

FACULTY COUNCIL OF DEL MAR COLLEGE
MINUTES
November 5, 2004--Room 434, White Library, East Campus

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m. by chair John M. Crisp. A quorum was present.

Present: Rose Caballero, Ed Cohn, John M. Crisp, Joe Dudek, Wayne Frederickson, Donna Hamil, Bob Long, Russell Long, Chuck McKinney, Eric Moller, Stephen Ondrejas, Cynthia Perkins.

Absent: Susie Crowson, Manuel Flores, Judi Phillips, Michael Potter, Ann Thorn, Mary Thornton.

Guests: None.

Approval of the Minutes of the October 8, 2004, meeting: No action taken. Crisp said that Secretary Ann Thorn had reported that the minutes would be ready for approval at the December meeting.

Chair's Report: Crisp reported that he had received from Russell Stowers correspondence between Stowers and Chris Black and VP Garcia regarding the status of immunizations for Del Mar students, particularly those involved in the health sciences. Stowers and Black had proposed the development of a committee to investigate the feasibility of making immunizations available through the College. During subsequent phone conversation with the chair, Stowers agreed that the Wellness Committee would be an appropriate venue for initial consideration of this issue.

Crisp mentioned the phased retirement program, which has been proposed to the President and which is currently being considered in VP Alaniz's office. Crisp suggested that this is an issue the Faculty Council wants to keep on the front burner, probably through its own Financial Concerns Committee.

Regarding the issue of proposed changes to administrative titles that was considered at the Council's October meeting, Crisp reported that the Council's resolution had been conveyed to the President and that the beginnings of a dialog had been opened. He reported, as well, that the issue of administrative organization had been broached at the ISD Council meeting of November 3 and that the door seems open for dialog on this subject. Crisp suggested that this is a matter that the Council will want to keep on the so-called front burner, as well.

Regarding the student grievance policy review committee, Crisp reported that he had heard from faculty representative Leola Coleman and had talked with faculty representative Brian Hart, both of whom report that progress is going "very well." The faculty representatives report that the committee has met four times and is in the process of revising the general policy statement and has completed revisions to one of the three types of grievances. The first 15 to 20 minutes of each meeting are reserved for input from anyone who wants to address the committee and contribute to the process. Crisp

reported that he'd gone to the first meeting and conveyed to the committee the interest that the faculty has in this process. Crisp said that he would ask the committee to make sure that notices of its meetings are properly distributed.

Finally, Crisp suggested language that might be used when the Council is asked to "review" proposed administrative or board policies. Rather than the misleading term "approve," he suggested that motions regarding proposed policies might contain language that would designate the policies as "reviewed with recommendations" or "reviewed without recommendations," and that motions connected with such policies include any recommendations the Council wishes to make.

Stephen Ondrejas asked about rumors he'd heard regarding the elimination of arena registration and the possibility of extending periods during which faculty members would be required to be available for advising. Crisp said that he'd heard that discussions of arena registration had been taking place and that likely at some point, whether now or in the future, arena registration will be eliminated. He'd heard that there are differences of opinion about when this should take place. A brief discussion ensued. Crisp said that he would report on any developments in connection with these two issues.

Crisp reviewed the actions items on the agenda: **Discussion and possible action on proposed policy B3.11 Public Speech Activities:** Crisp reminded the Council that at its last meeting the Council had "declined to approve" this policy and instead asked Judi Phillips, an original member of the committee that produced the policy, to serve as a clearinghouse to gather the Council's objections and recommendations. Feedback was very limited. Crisp said that he'd reported the Council's lack of enthusiasm for the policy to the ISD Council on November 3, and that he expressed what he believed to be some of the Council's misgivings. The ISD Council agreed that the policy should go back to the original committee, and Vickie Natale has sent an email to that effect to Carl Yowell, the chair of the original committee. Crisp said he'd talked with Yowell, who appeared to be willing to take a fresh look at it. In short, Crisp said, no action on this policy is required at this time unless the Council desires otherwise. **Discussion and possible action regarding appointments to the committee to review screening committee policy:** Crisp reported that the administration would like to put together a small committee to review DMC policy regarding screening committee procedures. He suggested that the Council should approve an appointment to this committee or give the chair the power to appoint a faculty member at the beginning of next week. **Discussion and possible action regarding proposed policy B5.44 Grievance Resolution Policy for Employees:** Crisp reminded the Council that it had reviewed a version of this policy on April 30 and had "declined to approve it," largely because the proposed policy eliminated the right to appeal to the Board of Regents as the final recourse for a grievant or respondent. Crisp noted also the proposed change in most of the policy from "B" (Board) policy to "A" (Administrative) policy. He noted the recent establishment of a committee that is considering revisions of the whole policy manual, including the extent to which procedures (or current administration policy) could or should be separated from Board policy.

Report from the distance learning ad hoc committee: Committee member Russell Long reported that the committee had been meeting every Wednesday, working on the job announcement for the Director of Distance Learning, and that the position had been

moved from a chairship with 60 percent release time to a directorship with 90 percent release if the position is filled by a faculty member who wishes to retain tenure and 100 percent release time if filled by a member of APT, who would serve at the grade 8 level. The committee will meet again on November 10 to finalize the announcement. The position will be posted shortly thereafter. The committee will discuss other concerns, such as the evaluation of distance learning courses, the approval of new DL courses, and the definition of “hybrid” courses.

Report from the committee to review the F.C. Constitution and Bylaws: Chair Cynthia Perkins reported that the committee had met and begun to review the relevant F.C. documents. She said that Crisp had come to the first meeting and suggested some guidance for the work. Crisp said that the main thing he hoped to convey was that, while the committee will determine the extent and scope of its efforts, the chief task of the committee might be to bring the Bylaws up to date and eliminate anachronisms and contradictions. Dudek suggested that the committee might try to clarify issues connected to the terms that Council members serve. Ondrejas brought up the notion of a “Faculty Senate,” in which all divisions are represented equally, regardless of size, and he suggested a “straw vote” to test the response to this idea.

Report from the Financial Concerns Committee: Chair Stephen Ondrejas reported that the committee met two weeks previous and that he was re-designated as chair. He said the committee discussed faculty participation on the Financial Concerns Committee and the Budget Committee, asking how younger faculty members could be encouraged to become involved in the financial elements of the College, but offered no recommendations at this point. He said that the committee hoped that the phased retirement program will be expedited so that any savings realized can be reflected in next year’s budget. He said that the committee would monitor the implementation of the 18th step in the faculty pay scale and would attempt to derive common definitions of terms like “performance-based budgeting.” He said the committee is interested in policy that guarantees equitable treatment in connection with grants. The committee has a meeting scheduled with the President next week. McKinney asked whether Del Mar could or should opt out of the Social Security System and whether individuals could opt out, independent of the College. No one had an immediate answer, but the committee will take it under consideration.

Report from the VPI search committee: Committee members Joe Dudek and Bob Long reported that, as of today, the committee had completed the matrix, applications are due on Monday of next week, and the committee will meet again on the 12th of November to begin looking at applications.

Report from the Teaching and Learning Center Committee: Ondrejas reported that the TLC Committee had met and reviewed its budget and unit plans, determining that the unit plans are in excellent shape and that the budget, including POD monies, is approaching \$200,000. The committee talked about exploring funds through the Foundation, which, Ondrejas reported, has about \$350,000 in faculty and staff development funds. Ondrejas distributed a brochure entitled “**Collaborative for**

Teaching Excellence, and announced a statewide conference on this collaborative on February 24. Don Craig has been designated chair of this committee.

Action Items:

Adoption of the Agenda: Motion: Caballero moved that the published agenda be adopted for the meeting. B. Long seconded. **Voting in favor:** Caballero, Dudek, Frederickson, Hamil, B. Long, R. Long, McKinney, Moller, Ondrejas, Perkins. **Voting against:** None. **Abstaining:** Crisp. **Motion passes.**

Discussion and possible action on proposed policy B3.11 Public Speech Activities:

No action proposed or taken.

Discussion and possible action regarding appointments to committee to review screening committee policy: Motion: Ondrejas moved that the chair be authorized to make this appointment early next week. Frederickson seconded. In discussion, B. Long said that he would talk with members of his department next week and forward any possibilities to the chair. Two possibilities from the Division of Business were offered, as well. Crisp said that he would make the appointment during the following week after input from Long and discussion with the officers. **Voting in favor:** Caballero, Dudek, Frederickson, Hamil, B. Long, R. Long, McKinney, Moller, Ondrejas, Perkins. **Voting against:** None. **Abstaining:** Crisp. **Motion passes.**

Discussion and possible action regarding proposed policy B5.44 Grievance

Resolution Policy for Employees: Motion: B. Long moved that the Council designate proposed policy B5.44 as “reviewed with recommendations,” as follows (1) that the entire policy remain as Board policy rather than be changed to administrative policy (2) that, in the interest of confidentiality, the documents required to file a grievance be available online and (3) that the final review of a grievance be made by a “grievance review committee,” if not the Board of Regents, rather than by an individual. McKinny seconded. McKinny said that, depending on personalities, he would much rather see a grievance go to a “handful of people,” rather than be decided by a single person. Caballero asked for clarification about the change from Board policy to administrative policy. Crisp said that another committee was currently in the process of evaluating the policy manual, especially with regard to the appropriate distinction between Board policy and administrative policy. Cohn supported the idea of deferring a decision on this part of the current policy until the policy manual committee makes decisions on the manual as a whole. Discussion ensued regarding differences between the old B5.44 and the new version. Frederickson asked, given the many exclusions such as sexual harassment, what this proposed policy actually covered. He said, also, that he didn’t see any reason why the Board should serve the last stage of appeal. Ondrejas agreed that it shouldn’t go to the Board, but said that he likes the idea of the appeal going to some sort of board, perhaps the Promotion Appeals Committee. **Voting in favor:** None. **Voting against:** Caballero, Dudek, Frederickson, Hamil, B. Long, R. Long, McKinny, Moller, Ondrejas, Perkins. **Abstaining:** Crisp, B. Long. **Motion fails.**

Motion: B. Long moved that the Council designate proposed policy B5.44 as “reviewed with recommendations,” as follows: that the policy be sent back to the original committee that produced it and that the committee consider adding a step or replacing the presidential review step with a step that includes a “grievance review committee” and that the committee consider the policies of other community colleges. **Motion dies for lack of a second.**

Motion: Ondrejas moved that the discussion of the policy be deferred until the Council’s December meeting. R. Long seconded. In discussion Dudek suggested that Council members email their suggestions to the grievance policy review committee. **Voting in favor:** Caballero, Dudek, Frederickson, Hamil, B. Long, R. Long, McKinny, Moller, Ondrejas, Perkins (Thorn, Crowson, McKinny by proxy) **Voting against:** Cohn. **Abstaining:** Crisp. **Motion passes.**

Announcements: None.

Adjournment: The Council was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Minutes prepared by John M. Crisp