

Laney College Council
January 25, 2012
Room Laney Bistro / 2-4 p.m.

MINUTES

Present:

Eileen White, Elnora Webb, Inger Stark, Amy Bohorquez, Denise Richardson, Brian Cervantes, Anton Bosneaga, Indra Thadani, Lilian Chow, Sonja Franeta, Newin Orante, Evelyn Lord, George Kozitza, Marco Menendez, Don Petrilli, Mark Rauzon, Karolyn van Putten

Absent:

James Blake, Dorothy Marie Wilson, Mariam Zamora-Kantor, Terrance Fisher, William Highsmith, Becky Hsieh, Louis Quindlen, Suzan Tiemroth-Zavala, David Raughton

Minutes: Maisha Jameson

Handouts: 1/25/12 College Council Minutes
Instructions for Completing an ICC
2012 Updated PCCD Travel Forms, Policies and Procedures
DRAFT Laney College Response to ACCJC Recommendation #5

I. Welcome and Introductions

Announcements & Updates of Constituent Bodies – Senates and Committees

- The group went around the table to discuss what their hopes and dreams for this College and Committee were for this semester.

ASLC

- ASLC has changed their governance structure. Now committees are organized by task and sub-committees. If there are issues to be addressed, please contact the Chair of the committee to which the issue is related.
- Upcoming events - Welcome back on Monday on the Quad and a Blood Drive on Wednesday.
- The ASLC publicly thanked Dean Marco Menendez and David Reed for serving as advisors to the ASLC and for helping them along. The help is really appreciated because the need is great. The ASLC vowed to make mention of this need at all meetings until a Student Advisor is hired.
- Concerns about Fund 82 – still trying to access this fund, but haven't had opportunity to do this. VC Ron Gerhard said the budget has not been loaded, but will be soon.

- The ASLC Publicity Committee is trying to come up with their own calendar of events. They will continue the ASLC Newsletter given that the Tower will not allow them a full page.
- Concern was expressed about the issue of dropping students from their classes. An email goes out as a warning to the student's Peralta email, but many of the students aren't aware of this or know how to access their Peralta email.
- All formal communication goes to the student's Peralta email.
- Need to identify where the system did fail in this regard and also inform students as to how to access their email.
- EVP White asked Business Manager Kozitza will develop a one-pager about this.
- If there is an emergency, Alertify is used to send urgent messages.
- Technology Committee asked to talk with Business Manger Kozitza about what they have already done in order to help the Business Office centralize this information.

Technology Planning Committee

- 2/17 – Next Technology Committee meeting. IT support has been boosted. Improvement on campus.
- The first District Tech meeting is on the 2/3.

Facility Planning Committee

- Town-hall meetings with Architects working on the Laney Facilities Master Plan build-out are set for... 2/8 → 6-8pm and 2/9 → 12-2 in Student Center.

Graduation Committee

- Graduation date/time -- May 24th from 6-9pm in the Football stadium
- The Committee is great – lots of students. Still building the membership.
- So far the Committee has decided that they want the graduation to take place here in the Laney Football Field. Rental money set aside for a venue is to be used for rain contingency and decorations.
- Keynote speaker – They are reviewing a list of 11 possible candidates and all of them will be checked with for their availability. Requesting that the speakers agree to this on a voluntary basis. The Committee does want the option to be able to pay if they have high profile options.

Library

- The Library had new study rooms installed over the holiday break. New plants as well. Open for business.

Faculty senate

- Haven't had meetings yet. Starting 1st and 3rd Tuesdays of each month

Learning Assessment Committee (LAC)

- The Professional Day power point presentation will be sent out to be shared with the college community
- Assessment week coming up 2/8 - 10

Safety Committee

- Back on track with fire drills. Will target building G.
- Meeting minutes to be shared with the Council via Maisha Jameson

Accreditation Task Force

- Beginning to work on a draft of the Accreditation mid-term report. Responding to 7 recommendations and our progress on our improvement plan.
- Most of the draft is complete. Working on formatting.
- Have a meeting set for 2/6 – may have to have 2 brief meetings.
- Looking to have a pretty much complete draft by next week.

Sustainability Committee

- Had their first meeting last Friday
- Working to pick a date for the Sustainability Conference to be held here on the Laney Campus. It will emulate last year's model.

Budget Advisory Committee

- Will meet on Wednesday
- VC Ron Gerhard has been invited to address the budget, budget calendar, the E-accounts and the implementation of the allocation model.

Curriculum Committee

- 3rd transfer degree going up for approval

Counselors

- Concerned about there being almost no classes left for students

President

- We are working on event and meetings calendars. Send all event and meeting information to Maisha Jameson.

Executive Vice President

- Working on a newsletter for faculty and staff to boost communication – This will come out of the A/SA office. If you have any announcements that need to be included, please send that information to Rochelle Rodgers.

II. Minutes Approval - Council

- The November 17, 2011 College Council Meeting Minutes were approved by the Council. Evelyn Lord and Don Petrilli abstained from the vote.

III. New Travel Form and Procedures

- Business Manager George Kozitza summarized the new travel request forms, policies and procedures.
- Chancellor will NOT sign to approve travel after the travel has taken place.
- The most notable change is the per diem rates (for meals and lodging) that have been established, by region. No more than the established per diem rate will be paid, even if the cost of the conference hotel is more.
- The question was asked how would individuals be notified that their travel form has been approved? Maisha Jameson to provide this notification once the signed form is received back from the Chancellor.
- Please keep in mind the length of time that it takes for these travel requests to move through the approval process...and even longer for out-of-state travel that needs to go to the Board. Start early.
- It was noted that we need to capture outcome measurements in order to assess how many faculty are still able to take advantage of Professional Development given the new travel policies and procedures. Need to report if there is any kind of shift away from using Professional Development funds or participation in Professional Development activities.
- Document that you are on institutional business if you travel on campus time (even if the travel is being paid by you) – for liability processes.
- Question was asked is there a place to sign-off for the Professional Development Committee/Chair?
- There is a \$500/faculty-member limit for Professional Development

IV. ACCJC Mid-Term Report and Response to Recommendation #5

- There is a mid-term report required as a part of the ACCJC accreditation process.
- Laney has to respond to the progress of our work to address the ACCJC visiting team's recommendations as well as what was outlined in our 2009 Self-Study where we developed a planning agenda to improve the college over the next 5 years. We are half-way through that process and hence need to report on our progress.
- Need to respond to a total of seven recommendations - 4 college-specific and 3 related to the District. One of them is Recommendation #5...which asks us to address how the college is adjusting and operating given the budget cuts of the state and district.
- The Accreditation Task Force gathered information from other committees and individuals to incorporate.
- The draft of the Recommendation #5 Response document was passed around for review. The group was asked to read through the document and review the data and information for accuracy. If there are any factual inaccuracies, please let both EVP

White and President Webb know. Also, does the response reflect our experience as a college?

- Please keep in mind that this is a draft – the first of two. It is an incomplete draft, and hence gaps and holes exist. The second version will be coming to this body for approval.
- The timeline is tight. We need for everyone to respond electronically (capturing edits and notes via track changes) by no later than Monday. Comments to be sent to EVP White and cc. President Webb.
- Maisha Jameson will send out this draft electronically to the Council.

v. Discussion of Shared Governance and Membership Make-up of Various Shared Governance Bodies

- This item was requested to be added to the Council agenda by the Classified Senate (CS).
- There was no CS representation present at the Council to present, as the CS President indicated that he would not be attending the Council until this agenda item was addressed and/or the CS decided that he should return.
- President Webb gave a summary of the concern. The CS requested that the following changes be made to the membership of College Council: Remove union representatives as members of the College Council (Locals 39 & 1021, PFT). It was indicated that the CS made this recommendation in order to “re-establish delineation of Union and Senate roles and responsibilities”.
- President Webb read the following communication from the CS to the group to give some understanding to the CS’ recommendation:

RE-ESTABLISH DELINEATION OF UNION AND SENATE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

It has been clearly established that the role of the unions is specifically to represent faculty and staff in contractual and workplace/employment issues. The role of the classified and faculty senates is to participate in the governance structure of the college. The present structure allows representatives of the unions to bypass the senates in matters of governance, and allows for the disengagement of the union from the senate as a result. The fact that this is the present situation with at least one of the union bodies makes it an urgent matter.

We are not making this recommendation to be exclusive of anyone; rather we want to create a structure that ensures democratic participation and promotes union/senate cooperation.

The Classified Senate

The Laney College Classified Senate represents all classified staff members of Laney College in matters relating to college governance, and assumes the primary role in disseminating information and gathering input on behalf of the classified staff.

- A discussion regarding this recommendation ensued.
- It was noted that union negotiation happens at the district level and is not a college matter, and that the CS is part of governance both at the College and at the District levels
- It was indicated that the CS are concerned about their role and their value to the Council with the unions still maintaining membership in this body. The CS feels their leadership and latitude is compromised by maintaining the unions as Council members.
- President Webb expressed that she felt that the CS should attend the College Council as a unit and weigh-in as a member of the Council so that the Council can have an open, informed and rigorous discussion about this matter.
- It was indicated that the CS has a valid point - that this is a governance body and Title V is quite clear. Budgeting is an example. The perspective and scope of both bodies is different. Conflict of interest may arise between them.
- Evelyn Lord likes the idea in theory but is particularly concerned that we don't have CS representation present as we consider a recommendation in this regard.
- Dean Menendez noted that he was under the impression that there was already a clear delineation, but that it was simply a matter of the College not practicing or implementing it. We need to look at the notion of membership as it relates to the Title V agreement and look at it in the bigger picture.
- The fact that this issue is not just a concern specific to classified, but given the argument, also for the Faculty (PFT union) membership on Council, was mentioned.
- Faculty Senate (FS) President Sonja Franeta indicated that she agrees with what CS President Blake, E. Lord and M. Menendez expressed, but is concerned about what the union representatives have to say about this.
- Don Petrilli indicated that whatever decision is made here, would extend to all other shared governance committees. He also noted that we make decisions in these committees that have to do with work conditions. If we delete them, we will be missing out on some valuable opinions and perspectives. We should be careful. We need to hear from all parties.
- Dean Menendez shared that he thinks that it's true that one could make the argument that all decisions relate to work conditions, but that when we as a Council feel that we are breaching into the area of work conditions, we need to realize that that is something that is handled at the district level. There are lots of areas that are strictly left for unions and not discussed with others. For example, senates don't weigh-in on collective bargaining. We can have unions weigh-in on some things that are within their scope.
- Denise Richardson asked whether this is a matter of us implementing the law.
- President Webb gave some history context to the discussion and indicated that AB1725 regenerated senates in participatory governance. At one point there were no senates and the unions did all the advocacy
- Dean Inger Stark indicated that she thinks this conversation should be had when both bodies (union and senates) are present and that it should be moved to agenda for the next meeting.

- It was shared that sometimes we have almost a bullying environment that exist. When you have forceful personalities, it gets tricky. Ex. The Staff Development Director is part of the Union and so the Senate no longer has control over this committee which is where the money is. Per Ed. Code, professional development is for faculty.
- Dean Newin Orante pulled-up the Ed. Code on this matter. It was clarified that there is a mandate for shared governance but that it is not prescriptive as to how we implement it. The need for Academic Senate representation is very clear. Others (staff and students) are not as clear. It seems as if our institution has agreed to a model that includes union representation in our shared governance bodies.
- President Webb requested the will of the group?
- Business Manager George Kozitza sees the two roles as separate.
- Denise Richardson indicated that she just wants us to be in compliance...whatever this means.
- Dean Menendez feels that it would be helpful to have these bodies present to continue the discussion. Suggested that we specifically invite the senates and unions to come to the next meeting to address this issue and share their perspectives so that the council can take action.
- A discussion ensued as to whether a special meeting should be called in order to continue this discussion and make a recommendation so that we could move as an institution.
- Dean Orante made a MOTION to call the special meeting noted above. FS President Franeta seconded the motion.
- More discussion was requested.
- Don Petrilli indicated that he felt that a single rep for faculty and classified is a good thing.
- The MOTION WAS AMENDED – There will be a continued discussion of this agenda item at the next College Council Meeting (2/15). Need to ensure that there is a quorum to vote on a recommendation. If the Council chooses to amend the Council membership, then the process for identifying the membership will need to be determined and approved by the governance bodies of the college. The motion was voted on and approved by the Council. Aton Bosneaga seconded the motion. George Kozitza, Denise Richardson and Mark Rauzon abstained from voting. All other Council members voted to approve the motion.
- This discussion should be allowed 1 hour of the next College Council agenda.
- Karolyn Van Putten indicated that going down the path of setting-up a process for what the College Council membership is opens up the question as it relates to the membership of all other shared governance bodies.
- It was requested that if we have this conversation, it should not impede or halt our progress as an institution. We need to continue to honor our standing process in the meantime.
- Dean Inger Stark suggested that we wait until the end of the semester to address this issue and reserve changes for future semesters.

- Dean Menendez indicated that he understands the hesitancy to take immediate action, but he is concerned about not having proper representation on this committee as we postpone making a decision. By doing so, we are telling the CS that this is not important enough to address right now. By not attending, they are protesting (for lack of better words) to express the seriousness of the situation. It was suggested that if we look at membership of this committee, then let's leave our recommendation and determination to just this committee. The other committees can go through the same process to determine for themselves.
- The Professional Development, LCPAC (dissolved), CIPD and College Council are the only shared governance bodies that include union representation. Facilities Committee includes Local 39 Union reps only. All of this is according to the Laney College Participatory governance Document.

Meeting Adjourned 4:12pm

DRAFT