spann expressed concern that a record would not be made if the grievance were heard at the Dispute Resolution Center, and asked that administration find out if an audiotape of the mediation would be allowed. She and Mr. Martin stressed the need for a record/documentation at each level of the review process. Mrs. Spann also pointed out that the Board should be the final step in the process, which was not shown on the handouts provided. Legal counsel noted that only a portion of the draft policy was being presented, and section B5.44.7.2 of the complete policy addressed her concern. Mrs. Spann asked that the Committee be presented with the complete draft for final approval. The Committee discussed the confidentiality portion of the policy, and the fact that the Dispute Resolution Center will only provide the outcome of the mediation, not the content.

Mrs. Spann made a recommendation that the Committee adopt that portion in bold print, with the changes that were made by the Committee. Mr. Stephen Hilmy advised the Committee that the bold portion being presented was administrative policy and not Board policy, and if they approved the motion, it would constitute Board policy.

Mr. Hilmy also pointed out that there was not an administrative role in the Dispute Resolution Center process, and it would be possible for the Center to come up with an outcome that may not be attainable. Mrs. Gonzales commented on what she perceived as numerous steps in the process, and questioned whether each step was needed. The Committee asked that the changes be made and presented with the complete policy.

There was not a second to the recommendation, and no action was taken.

STUDENT GRIEVANCE POLICY (#3)

Mr. Rivera reported that the Student Government Association had not provided a report on their review of the student grievance policy. He stated that the employee grievance committee would be recommending that a separate committee be established to review the Student Grievance Policy, and discussion ensued on the issue. Mr. Gabe Rivas

informed the Committee that action was not needed at present, and a recommendation would be given to the College president for a committee to review the Student Grievance Policy. Mr. Rivas pointed out that several faculty had expressed concern that faculty had not had the opportunity to review the policy, and it could have an impact on them. Mr. Mike Anzaldua, speaking as the advisor to SGA, stated that the SGA committee had been reviewing the policy for over one and one-half years, and had not yet shared any information with the membership, but after doing so, would bring their suggestions back to the Student Grievance Policy Review Committee. Dr. Dawod, Mrs. Spann, and Mrs. Gonzales stressed that the Board should be the final step in the review process, and not omitted from the process. No action was taken.

REVIEW OF ACTIONS FOR GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES (#4)

Comments were made during the review of the Employee and Student Grievance Policy agenda items.

POLICY FOR VOTING LOCATION AND PLACEMENT OF CAMPAIGN SIGNS (#5)

During the January 13, 2004, Board meeting, the Richardson Auditorium was designated as the location for voting on campus. The Board had previously designated the esplanade area by the Harvin Center for the placement of campaign signs, and administration recommended that the designation be modified to parallel the voting location. Board policy B4.26.4 was presented with the changes.

Mrs. Spann made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Gonzales, to recommend adoption of Board policy B4.26.4, Designation of Richardson Auditorium as location for voting and placement of campaign signs, as presented, and the motion carried by unanimous vote of those present.

RICHARDSON AUDITORIUM POLICY AND MISSION (#6)

Mr. Jose Alaniz stated that a mission statement for the Auditorium needed to be developed to provide direction for the coordinating architect. The Committee would need to set priorities as to instructional use or other use. Mrs. Spann stressed that instructional use would be the first priority. Mr. Guy Watts told the Committee that a policy should be adopted allowing the auditorium manager the authority to use the auditorium for instructional use as per schedule, and the remaining 284 days as an income-producing business, with the fees deposited into a designated account that would be used for the auditorium. Mr. Howard Karsh explained his process for booking various events and the possibility of using a co-partner for some events. Mrs. Spann pointed out that the expense side or safety aspects had not been mentioned. In response to questions regarding SACS requirements, Mr. Alaniz stated that SACS had made a suggestion regarding auxiliary services, but did not make a recommendation. He pointed out that a policy was currently in place, and reviewed the procedures for auxiliary funds. Mr. Alaniz told the Committee that the Board would need to decide if they wanted to take a risk and expose the College to potential losses. Mrs. Spann expressed concern over the amount of improvements that would need to be made, and subsequent funding, to place the auditorium in a competitive position. She felt it would require additional funding that

was not included in the bond program. Mr. Martin informed the Committee that he would not make a decision without additional financial information on this type of activity. Dr. Dawod commented on the possibility of privatizing the auditorium usage. No action was taken.

CALENDARING DATES (#7)

No items were calendared.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:28 p.m.