

MINUTES OF THE POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE DEL MAR COLLEGE DISTRICT
February 17, 2004

The Policy Review Committee Meeting of the Board of Regents of the Del Mar College District convened in the Isensee Board Room, Harvin Student Center, Del Mar College East Campus, Baldwin and Ayers, Corpus Christi, Texas, at 12:37 p.m. on Tuesday, February 17, 2004, with the following present:

From the Committee:

Mrs. Olga Gonzales (12:40 p.m.), Mrs. Dorothy Spann, and Ms. Beverly Winters.

From the Board:

Mrs. Chris Adler, Mrs. Minnie Arriaga, Dr. Haysam Dawod, Mr. Bill Martin, and Mr. Gabe Rivas.

From the College:

Mr. Jose Alaniz, Acting President and Vice President, Business and Finance; Dr. Rosie Garcia, Interim Vice President of Learning and Academic Affairs; Mr. Jose Rivera, Vice President of Student Development and Community Learning; Mr. Willie Keller, Director of Physical Facilities and Staff Facilitator; Mrs. Vickie Natale, Dean of Administrative Services and Staff Facilitator; Ms. Barbara Kimball, Assistant to the Vice President for Business Services; Mr. Howard Karsh, Auditorium Manager; and other administrators, faculty, and staff.

From the Attorney's Office:

Mr. Stephen Hilmy.

Others:

Mr. Bill Wilson and Mr. Dan Talley, coordinating architect firm of WKMC Architects; and other interested citizens.

CALL TO ORDER/QUORUM CALL/MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mrs. Dorothy Spann opened the meeting for Mrs. Olga Gonzales, chairperson of the Committee, and called the meeting to order. A quorum was present, and she announced that Mrs. Gonzales was running late. She requested a moment of silence.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one signed up or requested to address the Committee.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (#1)

Mrs. Beverly Winters recommended approval of the minutes of the January 20, 2004, Policy Review Committee meeting. Mrs. Gonzales arrived, and the recommendation was approved by consensus.

MISSION STATEMENT FOR RICHARDSON AUDITORIUM (#2)

Mrs. Spann provided a brief history of the mission statement and informed the Committee that the Board agreed it should be presented to the Policy Review Committee to include in official College policies. Mr. Rivas reminded the Committee that the coordinating architect had also requested a priority listing for their

use in the planning stages for the renovations in the Auditorium. Mr. Jose Alaniz pointed out that the primary function was for instructional activities.

Mrs. Spann stated that the auditorium committee had discussed purpose #5 in the proposed Mission Statement (Richardson Auditorium provides a venue for performance events and/or meetings sponsored by commercial organizations, including business and entertainment groups.), and it was their desire to have those monies collected accounted for in a separate account other than a general fund. Mr. Alaniz responded that there would not be a problem in designating those monies and restricting the funds for use in the Auditorium. He told the Committee that he could set up two operating budgets: one as a general operating fund to maintain the facility, and the other as an auxiliary budget to allocate income to reinvest back into the Auditorium for specialty items. He stressed to the Board that, related to #5, administration needed a decision from the Board to determine what events would be held. Mrs. Spann pointed out that administration would make the final decision on events held. It was the consensus of the Board and administration that these issues should be addressed in a Board policy, and not included in the mission statement.

Mrs. Spann made a motion, seconded by Ms. Beverly Winters, to accept the Richardson Auditorium Mission Statement as presented and to recommend approval by the Board.

In response to Mrs. Spann's questions related to expenditures, Mr. Alaniz reported that over \$900,000 had been spent on projects such as drainage, ceiling work, and environmental cleaning. Another \$3,000,000 was currently budgeted in the bond program for renovations.

With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

CALENDARING DATES (#3)

Mr. Jose Rivera reported that he had appointed committees to review the grievance policies for students and employees, and they were still meeting. His expectation was to bring the final drafts to the Policy Review Committee within 30-45 days. Mrs. Spann asked that she be provided with a copy of the minutes from the meeting at which it was decided that would serve on those review committees. She reminded Mr. Rivera that several faculty had requested that faculty be included on both grievance policy review committees. Mrs. Gonzales commented that she had received complaints that there were too many steps in the appeal process. Mrs. Minnie Arriaga suggested that the draft policies be brought to the Policy Review Committee in two months. Mr. Rivera responded that the committee reviewing the student grievance policy had not yet met. That committee was composed of two Student Government Association members from the East Campus, two Student Government Association members from the West Campus, and four at-large. Mrs. Arriaga suggested that the SGA review the policy and submit their recommendations to the Policy Review Committee, and another committee could review the policy and submit their recommendations. Mr. Rivera pointed out that there had not ever been a student grievance policy review committee—just a subcommittee of the SGA. Mr. Rivera expressed his disagreement that the SGA should report their recommendations directly to the Board and not be routed through administration, as was standard procedure. Mrs. Gonzales reminded the group that the idea to have the SGA appoint a committee to review the policy was presented at the Future Search Conference. Mr. Rowland Andrade reported that his committee was currently reviewing the policy.

Mrs. Spann requested that this portion of the minutes be transcribed and shared with Board members.

A Policy Review Committee meeting was scheduled for April 13, 2004, at which time the draft grievance policies for both students and employees would be reviewed.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:16 p.m.