

Ventura County Community College District
District Council of Student Learning
January 25, 2007
Moorpark College – President’s Conference Room

MINUTES

PRESENT: Leo Orange, Denise Avila, Jeannette Redding, Mayo delaRocha, David Farris, Ramiro Sanchez, Jeff Baker, Susan Bricker, Susan Cabral, Pam Eddinger, Jeff Ferguson, LaDonna Righetti, Letrisha Mai, Amy Cook, Andrew Anzalone, Kathryn Schoenrock, Ana M. Valle, and Eva Conrad. **Excused:** Lyn MacConnaire, Glenda Gardner

The meeting convened at 2:00 p.m.

Approval of November 2007 Minutes

Additions requested; unanimously approved with suggested changes.

Discussion on Group Structure

Request was made to place “Robert’s Rules of Order” as an item on the agenda. Eva suggested postponing the request until the end of today’s discussion, as the emerging conversation about the group’s operating agreements may inform the issue. There were further suggestions about the practice of operating by consensus, and various discussions surrounding the pros and cons of past practices in DCSL.

Eva introduced a working timeline and a draft document about DCSL structure, and asked for discussion. A number of concerns were voice about the process by which the timeline and the draft were compiled. Concerns were also raised about the need to have feedback from the Academic Senates and Curriculum Committees.

The Senate Presidents responded on behalf of their Senates on the process and the documents:

- Jeannette noted that the OC Senate and Curriculum Committee require more time to review the material.
- Kathryn noted that the VC Senate and Curriculum Committee have reviewed the material and is ready to respond.
- Jeff Baker reported two issues from the MC Senate: 1) There is a deep concern that Jeff Baker was prevented from participation during the previous meeting, ostensibly because he had not shared the draft and the timeline with his Senate. The MC Senate finds that reason to be invalid, and is in the process of drafting a letter of complaint. The letter will reflect the sentiment of the MC Senate that their president is free to speak for the Senate with or without prior consultation. 2) The MC Senate asks for the reassurance that we

all have the right to “agree to disagree” in an effort to move the process forward. Without that agreement the group risks impasse and inaction.

Jeff Ferguson noted that there is an urgency to deliberate and act because we had agreed to present a solution by April.

A lengthy discussion ensued, recapping the pros and cons of current practices, the nature of DCSL as a shared governance committee versus a district council, and the primacy of college curriculum committees in college curriculum work. Several conflicting suggestions were made, including the formation of a non-voting council for curriculum, disbanding of DCSL, formation of a voting shared governance subcommittee under a district council model, and others.

A key question was posed as to the Chancellor’s primary concerns. After a short dialogue, the group understood the Chancellor’s concerns as follows: 1) Accreditation and KH Study both cited the need for formalized structures of communication, and 2) the need for a check and balance system for legal compliance of our curriculum. It was also reiterated that the Chancellor is asking the members to define and document the structure being proposed, but is not interested in dictating the final form of the structure, as long as it effectively addresses the two points noted.

While there were vocal concerns that the draft and the timeline were clearly not acceptable in its current form, and there was no common understanding of the structure or the charge of the body to be formed, the members agree to review the documents together.

In the discussion of the draft timeline, a number of key points were made: 1) Campuses would have opportunities to review progressive drafts of the document. 2) It will be difficult to add more large group meetings between now and April. 3) We could revise the timeline if, in the process of editing of the document, we find that we need more time. With these points noted, the group agreed to try to work with the timeline presented.

In discussing the structure of the proposed group, a number of configurations were suggested, with a general consensus that it should be two separate groups, each with a different function:

- **Group A:** participatory governance committee, reviews curriculum for legal compliance
- **Group B:** district council, deliberates on student learning issues

Kathryn reiterated that she and her Senate would not support a gate-keeping committee, and urged that the name of the group as well as the charge reflect that fact. A variety of suggestions for names were offered, all of which reflect

common concepts such as: curriculum review, tech review, workgroup, and compliance. Members agreed to postpone the decision of a name until the concept and its documentation is in a more complete state.

The group work through the initial portions (**Group A**) of the document in a line-by-line fashion, completing review and changes for a number of pages.

The group concurred with Jeff Baker's suggested that the Chancellor be apprised of the progress of the group today, and to ask for an extension of the April date.

Eva will amend the draft with suggested changes, and distribute via email to the group. The group is requested to review and send back any corrections.

The Academic Senate Presidents are asked to take the corrected draft to their Senate for review and feedback. Feedback is due on or before the February 22 DCSL meeting.

The February 22 Meeting will address: 1) the feedback for the proposed structure for **Group A**, and 2) the portion of the document that defines the structure of **Group B**.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Note: Additions and revisions to Moorpark College and Oxnard College curriculum were presented and reviewed at the subcommittee prior to the full DCSL meeting.