

Laney College Council
March 20, 2013
Laney Bistro / 2-5 p.m.

MINUTES

Present

Elnora Webb, Steven Cohen, Inger Stark, Joe Bissell, James Blake, Evelyn Lord, Irina Rivkin, Anne Agard, Indra Thadani, Mark Rauzon, Lilian Chow, Phillippa Caldeira, Brian Cervantes, Amy Bohorquez, Son Franeta (representing for PFT), Greg Valentine, Trent Taylor, Karolyn Van Putten, Students from Tobacco-Less Club

Absent

Peter Crabtree, Terrance Fisher, William Highsmith, Denise Richardson, Louis Quindlen, Don Petrilli

Minutes: Maisha Jameson

Handouts:

- Agenda
- LC Emergency Operations Plan
- Informational re: Classified Staff Prioritization Process – “A Long-term Solution to Ensure Staffing for Institutional Effectiveness
- List of Contract Faculty Vacancies by Department
- Listing of Classified Staff Vacancies by Category of Employee
- Listing of Academic Administrators Before and After Fiscal Impact
- Provisional Classified Staffing Recommendations for PBC
- Tobacco-less Club Survey
- Shared Governance Calendar of Standing Committee Meetings
- Laney College Participatory Governance and Administrative Structures Doc
- Health and Safety Committee Minutes

I. Welcome and Introductions

II. Minutes

- Amy Bohorquez moved to approve the minutes for the 2012 through February 2013. Motion was seconded by James Blake. 1 abstention.
- James Blake asked that the Council keep a list of the timeline of the motions and make note of those motions that require action so that we will be able to track follow-up to action related items.

III. Tobacco-less Club - Students

- The non-smoking advocacy group started at BCC and have been successful in getting signage and such for that campus working from a grass roots standpoint
- This club is currently brainstorming about how they can better inform the board policy on this subject
- Have already met with Laney and PCCD administrators
- Desire is to streamline the implementation of AB795 and specific board policy – Need to identify what is the best way to educate the stakeholders that doesn't come across as the smoking police.
- An idea shared was possibly going into classes and doing presentations
- Also will be following-up with the Laney Health and Safety Committee
- Signage needs to be updated
- It was noted that until the signs are up, we cannot cite students
- There are signs already up around campus – additional signage will be going up next week.
- Another idea shared was to create smoking areas with receptacles around periphery of campus to prevent the littering of the campus. Dr. Webb's indicated that is the Laney policy is that if we are a non-smoking campus, there will be no smoking anywhere.
- Mark Rauzon – Question: Curious why COA and Merritt allows smoking and BCC and Laney don't. Should be uniform. Answer – The set-up at BCC is one entrance/exit. Berkeley already bans smoking in public zones. Dr. Webb followed up and added that Merritt has a no smoking policy as well.
- Sherriff shared that they also have issues with there not being a uniform policy across the campuses. It creates confusion and issues with regard to enforcement.
- Irina Rivkin shared that she was concern about smoking allowances on campus... Smoking should not be allowed near the crosswalks where folks are forced to wait in the smoke.
- Phillippa Caldeira noted that people don't read the signs. The c=city of Berkeley has the resources necessary to enforce these rules (i.e. ambassadors). Is there any way to provide a resource to help the smokers stop smoking...smoking cessation workshops? Need enforcement of signs. Also it should be noted some students can't read the signs.
- Ideas shared - Possibly collaborate with the student safety aides. Encourage collaboration with the Health & Safety Committee.
- Dr. Webb confirmed that the College would work for better implementation and enforcement of the non-smoking policy.

IV. Clery Act and Emergency Preparedness – Greg Valentine

Clery Act

- This is a State mandate that includes requirements that the Colleges carry out appropriate notifications, drills, plans, etc. with regard to incidents on campus.
- The major notification system for PCCD is the Alertify system which captures contact information for staff and students and when prompted, sends out emergency messages from the District Office, Colleges or Police Services.
- There is a list of authorized users for notification that has been updated. This list was recently sent to Vice Chancellor over the Dept. of General Services so that it could be posted on the website along with other emergency preparedness information.
- Working to update the Alertify data. Data captures are pending (pulling current contact info. for all constituents soon) – expect to be completed this semester
- There is a gap in the system – Alertify is our way of capturing the faculty, staff and students in the classrooms, however, there is currently a no cell policy. There is a push to change the no cell-phone policy to allow for cell phones to remain on vibrate during classrooms. Working to boost cell phone towers around campus so that cell reception is not an issue.
- Testing to be done predominately in the spring and then also during the summer.
- The Clery Act requires evacuation drills as well. Laney has done a number of successful drills for various sectors of the campus. Next is to have a college-wide evacuation drill. This is scheduled for May 8, 2013. The President's Office to confirm this date and time and send out the invite to the first Drill Planning Meeting.
- In support of this College-wide drill, the Health and Safety Committee will call a separate meeting dedicated specifically to planning for this drill. This drill will involve the Fire and Police Depts., faculty, staff and students. Need to provide advance notice. Will also post signs around campus.
- Campus Emergency Preparedness Incident command Team to assist with this as well.

Emergency Preparedness

- A section from Laney Emergency Preparedness Plan was passed out.
- The Office of Risk Management has repeatedly updated the Incident Command Team List in the Plan so that it remains accurate. The group made some updates to the list given the current staffing at the College. Mr. Valentine asked the group to make updates as suggested and that his Office would then email the updated pages to be inserted into our binders.
- Incident command system is designed so that we should not have to have all members of the team present on any one date.
- Dr. Webb indicated that she would like to bring more of our college staff to be involved so that they can be leveraged for these roles. We seem to always use the same folks. Dr. Webb went on to point-out that the Incident Command Team is overwhelmingly made up of classified staff by design in order to ensure we don't make assumptions about faculty. But we welcome the input and help of faculty staff.

v. Classified Prioritization

- Pres. Webb made note of the Shared Governance Process as it relates to the Classified Prioritization process. Some classified priorities were identified and passed out. It was noted that we are going to go through a shared governance process this year (which we will continue in future years). Pres. Webb asked the group to provide their feedback on what they would like to have changed or what they like about the process that was passed out.
- Evelyn Lord noted that there seemed to be one step that is missing → That usually when we have a vacancy – we give first opportunity to refill vacancies. Pre-existing vacancies get automatic priority.
- James Blake shared that the faculty should be able to see a breakdown of staffing for their areas on the Program Review form that allows faculty members to be prodded to address this issue. He also asserted that if we always prioritize the existing vacancies, then the only new positions that we will get to consider will occur only if you get new money. And we are likely to not have this (incoming money) happen very often or soon. This would significantly reduce the district's flexibility to fill or advance other needed positions. Our needs will change overtime. We need to remain flexible to adjust. For example, do we replace the shoe repair faculty?
- Inger Stark suggested that we include the pre-existing vacant positions so that they make the list, but that they get re-rated each year along with the others.
- James Blake noted that this speaks to the issue of process....There needs to be some engagement from the college community as far as what we need as far as staffing needs.
- Evelyn Lord followed-up with an alternate suggestion → If there is a position that is a vacancy, it will be placed on the list, and that unit will be allowed the opportunity to fill the position, however the need for that position will have to be justified. There is serious concern that departments will lose their positions if the vacancy is not funded, as the need is still often there.
- Irina Rivkin suggested filling gaps and prioritizing staff by need of service. For example, if a position is lost and the service is no longer provided, it will be removed from the prioritization list.
- Denise Richardson agreed that we should maintain the process of putting old positions at the top and allowing the committee to vote as a part of the regular process each year.
- Don Petrilli suggested that we first need to determine as a college what are the pertinent positions and operations that we need to fill. Viability of program should play a part. We do have some models that could be shared as far as how we prioritize these things. Maybe we should allow ranking to be done by a broad sector of the college.
- It was suggested that we need to assess what's happening now on campus in order to determine and address how this is all affecting staff and students as well.
- Irina Rivkin noted that we should always consider how each vacancy attributes or affects student success.
- It was shared that Laney College has to look at re-establishing what are the priorities of the College, and then determining where do we put our resources. We may likely need

to do some reallocation of resources. Laney has changed the way we look by circumstance (as opposed to by design).

- Amy Bohorquez agreed that the existing vacancies be added to the list but not ranked any higher than the others on the list.
- Inger Stark shared that we need clarity on what “funding purposes” means – for clarification (step 5 & 6) noted on the Classified Prioritization Process.
- Dr. Webb wants the Council to review this draft Process document and provide your vote to approve, OR provide feedback for change.
- Evelyn Lord – Suggested that we add justification of the need be included as required by the units requesting a position so that those reviewing it are aware of the need and circumstances. This should be included as a part of the process.
- James Blake noted that it would be best to have a system of transparency as far as the data – ex. unit plans.
- Mark Rauzon noted that legal compliance for health and safety concerns be included at the top of the list for the review criteria. Consider full time vs. part time. Consider part time positions to allow flexibility for when the needs are changing.
- We will consider all the input received and Dr. Webb to update the process. Dr. Webb asked the group if any were interested in serving on a small Task Force to update this Prioritization process/document. Dr. Webb and James Blake to meet this Friday afternoon in this regard.
- Inger Stark shared a reminder that this body makes recommendations to the College President and the College President makes the decision. This should be stated clearly on the document.
- It was asked who defines priority?
- Suggestion 1– Each unit has the opportunity to defend an existing vacancy to be re-prioritized.
- Suggestion 2 – Allows each unit to put all vacancies in the same batch each year to be considered for prioritization, and the need for all positions have to be defended.
- Administrative input provided in steps 2 & 3 because the unit may not be aware.
- James Blake noted that we need a process that quickly determines what units need to fill vacancies so that this process doesn’t go on and on.
- Dr. Webb shared that as of last week, the Colleges were told that if you have a vacancy in your budget, you can fill it now (faculty and classified). No longer a laborious process to fill it. Please note: Still may need to advocate and fight for positions that should not have taken out of the budget.
- Louis Quindlen asked what happened to all of the positions that were taken from our budget?
- It was noted that we have to have sufficient staff (the human resources) assigned to screening committees in order to get the hires completed. People are overloaded. The processes are taking too long and so we are losing capable candidates along the process. If the screening committee only requires 3 staff, we are going to have that number and no more. Louis Quindlen noted that he would volunteer for a hiring committee.

- It was shared that the District has taken away funding from our full-time faculty positions. The only ones we can hire for are those that were in our budget last year (2011-12).
- Pre-existing positions that are on our lists and in our books, but they are no longer in our budget, the funding is gone.
- Administrator positions are required to have administrators on their hiring committees. There are only so many administrators, and they are also overloaded. Classified positions can be done over the summer. Faculty hiring has to be done before summer.

vi. Laney College Participatory (Shared) Governance (SG) Structure

- As early as next week, President Webb will provide a redraft of this SG document in order for the Council to inform the changes that will be made to the SG doc
- President Webb asked for the Committee Chairs to provide an update on recommendations for 1) change to existing charge, 2) change to existing membership (dept./titles or SG units represented)
- Committees include → Facilities Planning, Technology Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, Matriculation, Health & Safety, Budget Advisory, **Learning Assessment**, **CTE Advisory**, College Council, Professional Development, **Curriculum** (this Committee brought their update last year), Foundation Skills, Faculty Prioritization, **Instructional Equipment and Library Committee** (Those in red are not SG committees)
- The question was posed, “What makes a Committee a SG Committee?” Answers shared include: Charge, Members, Constituents, Ed Code AB1725, how we define them in our Educational Master Plan (EMP), where decisions go for consideration, who the committee advises
- It was suggested that all of these Committee be sub-committees of the College Council
- It was noted that the Unions are a negotiating body and hence not a part of shared governance. The various members in the SG committees are already members of the unions anyway.
- Louis Quindlen suggested that when looking at carrying out the EMP, we need to keep our 3 priorities in mind. Have to tie the organizational and SG structure back to the goals we are trying to carry out. Organize the committees around our 3 college priorities (CTE, Fdtn. Skills and Transfer)
- Need a way to link the plan to the structure...as opposed to organizing them around subjects. What about transfer program concerns? How do they get discussed?
- Discussion ensued about which committees should be considered SG Committees?
- All units may not need to be included in membership. Ex. Bring in experts to consult on issues from time to time when this is needed/appropriate.
- Evelyn Lord shared that some examples include Transfer and the CTE Advisory Comm. and Foundation Skills Committee – all falling so clearly under Education and should be predominantly under Faculty. These Committees are more appropriate as Faculty Senate committees.

- Inger Stark – College Council is the ultimate SG Committee. There are some groups that are sub-committees of this larger Council. Need to map these committees back to the Council.
- Goal – at end of semester is to have a revised SG structure.
- Trent Taylor suggested that Custodians should have input into this revised structure as well.
- A small SG Work-group was identified – James Blake, Elnora Webb, Trent Taylor, Inger Stark. The charge of this group will be the following: 1) Define SG at Laney College, 2) Determine the charge and role and responsibilities of each committee, 3) confirm which groups are SG committees and 4) Determine the membership of each Committee. This will all be the beginning of the process of defining Planning and Budget integration at Laney College. Please also identify the web addresses and contact information for each Committee. Establish annual planning & budget process timeline (adding assessment to this so that it is just integrated). This could also be a sub-group of the Inst. Effectiveness Comm. (IEC). The IEC website to be updated.
- Pres. Webb – This revised document is to be done by April 3rd. This doc should have our Unit plans and PRs included as well.

vii. FY 2012-13 Budget & FY 2013-14 Budget Development

- Joe Bissell, Business Manager Consultant provided an update on the Budget Development process.
- We are in a unique situation – Thanks to passage of the Parcel Tax and Prop 30, its good financially this year, unlike in a long time.
- The District is predicting a 1% growth for next year, which means adding 11 new positions for next year and 8 of them will be instructional.
- We can change our discretionary accounts, but the total amount stays the same. The group was advised to look at the discretionary accounts.
- Joe Bissell asked all departments to look at all of the positions within their budgets. Very important to go through this list because the District has many errors in the budget, ex. Pres. Webb is coded in the wrong cost center.
- Passed out the timeline for budget development. Needs all input by April 13. Deans have had this information for a while now. It was suggested that all non-administrators indicate their specific wants for changes to the budgets by communicating with their Dean.
- Many of us deal with categorical accounts, but the assumption is that the overall amount will be relatively flat. In this case, we should be looking at what should be shifted.
- The Governors January proposed budget allows for a 3.6% increase. District hasn't taken this into consideration yet. The Board of Governors will determine how this will be given allocated – ex. as a COLA? District on hold with this. Classified positions to come in if and when that extra funding comes in.
- Within PCCD the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) is being implemented. Still working to create some equity amongst the colleges. The plan is to balance this over time.

- The Business Manager will also Co-Chair the Facilities Planning Committee, the Health and Safety and Budget Advisory Committee.
- Louis Quindlen – We need to look at people who are retiring soon in order to plan for succession.
- Philippa Caldeira – knowledge should be shared in order to mentor potentially capable and experienced staffers to take over.
- Although this has occurred in certain departments where we had had outgoing retirees who mentored those who took over. Ex. Shirley Coaston mentored Evelyn Lord and Coach Peters mentored Coach Beam, it was noted that current District-wide hiring procedures don't allow this automatic hiring/promotion process. The process at Laney is more often to bring back the retirees on a contracted basis to do overlap in training
- Bob Fleming in our Financial Aid Dept. will be retiring in May – we need a transition plan that will be smooth. It was noted that the Financial Aid supervisor is already addressing this.

Meeting Adjourned 4:45pm

DRAFT