

Ventura County Community College District  
DISTRICT COUNCIL ON STUDENT LEARNING  
March 29, 2007  
Ventura College – Cafeteria Conference Room

MINUTES

PRESENT: Jeff Baker, Kathryn Schoenrock, Jeanette Redding, Glenda Gardner, Letrisha Mai, Denice Avila, David Bransky, Susan Bricker, Kathy Colborn, Jim Merrill, Mayo DelaRocha, Pam Eddinger, Ramiro Sanchez, Jeff Ferguson, Eva Conrad and Diane Eberhardy

**1. Introductions**

Motion made by K. Schoenrock, requesting particular notations be made in the February minutes regarding the tense discussion that took place. After a brief dialogue, members voted not to sustain the motion. Noting the gravity of the matter, however, the group clearly acknowledged the tension at the February meeting and pledged to help one another avoid a repeat of similar incidents in the future.

J. Redding requested to tape record the meeting; the group consented.

2. Approval of minutes for January 25, 2007 DCSL meeting  
Minutes were approved as submitted.
3. Approval of minutes for February 22, 2007 DCSL meeting  
Minutes were approved as submitted.
4. Approval of curriculum for OC reviewed by the DCSL Curriculum Subcommittee  
E. Conrad stated that the subcommittee recommended approval of OC's curriculum. Motion was made and seconded to accept the recommendation from the subcommittee to approve OC's curriculum.

J. Ferguson questioned the need to vote on curriculum as future curriculum will not be presented at the larger DCSL meeting. J. Redding expressed her understanding that while curriculum would continue to come to the larger DCSL group for information only.

The motion was withdrawn.

5. Meeting Place for DCSL in April  
The April 26<sup>th</sup> DCSL meeting will be held at MC with a room to be identified later. J. Ferguson noted that the articulation officers from MC and VC will be away at their annual conference. Curriculum will be reviewed by the articulation officers prior to April 26.
5. Review/Edit/Modify
  - Draft #4 for District Technical Review Workgroup
  - Working Toward Compromises Document

Process:

E. Conrad provided both Drafts #3 and #4 of the District Technical Review Workgroup. She suggested working from Draft #4 because it is the most complete and up-to-date.

Members worked through the draft, line for line. E. Conrad will forward the new edition to the group. A small group (J. Merrill, K. Schoenrock, P. Eddinger, R. Sanchez, J. Redding) agreed to check the changes, and respond to E. Conrad within 24 hours.

Members agreed to share the resulting draft to their respective constituent group for feedback. The Chancellor will receive the same draft by April 1 for review.

Points of Discussion:

**Membership:**

Student representative A. Anzalone supports student representation, noting that accurate curriculum has an impact on funding. There is also interest in student participation at Curriculum Institute.

J. Baker stated that MCs Curriculum Committee was uncomfortable with students having an equal vote as faculty, and agreed to an advisory student vote. J. Merrill is interested in a way to indicate an advisory or informational role for students.

P. Eddinger noted the importance of student participation as part of leadership development.

E. Conrad asked that this issue be taken back to the respective constituency groups for input.

J. Ferguson queried the logistics of having each Academic Senate select one faculty member. K. Schoenrock suggested that everyone take the questions about student representation and having each AS appoint one faculty member back for more discussion on campus. The group agreed.

**Handling Disagreements:**

E. Conrad noted that the Workgroup would be an advisory body to the Chancellor. Disagreements would be presented to the Chancellor. J. Redding added that the group is also advisory to the Curriculum Committees and need to provide feedback to them.

E. Conrad noted that the workgroup is charged to research and document interpretations it adopts. The documentation would form the basis for implementation. Consistent documentation, interpretation and implementation will keep the colleges and district in compliance and provide an audit trail should an audit occurs.

## **The Golden Rules**

Members agreed that this document will be reviewed.

6. Review/Edit/Modify
  - Draft of Charter for DCSL

The draft document was reviewed and changes suggested. The group also discussed the status of DCSL: is it a council or a shared governance committee?

E. Conrad noted that a group constitutes a council if members are appointed by virtue of their position. S. Bricker noted that DCSL is necessarily a council because of the broader, campus-wide issues that the group would address. E. Conrad will capture changes and suggestions made to the DCSL document and disseminate to the group in preparation for discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm