

Laney College Council
January 30, 2013
Laney Bistro / 2-5 p.m.

MINUTES

Present

Elnora Webb, Steven Cohen, Mildred Lewis, Indra Thadani, Lilian Chow, Kathy Ma, Irina Rivkin, James Blake, Peter Crabtree, Anne Agard, Louis Quindlen, Denise Richardson, Karolyn Van Putten, Evelyn Lord, Amy Bohorquez, Irina Rivkin, Marco Menendez, Phillipa Caldeira, Mark Wilson, Brian Cervantes, Anthony Elias, Kim Bridges, Trent Taylor, Nick Kyriakopedi, Brandi Howard, Suniya Malhotra (VBN)

Absent

Terrance Fisher, William Highsmith, Terrance Green, Suzan Tiemroth-Zavala, Miriam Zamora-Kantor, Mark Rauzon

Minutes: Maisha Jameson

Handouts: Agenda, Minutes (2012), PCCD 2012-13 Budget, Draft ACCJC Follow-up Report, Program Revitalization/Discontinuance Overview Doc., Draft Facilities Master Plan, 15% Restoration Budget Information, Draft Restoration of Discretionary Funds Memos from President to Chancellor with Budget Page attachments (Recommendation & Essential for Spring 2013 Memos)

I. Welcome and Introductions

- The group introduced themselves.

II. Minutes

- There was not a quorum for the meeting. The vote to approve the previous meeting minutes will be postponed for the February Council Meeting.

III. Facility Master Plan (FMP) – *Suniya Malhotra (VBN Architects)*

- The purpose of this agenda item is to vote on a recommendation for approval of the Draft FMP to go to the President. The FMP is also due to the District Chancellor for his review so that it can go to the Board for approval.
- VBN Architect Suniya Malhotra gave a brief presentation on the FMP....including a brief historical summary as to how we got to this point. Included mention of the input from faculty and staff. Focus is on sustainability and is based on the foundation of the global standpoint of the economy.
- The FMP is meant to identify and build upon the goals and priorities set within the Education Master Plan (EMP).
- There is a demand for Laney to offer more, to more students.

- The purpose of the FMP is to look forward, expecting for the funding/budget issues to be overcome in the future.
- The plan addresses 1) the campus aesthetics to make it more inviting to students and the community, 2) the infrastructure upgrades and updates, 3) supports what is underground so that we are able to support the foundation on all upgrades and 4) includes smart technology upgrades that last.
- There will be a computer lab for each building for teaching purposes, and then an additional computer lab that is accessible to students at all times.
- Large lecture halls will be included in the new BEST center building.
- Secure gallery spaces to allow for more of an arts hub within the surrounding art community.
- New Wellness Center to include a new pool, gym and tennis courts. Potential to open-up the gym to community members.
- The entrance ways to the campus will be restructured to open-up the campus to the outside in a more inviting way.
- Include signage and way-finding.
- There will be a new Learning Library Resource Center. The existing (old) library will become the swing space for all other upgrade/construction projects....and then when all is done, will be used as the new Laney Commons.
- The plan has a phased approach that spans out over a 30 year estimated timeline.
- Will modernize the Odell Johnson Performing Arts Center/Theatre.
- Will modernize the B and G buildings.
- The A bldg. will become the new One-Stop Center to include the Welcome Center.
- There will be a new Children's Center in the later phases.
- New face to campus on Fallon street side
- Amphitheater near the Art Bldg.
- Mesh screen on the Laney Tower to brighten up the architecture.
- Screen shots of the layout were shown
- Lanterns on each building will connect and light the bottom and top floors of each building
- Bio-swells & water features through the campus
- The process we went through to develop the plan is included within the body of the plan
- Marco Menendez – shared that it would be helpful for people to understand the approach the District & College took towards the plan and architectural designs. This plan is a big picture and we will need to go to bid for each one of the projects individually. This plan will not be departmentalized. Also, the timeline of the plan may change due to funding.
- Karolyn Van Putten – Q: Does this plan address any of our short term plan projects.? A: No. This plan is a bigger vision.
- There is a \$900million estimated cost for the full plan. Includes technology, furnishing, architectures, engineering, management fees, etc..
- Peter Crabtree – Q: What is the estimated cost of ownership post construction? Do we have the funding to maintain the facilities one it's all completed? A: This plan definitely increases the square footage of the campus by at least 25%. This is based on a predicted 20K headcount, which should bring in additional funding by the state based on FTES. We will also save on utilities. An increase in maintenance and custodial staff will be needed.
- We are prioritizing the work/projects based on what is needed most, and doing that first.

- Louis Quindlen – Q: Has anyone taken into consideration how these types of upgrades work for an urban campus? If we make much of these upgrades, we'll have more folks living on campus. We need more security A: Yes, USC is an urban campus and has made many of these upgrades. There will be less hidden areas.
- Irina Rivkin – Q: What is the source of funding? Concern expressed that funding not be taken from student services and instruction to fund this. A: We will have to bring in additional funds (bonds, grants, state funding, etc.)... The sooner the State allows for the additional FTES, we are assuming (big assumption) there will be more associated state funding.
- It was emphasized that there needs to be a single point of entrance for the Library. The lantern idea for the library may not work because it allows entrance for various levels.
- The Facilities Committee has concerns about the phasing of the plan. There are 20 steps to the plan that will detail the phasing. How fast we move through the steps depends on funding. For example, we may only initially be funded for Steps 1-5.
- Concern expressed about Dance having access to locker rooms if they are moved out to the Wellness Center.
- The plan of the phases will need to be flexible because the market may change, funding, etc.
- The Infrastructure, sustainability and smart technology standards are not flexible...and are non-negotiable because they are priorities.
- Suggestion - Measure A monies should be spent on energy efficiencies and infrastructure because they are really needed and it is harder to get other bond measures for these basic needs.
- President Webb asked the Council to recommend to her as President to move forward with this FMP. Next step would be that this first final draft of the FMP be presented to the Chancellor in hopes of his approval to go to the Board for approval.
- Denise Richardson – Q: Has the plan gone through the Facilities Planning Committee (FPC)? A: Marco Menendez – the FPC led the initiative. There is still some discussion to be had about the plan. Text is still needed to back up the plan they are discussing.
- Karolyn Van Putten – Q: Has the FMP been officially vetted through the FPC? If not, it should be. A: The FPC just got that actual plan, and hence are finally seeing the finalized version for the first time last week.
- Evelyn Lord – spoke to her concern about the library being a priority. President Webb affirmed her that the library is the #1 priority, independent upon the pace of this FMP.
- Peter Crabtree – Q: What does it mean to approve the FMP in today's meeting? Needs to be high level approval. A: A Master Plan is a broad, global perspective. Making clear our principles and links of programming. We're approving our priorities. It's saying, "here's our trajectory given the educational priorities of the college". The Plan is not to be placed in stone. It's a flexible document. Overall concepts are planned out.
- The President expressed concern in the fact that the FPC was not ready to make a recommendation today. Expected for the FPC to get what they needed to be ready to recommend to the Council today. Disappointed that this rigorous discourse has not been done to date.
- It was shared that crisis can be an opportunity for both danger and opportunity. Danger of not moving this forward in a timely manner is that the Plans of the other colleges are being moved ahead while Laney's stands still. If we get our plan in quickly, then we can drill down in on the specifics later. Suggested to it in so we don't lose traction now.

- Louis Quindlen noted that he is a member of the District Facilities Committee, and decisions are currently being made to buy buildings for other colleges.
- Suniya Malhotra – We need to get the big picture approved by the Board, and then we can still mark up and change each of the pages for the actual FMP document. The final one will have all the comments addressed. The drawings have not changed since last year.
- Denise Richardson asked a question related to making a MOTION - Has concerns about the process...about the fact that the FMP has not obtained a vote from the FPC. Q: Can we chose wording within the motion that is a win win, leaving today with a conditional vote for approval? Ex. Approving the FMP on the condition that the input of the FPC is considered and incorporated in a meaningful way?
- Amy Bohorquez expressed concern about the word “consensus” with regard to the FMP.
- There has been poor turn-out at the FMP related Townhalls, FPC meetings, etc..
- Concern was expressed – “The reason we have not gotten our own share of Measure A is our own fault. We’ve had a hard time doing the work that’s necessary to get our place holder across the street. We have seen so many iterations of this document. Just need to get it done.”
- It was shared that out of respect for the Shared Governance process, we should wait for the FPC’s input before the Council officially makes a recommendation.
- The Chair of the FPC was not present at the meeting.
- Denise Richardson called a MOTION TO APPROVE THE FMP IN CONCEPT TODAY WITH THE UNDERSTANDING, AND ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS THAT, THE FPC WILL REGROUP, REVIEW THE DETAILS, WEIGH-IN AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION THAT WILL BE HONORED AND USED, WITH THE APPROPRIATE CHANGES, INPUT AND FEEDBACK BEING INCORPORATED INTO THE DETAILS OF THE PLAN BEFORE SUBMITTAL TO THE CHANCELLOR. MOTION APPROVED. EIGHT COUNCIL MEMBERS VOTED YES, ONE MEMBER VOTED NO, AND TWO MEMBERS ABSTAINED.
- Evelyn Lord – Concern expressed about the necessary high ceilings in lab spaces. Q: If we approve this plan, do we lock ourselves out of getting this for needed instructional labs? A: No we do not.
- Peter Crabtree – Concern – DAS Pres. use of term “dispatch”. Doesn’t think the College Council can vote in a meaningful way until it gets back from FPC. Needs to be a timeline for action. Feels vote that just happened is mute until FPC reviews it. Wants the Council to give the FPC a deadline.
- Denise Richardson doesn’t want to stop the Plan from moving forward.
- Recommendation that there be a special meeting called of the FPC to occur before the next College Council meeting. FPC to meet on February 11 in order to discuss the Plan so that the Committee can bring the Plan back to the February College Council meeting with a recommendation. If this does not happen, the recommendation goes forward.

IV. Program Revitalization & Discontinuance Process – Karolyn Van Putten

- Discussion ensued about the development of the process/document
- Louis Quindlen made a MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROCESS. AMY BOHORQUEZ SECONDED THE MOTION. 10 COUNCIL MEMBERS APPROVED THE MOTION. THREE MEMBERED ABSTAINED. MOTION PASSED.

- The District developed a procedure for program discontinuance and revitalization, and requires the campuses to have a process at a local level before the district implements theirs. Ours will be used as a model for all campuses. Our process has been thoroughly discussed and vetted with Faculty on campus and was inclusive of academic and CTE programs.
- Marco Menendez – Q: Does it drill down to course level – A: No.
- Louis Quindlen assured the group that every attempt will be made to revitalize programs before they are discontinued.
- This document has been posted on the Curriculum Committee’s website for about a year, and was sent out FAS a couple of times.

V. Accreditation Follow-up Report

- The President asked the group, “How many had a chance to read the Follow-up Report?”...Few had.
- Very proud of our Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) working with our Faculty Senate President, Denise Richardson and all of the Deans to produce the draft we have today. This document was a truly collaborative effort that included input from many across the campus.
- EVP Cohen thanked the group for their work and collaboration on this.
- This document did not have a high level of student involvement, but we expect to have more student involvement on the Laney College Self Study (Evaluation).
- Details, suggestions/feedback and concerns to be sent to the EVP by this Friday.
- This group shared how their response to the document.
- James Blake – to provide feedback from Classified Senate by Friday.
- The Report is basically our response to a recommendation given to us by the ACCJC.
- Marco Menendez shared that this document is not just for the ACCJC. It is also for us as well. We use these reports for ourselves as a way to assess ourselves.
- Louis Quindlen – Shared a concern about when the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) is addressed in the Plan, it is not well defined. The BAM is critical for our ability to survive financially. In terms of our own wellbeing, we need to document this importance of the District adhering to this BAM for our survival.
- Classified Faculty Senate President, James Blake – expressed concern about the shortage of staff and the critical need for additional classified staff due to many staff working more than one job and not being reclassified. Expressed that he felt that no one talked to Classified (they are not given the opportunity to weigh in on this report). Concern was also expressed about pgs. 12-13 – replacing classified positions with faculty or consultants...This is problematic from the Classified Senate’s standpoint.
- We need to include discussion of ratio of classified staff to students – similar to how it is done with the faculty to student ratio.
- Need to reference how we are making determinations of what is needed as far as reasonable accommodations
- Need to ensure that one particular sector of this community isn’t taking the brunt of the funding cuts.
- More custodial services and staffing is needed here.

- We are putting a lot of pressure on Classified staff to perform over and above what they are capable of doing. This is pushing people to find other work elsewhere. Need some sense of normalcy, because this is not normal.
- Need to start talking about our fiscal relationship with the District. Laney is not in a favorable position as far as how our funds are being allocated. Takes too long to get budgetary information each year. Until we have more autonomy as far as how we allocate our budget, we will have others framing our priorities for us.
- James Blake asked for documentation as far as our needs for custodial services. Marco Menendez was asked to resend electronic versions of these numbers.
- Brian Cervantes – Expressed a strong stand with what James Blake stated. Also concerned that this report is missing the student’s perspective. Students haven’t had any way to provide input to the ACC JC Follow-up Report. It was asked that we please involve the students in these report planning/feedback meetings.
- Denise Richardson shared that the ASLC is going through a leadership shift due to loss of eligibility of several of its’ leaders. They need to regroup and encourage involvement from all levels. Marco Menendez to send emails of the student leaders to Denise Richardson so that she can do email blasts to include them.
- The Faculty Senate reviewed the Follow-up Report and voted in support of the document with the condition that the feedback submitted on last Friday will be included and considered.
- Trent Taylor expressed an agreement with the statements from James Blake related to the lack of resources and the vacant positions within Custodial. Maintenance of facilities is not being addressed. Not sure of the protocol and funding to get these things taken care of. We have students and parents bringing Cal OSHA on board for matters that are not being tended to. Q: How will we go about addressing these outstanding staffing matters and facility issues? A: Maintenance for this campus is left to less than two people for the entire campus. The work orders are piling up and they are trying to address this. In short, there is insufficient staff out of DGS to address our college’s needs. There are only two custodial vacancies in our budget. A fourth one may be given to us because a custodian has not returned to work after being on leave. There has been an \$11million difference and reduction in our budget over the last couple of years. Our role, as administrators is to try to unencumber staff from these issues. We will be now engaging in prioritization of classified and faculty staff positions based on the program reviews. The appropriate committees should be completing this work within the next couple of weeks. Classified prioritization to be done through the Budget Advisory Committee. Need to add a meeting to get this work done. The President indicated that these priorities will be addressed via one of these processes.
- EVP Cohen – There are infrastructure and staffing issues noted in the report...They were informed by the program reviews. All program reviews spoke to these issues – specifically our lacking in classified staffing.
- The Plan for ensuring quality programs and services in on page 36 and is still in progress. This section will address the issues that the Classified staff are raising in this meeting. (Ex. busted pipe in classroom that is dropping onto the lab beneath it.)
- As a college, we need to identify what are our priorities moving forward. Need to state our plan going forward. We are doing hiring now, and will be doing more hiring for additional positions that we will hire for soon. Suggestion - This plan needs to have more autonomy as far as budget allocation.

- We need to identify what our next steps are.
- Karolyn Van Putten – already shared detailed feedback through the Faculty Senate and EVP... Was surprised by how specific and detailed the section on facilities was in the document.
- Louis Quindlen – Monday Dr. Ortiz was on campus with Dr. Ikharo doing a walk through. Shared concern that the Laney President or a FPC member wasn't included. Information not getting through to the Board via DGS.
- Evelyn Lord – The layout of the document – On pg. 9 there is an analysis of the impact of financial decisions on staffing. Q: How does this differ from pg. 19 (“Impact”) and pg. 11 (librarian/counseling services)? Suggestion – remove the section about the library. A: EVP Cohen – We'll take another look to make sure they connect and there are not redundancies.
- Irina Rivkin – will send her feedback – Please include addition to counseling section on page 11 → Learning Community Models. Add to solution – to increase collaboration and communication between all sectors of counseling.
- James Blake – The ACCJC representatives have encouraged us to find our own problems and highlight our challenges and provide a plan to resolve it. Need to be honest and transparent. Need to show we know we have a problem and address it. Need to connect the dots to this conclusion. We don't have a lot of money, but need to speak to this. It's ok not to know the answer. Maybe the answer can be found with those that do this work every day. We will be measured by our ability to stay true to these values and our mission. Need to believe in values and one another to get things done as a community.
- Karolyn Van Putten – Appreciate the truth being reflected in this document.
- Marco Menendez – Reminder - This is due to the Commission March 15...Has to be approved by the Board in early February. Can't touch it after that.
- Notion of the Follow-up Report is different from a Self-Study and/or Mid-Term Report. These last two are more comprehensive. A Follow-up Report is meant to address a specific recommendation → Evaluation of the impact of the District's financial decisions on the College's ability to provide quality programs and services. Need to just address this.
- All comments are due to the ALO by this Friday. The College President must have the Report next week and it needs to be done by then. There are three major issues that are still to be addressed: 1.) Planning for the road ahead. 2.) Need more complete budget details to be included, and 3.) Need to correct the errors in staffing (What we received from the District is not right. President Webb indicated that we used to have up to 29.5 faculty vacancies several years ago...but they are not all showing in the details we currently have in the report.)
- The President indicated that she needs to ensure accuracy, completeness, and integrity in this document.
- The EVP is working on compiling the back-up documentation for the Follow-up Report. Maisha Jameson Q: Does the Office of A/SA needed help with this project? A: The EVP said that he would contact Maisha Jameson to follow-up.

VI. Budget

- The President is working to ensure that the Chancellor frees up as close to the 15% of the “discretionary” funds to the campuses as possible. The President handed-out copies of the draft memo that went to the Chancellor communicating our urgent needs that need to be addressed with these restored dollars. This document lists priorities needed for this year.

- The President informed the Council of the budget gap analysis document that was developed within administration. This document identified the gaps in funding for Office of A/SA.
- President Webb spoke to the letter from Vice Chancellor Gerhard to the Chancellor – This includes notes to the fact that the Colleges have constraints as to how they can use the dollars. Must use the 15% not for where they came from, but rather for where they are being reassigned. The Business Office has already placed where that 15% of restored funds should go. Restoration of 15% funds. These should be directly aligned with what the deans said they needed.
- We currently have salary savings in 3 distinct areas (counseling, librarians and classified). Some of these dollars are to be specifically used for this semester. But the remainder are to be leveraged to fill other positions in other parts of the College.
- We may have to move money from additional salary savings we have in order to backfill so that at the end of the year, we will have a balanced budget. Please make sure that you are moving money where it is needed, but also where it is legally appropriate.
- Irina Rivkin – Q: Categorical Counselors also do some counseling related to career planning, etc., Can some Measure B funds be used for backfilling to those areas? A: President Webb – Please bring these questions to your immediate supervisor to bring to the EVP.
- EVP Cohen - Laney received approximately \$1.6 mill from Measure B. Prop 30 provided and additional \$800K.
- James Blake – In the District’s Planning & Budget Council (PBC) meeting, it was indicated that they want to stabilize/equalize deficiencies of colleges to bring all colleges to the level that they should be. Hence may not be an equitable restoring of funds across the campuses A: President Webb – This is not exactly fully accurate. Karolyn Van Putten – It appears that some things were undercounted and that’s why those adjustments were made.
- President Webb – The BAM has still not been fully implemented. We need a focused discussion to understand this model as a Council. Too much ambiguity still remains.
- Marco Menendez – Currently Laney is not getting its’ full share. Currently the other colleges are getting close to \$5K per FTES and Laney is getting approx.. \$3500 per FTES. We have over 40% of the CTE programs which have smaller class sizes and need more money to operate/provide these courses.
- Karolyn Van Putten – The BAM still needs to be reviewed and updated. Get your concerns to the College President or Karolyn Van Putten (members of the PBC) in order to bring these concerns to that PBC body.
- The BAM has some gaps and loopholes – which leaves it up to interpretation as far as how it’s implemented.
- In future facilities funding, the facilities will also follow the BAM. The PBC voted on it and approved it.
- Evelyn Lord – asked Marco Menendez to email the group his calculations on how he got these figures (above). This speaks directly to student equity.
- Nick Kyriakopedi shared that certain infrastructure issues need to be addressed ASAP.
- Karolyn Van Putten – Q: Where are and will these urgent facilities/maintenance needs be systematically documented and addressed? A: EVP – should be through the business office. Peter Crabtree shared that he feels it goes beyond that. Many of these projects go beyond what the engineers can do and should be considered small projects to be addressed by DGS.

- President Webb – Q: Can the representatives of the FPC have a discussion about this and make a recommendation as to how to handle these requests? This group should work to recommend to the President’s office a process to address these issues that includes working with the Business Office. Louis Quindlen requested that this list be shared with those on the District Facilities Planning Committee.
- There was a Deferred Maintenance List that was provided to the DGS – and was developed by faculty in their Program Reviews. When this list was compiled, and submitted to the District Facilities Committee, they were told to resubmit all the work orders. We need to go beyond this to advocate for a budget allocation that will be used for these emergency infrastructure needs.

Meeting Adjourned 5:05pm

DRAFT