



GCCCD VISION, MISSION, AND VALUE STATEMENT

Vision: Transforming lives through learning.

DEC CHARGE: The District Executive Council (DEC) serves in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor. DEC advises the Chancellor on District policy development and governance issues, and on matters referred to the council by the colleges, District Services, and/or college/District standing councils or committees. DEC reviews and recommends items for the Governing Board meeting dockets.

DISTRICT EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MEETING NOTES

Monday, November 30, 2015, 1:00–2:30 PM
Grossmont College, Griffin Gate

Chair: Chancellor	Cindy Miles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Confidential Admin Rep.	John Valencia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VC Business Services	Sue Rearic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Confidential Employees Rep.	Cheryl Detwiler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VC Human Resources	Kim Widdes for Tim Corcoran	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Academic Senate President-CC	Alicia Muñoz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
President-GC	Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Academic Senate President-GC	Tate Hurvitz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
President-CC	Julianna Barnes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Classified Senate President	Ari Ahmadian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ASGCC President	Mariah Moschetti	<input type="checkbox"/>			
ASGC President	Baredu Morka	<input type="checkbox"/>	Also Present:		
AFT Representative	Jim Mahler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recorder	Rosie Ibarra	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CSEA President	Eddie Vasquez	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Admin Assoc. President	Michael Copenhaver	<input type="checkbox"/>			

Convened:

Discussion items	Action/Follow-Up	Communication (Yes/No, to whom/by whom)
<p>A. Governance Handbook Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districtwide Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Council Technology Coordinating Council Website Standards & Communications Committee Workforce Training Coordinating Council District Services Council 	<p>Cindy welcomed everyone. There were no additions to the agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workforce Training Coordinating Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a deletion in wording of a duplicate committee. ➤ Classified Senate Representation will alternate on all participatory governance councils/committees, pending update of Classified Senate constitution and Bylaws. <p>This was the final review of the Governance Handbook; it will go to the Board in January 2016 for adoption.</p>	No
<p>B. Tuesday, December 8, 2015, Governing Board Docket:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4:00-5:00 p.m., Board/DSP&BC 2014/15 Strategic Plan Outcomes Report 	<p>Item 204 Set the Time, Frequency, and Place of Year 2016 Regular Governing Board Meetings—As a side note, the January 2016 Governing Board meeting will be held at <i>Grossmont College</i> instead of Cuyamaca College, and the March 16 Governing Board meeting will be on a <i>Wednesday</i>.</p>	<p>Re Item 204, yes. Rosie will email docket 209 to DEC</p> <p>DEC members will communicate the changes in Governing Board meeting information.</p>

Discussion items	Action/Follow-Up	Communication (Yes/No, to whom/by whom)
	<p>Item 207 Academic Calendar 2016/2017 Grossmont and Cuyamaca Colleges—There was discussion on whether the Colleges will be moving toward having the summer 4/10 schedule start after commencements. The Committee is working toward this.</p> <p>Item 209 Grossmont College and Cuyamaca College 2015/2017 Student Equity Plans and Item 303 Purchase Orders and Warrants—Will be emailed as soon as it is available.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Re items 209 and 303, yes. Rosie will email the items as soon as available.</p>
<p>C. Board Policies/Administrative Procedures</p> <p>Reviewed by DCEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BP 5016 Veteran Student Attendance 	<p>The following board policy will move forward to the Governing Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BP 5016 Veteran Student Attendance – renamed to “Veteran Affairs”. 	<p>No</p>
<p>D. Consideration of a Bond Proposal for 2016</p>	<p>There was discussion regarding consideration of a bond proposal for 2016, and noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of the unions will be willing to fund it and do all the heavy work • The District would not need to spend their resources, as AFT will fund the bond campaign • A high turn-out of voters is expected for the 2016 General Election, so placing a facilities bond proposal on the ballot would be beneficial • The District would need to put together an updated Master Plan <p>A document that provided Prop 39 information that includes what is required to place a facilities bond on the ballot, the actions required, and the costs involved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current bond that passed in 2012 is for \$398 million and the needs stated in the Facilities Master Plan were for over \$700 million. However, there also needs to be a review of the financial aspect of a bond campaign, including the cost involved to fundraise, capacity of work, support of area, and more. 	

Discussion items	Action/Follow-Up	Communication (Yes/No, to whom/by whom)
	<p>There was concern for the large amount of work involved in this large undertaking with the other projects that Cuyamaca College is involved with: Alliance, Strat Plan, all the student equity efforts and Student Success efforts.</p> <p>The council was walked through the timeline of a bond: electoral feasibility, financial considerations, legal compliance, and voter alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase I: Feasibility analysis (9-12 weeks) • Phase II: Pre-Ballot Bond Evaluation and Community Outreach (6-12 months) • Phase II: Bond Campaign (88 days to election) <p>There was concern that the District would survive a campaign at this time. Between accreditation work that needs to be done and two new presidents having six months total time on staff, it would be really important that the Board knows that the Colleges do not have the capacity to do this campaign.</p> <p>The Foundation is trying to raise \$10 million at this time for the Alliance Higher Edge Scholarship endeavorment, and that asking for money to campaign would be competing against the Foundation. The concern is that the fundraising and support for the Alliance might be hurt by an antagonical bond campaign.</p> <p>It was stated there would be no need for campaigning through District employees. The only project the District would have is to update the Facilities Master Plan. The union would supply all the money and all the campaigning.</p> <p>Updating the Facilities Master Plan is a large undertaking. Currently, with so many large scale projects underway, massive staff turnover, folks are already feeling stretched, and do not have the bandwidth to do another big initiative. Everyone needs to be very respectful.</p> <p>A question was asked: if the bond campaign would be affected by the people that are upset over the PLA. Yes, the same groups will campaign against a bond.</p> <p>It was added that going out for a bond is too soon, Prop V is just getting started - and there is concern about the implications for the Colleges if people come out against them. In terms of public perception, being that the two presidents are new, they have not had the opportunity to build public perception and good relationships.</p>	

Discussion items	Action/Follow-Up	Communication (Yes/No, to whom/by whom)
	<p>In addition, there was agreement that there would be attacks on the Colleges and District. The attacks likely would charge that the District didn't keep their word the last time, and it's too soon to ask for more money because no building projects have begun on the 2012 facilities bond. There is also concern about the effect on enrollments. Numerous organizations as well as mayors and other elected officials would publically and actively oppose the District. Although there is never a perfect time to go for the Bond, this would be an especially bad time. The elections of 2020 would be better in that the Colleges and District would have had a chance to heal community relations, to prove the work with the PLAs, to prove that building projects have started and finished, and dismantle some of the arguments that would come.</p> <p>It was suggested to go for a bond anyway and that it really wouldn't matter if we lost, at least we tried. However, it would indeed matter if we lost. When a district loses a bond election, it is a "vote of no confidence" from the community.</p> <p>There were no further comments or questions. If Jim wishes, he could send a proposal.</p>	
E. Next Meeting	Monday, January 11, 2016, 1:00–2:30 PM, Cuyamaca College, Student Center, Room I-209	