

Laney College
November 17, 2010
Room T-450 / 2-4 p.m.

MINUTES

Present:

Eileen White, Don Petrilli, Indra Thadani, Louis Quindlen, Shirley Coaston, Dawna Williams, Ann McMurdo, Lisa Cook, Karolyn van Putten

Absent:

Elnora Webb, Marco Menendez, Tina Vasconcellos, Dorothy Marie Wilson, Ron Jones, William Highsmith, Lisa Cook, Amy Bohorquez, Miriam Zamora-Kantor, Lilia Celhay David Reed, Donald Moore, Becky Hsieh, Sonja Franeta, Laura Bollentino, George Kozitza, Terrance Green

**I. Welcome and Introductions
Announcements & Updates**

- President was called to the District to a special and impromptu budget meeting for Presidents and Vice Chancellors

II. Minutes Approval - Council

- There was no quorum present to approve the minutes from the Oct. 20, 2011 College Council meeting. They will be added to the agenda for the next College Council meeting.
- The Vice President of Instruction Eileen White should have the answers to the questions asked of Vice Chancellor Ron Gerhard at the next meeting.

III. Faculty Prioritization – Vice President of Instruction Eileen White

- The Academic Senate members already received today's report, which has since been edited by President Webb.
- The provided handout is missing the DSPS coordinator/counselor.
- Item number 8 on page 2 will be the P.E. instructor.
- There are a large number of needs campus-wide.
- There are massive needs on both sides of the 50% law, so the Committee generated a report to show the needs of the college and didn't separate the Instructional vs. Student Services Faculty needs.

- The Faculty Prioritization Committee reviewed work from previous year's Committee and invited individuals/departments that had current retirees from the previous year to be added to the list of positions to be reviewed/prioritized.
- "A" list = most urgent, "B" list = must have justifications, "C" list = positions that we need, some have justifications. All lists were submitted to impress upon the District the need, but we don't know at this time how many positions will actually be given to Laney.
- The need for the DSPS coordinator/counselor was noted. PFT Representative Marie Wilson, Sonja Franeta, Eileen White and President Webb met and agreed to add 2 additional positions. This was approved and forwarded to the Department of Educational Services.
- Question: Is Laney in compliance with the 50% law (50% of budget has to be spent on the classroom)? Answer: This is counted at the District level, not at the individual campus level. We are in compliance.
- Positions within CTE cannot leave CTE, so sometimes they are moved around.
- There was discussion about Counselors not attending the last meeting and how this may have affected the prioritization of counseling positions.
- Concern was expressed that because this prioritization list is from the prior year Committee's work, and does not reflect current needs.
- The Committee made the decision as a group to follow the process used the year before – to use the old list of positions, and then add only the vacancies/recent retirees to that list. Then the Committee looked at the justifications that came from the program reviews. It was acknowledged that the list was based on retirees and vacancies, not a complete list of needs.
- Faculty expressed that they were led to believe that the Program reviews would be used to generate the faculty prioritization needs. But that this is only true if there is opening/vacancy in a department.
- Concern was expressed that ALL of the needs for the campus (old and current) were not included in this report because of the process. Some felt that the list was not complete given the process that was followed. Needs were not based on the current program reviews. It was stated that this affects the ability of departments to have access to information as to how to move forward based on how they would've been ranked in this prioritization process. Concern was expressed that the unit plans are not being used accurately.
- It was indicated that the tight timeline for the prioritization process this year did affect the Committee's ability to include all positions.
- Sonja Franeta indicated that this was a very difficult task, and that the committee did very well under the circumstances and timeline.
- Concern about the process with which the list was developed was reiterated. Those concerned clarified that the outcome is not the point. The concern is related to the process not being in line with the agreement as to how it would be developed, and that the agreed upon process was not adhered to.

- Vice President of Instruction Eileen White suggested that at the beginning of the next semester, the committee can go through the list and look at the positions that people have asked for in their program reviews, and that were not included in this prioritization list, and add them to the list to be prioritized. Looking through the other documents without the time constraints will allow them time to do a more comprehensive prioritization process.
- Before the Committee gets together again, Shirley Coaston suggested that the Deans go through the program reviews to pull out identified/needed positions, and then the committee will prioritize those positions.
- It was suggested that the overall process is flawed because it does not allow for long-term planning. What are we doing to document long-term needs? How do we document something that hasn't happened? Discussion ensued about how to do this and why it is needed. Vice President of Instruction Eileen White agreed it needed to happen. We may not have the money for all of the needed positions, but we need for the placeholders to be maintained so that we project the need for these positions.
- President Webb is in contact with the District to make it well known which positions we need, regardless of vacancies due to retirement.
- Concern was expressed that the classified positions, once lost, are not being returned to the campus.
- Change to Faculty Prioritization document handed out. Take away #9 on page 4.

IV. Assessment - Assessment Coordinator, Karolyn van Putten

- Assessment (the completion of Program Reviews and SLOs) is a College-wide goal and an ACCJC recommendation – Assessment of all courses by the end of the semester.
- Per the Assessment Coordinator, Karolyn van Putten, we have not made significant progress in this regard since August. Only slow progress. Hence, will need to adjust one of the intended outcomes of the year.
- General Education/Institutional outcomes will be assessed, however, this intended outcome will not be met given that the general education assessment has not begun and the institutional outcomes have barely begun.
- Supposed to have all program level outcomes in place by the spring semester. Dr. Van Putten also doesn't feel we've made any noteworthy progress in this area. Also moving slowly here.
- Peralta Federation of Teachers President Debbie Weintraub sent out a communication to PT faculty to not be pressured to sign-up for extra services/duties without being paid a stipend. Dialogue has begun with Chancellor to understand the need for stipends because of the necessity of assessment.
- We have 2 assessment hours planned 11/23/10 and 11/30/10. Purpose is strategizing for learner-centered teaching and deep learning.

- Knowing how to use Taskstream is important. The Assessment Committee is working on developing a structure whereby department chairs will be trained in order to train the faculty within their department.
- Suggestion: Hold a work-day for as many staff as possible to do Taskstream work.
- Concern was expressed about starting a practice of giving stipends to faculty/staff for assessing SLOs or entering their work into Taskstream because it's a part of their instructional duties.
- Faculty Senate concern that many faculty are not familiar with Taskstream and so have shut down to this process.
- Based on the outcomes of last year's training sequence, we made 1% progress that year. New strategy is to target the training to hopefully be more successful.
- Concern was expressed by the CTE chair, Louis Quindlen about program level outcomes and the limited capacity to follow-up on students 6 months after they leave to assess how well we prepared these students for the jobs they go into.
- Louis Quindlen indicated that state-wide, it's being reported that CTE is having problems doing program outcomes and assessment.
- Also expressed by CTE faculty... Other circumstances that create roadblocks to get this work done, is that there is not enough time in their work day to do these tasks. Requested that someone be hired to take the info. from the course outlines and syllabi and Curricunet and to enter it into Taskstream.
- Discussion ensued about the difficulty of getting information into Taskstream and the importance of doing this, and brainstorming on diff ways to address this issue.
- Additionally, the Catalog is completed based on the information that is entered into Curricunet. Catalog coming out in July 2011. Need to get all classes entered for this process.
- Question posed → What we can do to force faculty who haven't updated their curricula in YEARS, to update it? The educational code says to update it every 6 years. Are we in compliance? How do we get in compliance if certain faculty don't do their job?

Committee/Senate & Resource Updates

- ASLC President Dawna Williams
 - Concern expressed about students being locked out of classes because of the IT fiasco
 - Is there an opportunity for students to get help when they are not being allowed to enroll? Now they have to go on a wait list. Someone needs to talk to Vice Chancellor Ng about this.
 - Priority registration was not honored. Students want the support of the Faculty and staff on this.

- Is there a way that we can identify the students who are having difficulties with their priority registration and hence are now not able to get their classes? At last board meeting they said that they would extend the prioritization time so that students would be able to address this. This is a moot point now, because the time has come and gone.
 - Haven't received update on the date of the temporary health center completion...Any word on this? Student leadership offices are now empty and completed but no one is there. It was suggested that the ASLC President follow-up with Vice President Moore in this regard.
 - It was noted that before we communicate with students, we need to be clear with the District about what accommodations will be.
- Head Librarian, Shirley Coaston brought an item for discussion by the Council – the Electronic Database for the Library. This line item has been consistently passed over in past budgets. It was argued that it is critical for students to have access to electronic database subscriptions, so we need to have them. This subject was agendaized for the Faculty Senate meeting yesterday but they ran out of time. It is being requested that this be funded from the district level, rather than from the college level - using Measure A dollars. The Librarians want College Council's support when recommending to the District Education and Budget committees. No quorum present to vote, but Council members present supported the request that the District fund this purchase.
 - Board policy committee sent the issue of fees for concurrent student enrollment to be reviewed by Legal Counsel to ensure that the policy revisions that they are considering are even legal.
 - On Dec 4th, \$2 million for community colleges in grants will be opened up. As a college, how are we going to decide to go out for those grant funds? We need a systematic approach to ensure that they fit in with our education priorities and Facilities and Education Master Plans.
 - The process for going after grants was explained. Concern was expressed about the one person at the District responsible for going after grants having a great disdain for Laney. President Webb indicated that we will determine this as a college. The decision is not completely up to the District. Suggestion was made to bring this to the Education Committee and/or the PBIC.
 - Note: We have to reapply for the CAA funds. Not automatic.