

Laney College Council
April 17, 2013
Laney Bistro / 2-5 p.m.

MINUTES

Present

Elnora Webb, Joseph Bissell, Denise Richardson, Anne Agard, Phillippa Caldeira, Kim Bretz, Don Petrilli, Josefina Baltodano, Peter Crabtree, Steven Cohen, James Blake, Brian Cervantes, Mark Rauzon, Louis Quindlen, Irina Rivkin, Carl Oliver, Amy Bohorquez, Lilian Chow, Karolyn Van Putten

Absent

Inger Stark, Terrance Fisher, Evelyn Lord, Indra Thadani, David Raughton, Sonja Franeta

Minutes: Maisha Jameson

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Classified Staff Prioritization Process
- Shared Governance Calendar
- Laney College Participatory Governance and Administrative Structures Document
- Preliminary Budget Development
- Peace Concert Flyer
- Enhancing Participatory Governance
- Facilities Resources Prioritization Document

I. Welcome and Introductions

- Dr. Josefina Baltodano has been hired to serve as the new Interim Vice President of Student Services (VPSS). She will be working to help fill the VPSS position permanently.
- Carl Oliver – former student of Mark Rauzon’s is visiting the Council...Carl will be running for student body president. He wants to learn more about the institution.

II. Minutes

- The minutes for the March 20, 2013 College Council Meeting will be voted on for approval at the May College Council Meeting.

III. Personnel Update

- We are working to hire the following administrators: two new Vice Presidents (VP of Academic Affairs/Instruction and VP of Student Services), one of the two Deans that

were cut during the re-org (Dean of Humanities), a new Dean of Mathematics & Sciences to replace Dean Inger Stark (who will be returning to faculty), eight new full-time Faculty positions, up to eight different classified positions + one additional to be added – All to address the significant gaps in our capacity.

IV. Classified Prioritization – James Blake, President , Laney Classified Senate (LCCS)

- A summary was provided as to what we can expect between now and the end of the semester as far as the Classified Staff prioritization process.
- Feedback has been incorporated into the process. There are no drastic changes...only minor updates. Once this process document is complete, it will go out to the Council by next week.
- Classified Senate President, James Blake recapped the process as it is noted in the process document. The goal was to try to capture as many positions as were identified through the Program Reviews. It was noted by James Blake that he has received input from other members within the campus community that their specific classified resource needs were not identified via the Program Reviews.
- It was shared that there is also a need to address the areas or people through-out the campus who are working in two positions, as well as those units that are depending on temporary workers, i.e. cashier's office, Curriculum specialist (Amany), etc., Welcome Center. We are seriously understaffed – We are double the size of the other colleges, and hence need more staff.
- The criteria used for the last prioritization process was passed out.
- It was noted that the list of Classified Staff identified were presented (in a non-prioritized format) to the Planning & Budget Council (PBC).
- This list of positions now needs to be prioritized. President Webb asked, do we handle this process through a classified prioritization committee, or should this be done via the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)? A response was shared by Faculty Senate President, Denise Richardson as far as the IEC's lack of capacity to take on this work before the end of the school year given the already existing tasks of that committee, i.e. SG committee analysis work (performing a critical review of each of our committees and determining how they are interconnected).
- Need to come to an agreement of a process and body to carry-out this prioritization work. Suggested bodies to do this work included: the Administrative Leadership Council (ALC) the Classified Senate/LCCS President, a sub-group of the College Council, or a combination of the Business Manager, James Blake and Dr. Webb.
- James Blake shared that he would feel more comfortable with more individuals being included, specifically from the student services side. Should capture a more true reflection to what our needs are.
- The following individuals were identified to serve on a smaller sub-group of the Council to address the task of Classified Prioritization: James Blake, Denise Richardson and Joe Bissell. The EVP will also identify another couple of individuals - a counselor and/or staff member within student services, and another classified staff person. Irina Rivkin indicated that she would serve on this workgroup if she doesn't

have to cancel any student appointments. More classified and student services staff are needed. The two VPs are to identify and confirm the members of this group.

- The group was given a timeline of 3 weeks to complete this work.
- It was also suggested that there be more student involvement. Brian Cervantes volunteered to serve.

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

- Denise provided a brief context about what the IEC were charged to do with regard to the shared governance (SG) process.
- The IEC have roughly half of the reports turned that are to be included in their future report to the College Council.
- There has been some very helpful information gathered which provides an excellent perspective to help inform this process for next year.
- This work will directly lead into our other SG efforts to update the College's Participatory Governance structure document and manual.
- The current Committee charges are out of touch with the salient needs of the College ex. Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) charge to cover policy.
- Need to make sure that this work is continuously assessed regularly to make sure that it is on board with the College's mission, priorities and needs.
- SG Workgroup members include James Blake, Evelyn Lord and Inger Stark.
- Key tasks of this group will be to take the feedback shared in the Council in order to define shared governance for Laney College and to clarify the charges of the various SG groups. Also will need to determine which are true SG committees. And will need to design the integrated planning processes in terms of how the work of all planning committees is related and tied back to budget and resource prioritization.
- President Webb asked the Council for feedback as to whether this is too much to be expected from this group, within this timeline?
- Amy Bohorquez suggested that the Council should only hear from the committees that are involved in updating the Educational Master Plan (EMP). Suggested that maybe the non-SG committees can just report through the Faculty Senate. Also, suggested to use the ACCJC rubric and not try to create our own. This is what we are being held to, and hence this is what we should use in order to report on.
- James Blake noted that the work that this work-group is being charged to do is dependent upon the work of the IEC.
- Peter Crabtree & Josie Baltodano shared their concern that the timeline seems very aggressive
- Concern was shared that the College's Facilities Planning Committee (FPC) is spending too much time following up on work orders – should be paying attention to the strategic stuff.
- Kim Bretz shared that the FPC is too busy to get to assessing this information, this semester, given the timeline and asked that given their other tasks, why rush this important work? It was noted that this agenda item has been on the FPC agenda since their first meeting this year, but they didn't get to talk about it until just recently.

- James Blake asked would it be possible for each committee to come up with their own individual timelines to see what time it would take for them to complete the task...and then determine when can we start the process in order to start-up again in August.
- It was shared that we need to take into consideration the move back into the Tower Building.
- Minutes to be posted on line for the various SG committees.
- President Webb shared that the primary reason why we are here is to accomplish the mission of the College to support students and provide quality programs and services. Hence, this work is secondary and is only critical so that we can rationalize the organization of getting to what we need to do.
- President Webb asked... Q: What is it that we can accomplish between now and when we leave at the end of May that moves us forward on this? It may be as simple as establishing/affirming the various charges of the existing committees. And then maybe providing this information to the Workgroup in order to look at it along-side the EMP and the ACCJC rubric to determine its' interconnectedness with the planning and budgeting decisions of the college.
- President Webb asked the small SG Workgroup to obtain from the SG committees their various charges, and to focus on #2 and #5 in the handout related to leveraging the ACCJC rubric and the EMP in order to evaluate the appropriateness or effectiveness of these existing charges.

vi. FY 2012-13 Budget & FY 2013-14 Budget Development – Joe Bissell

- Preliminary Budget Development handout passed out
- The District breaks-up the budget development into 2 parts:
 - 1) Personnel – provided list of positions...makes-up 80% of the General Fund budget
 - 2) Discretionary – this is unrestricted \$2.9mill dollars that we have some flexibility with. This does not include 1351.
- Need to build budgets with the input of the cost center Supervisors and Deans.
- If there is no new money is coming in, you are allowed to just shuffle the funds to where you want it within these discretionary areas
- Peter Crabtree – There is one big difference between this and last year → they are not taking away 15% this year, so we hope to get a fully loaded budget. In January, the Governor's proposed budget included a 3.6% increase. In May, the Governor also puts out a "Revised Budget". Legislature will probably approve the final budget in later June. The actual allocation is determined by the State Board of Governors (BOG) – They are not going to do this until after May – because that is closer to a reality. The new funds may be allocated for COLAs...or new programs, etc.. This is currently an unknown.
- Within our District, we create two budgets...We are required to generate a preliminary budget to be in place and approved by the end of June, and the next one to be approved by the second week of September.
- Joe Bissell spoke to the calendar for the Budget Development process that was included on the back of the handout

- Vice Chancellor Ron Gerhard will be on campus to answer questions on the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) on April 24th from 12 -1pm in D200
- It was noted that several faculty senate members have requested information in prep for this session. Joe Bissell to get this information out to Denise Richardson to send out to faculty ASAP
- Karolyn Van Putten asked how the dates on the budget calendar that was passed out aligns with the PBC meetings? Answer provided: This calendar is only for the preliminary budget. The District also expects a set of priorities that are related to budget (Technology, Facilities, Personnel) to be submitted. Joe Bissell will put together a calendar that relates to the budget development cycle.
- We will also be working to hire staff to fill the Assistant positions. Still trying to identify funding to cover the Assistant for the Dean. President Webb asked for suggestions.
- The average cost of fringe benefits was shared (\$0.26 for every dollar spent on faculty). It costs approximately \$24,000 for medical/dental/life and disability for each employee.
- The Vice President of Student Services (VPSS), Dr. Baltodano is looking for a temporary support person to start immediately.
- Some of these positions are already funded. It was asked to send out job descriptions of the various positions we are recruiting for so that individuals can spread the word.
- A brief description of what the BAM is was provided → a system the District is currently using to allocate funds amongst the four PCCD colleges. The funding is based on a 3 year rolling FTES average. Laney gets approx. 40.23% of the total for the District. Laney should be given 40% of the revenue to distribute. District expenses are pulled off the top. This distribution to Laney is \$1.78 million short of what the model says we should be receiving. It was noted that all programs and their costs are not equal, eg.CTE vs. transfer programs. Hence the way the BAM is designed, it won't allocate exactly Laney's fair share.
- Based on the 3 year rolling average FTES calculation, some of the other colleges are pushing for higher FTES in order to get more funds.
- Joe Bissell provided a warning against being FTES chasers...and eliminating low enrolled courses. Productivity is an issue. Laney's productivity has decreased. This is because last Spring we cut some of our large classes.
- It was shared that from an educator's point of view, it is important for faculty to be able to count on the BAM to provide what they feel is good education.
- The BAM is meant to provide more fairness to the Budget allocation process. From the other colleges' perspective(s), the implementation of the BAM may feel very unfair. This is being expressed by the other colleges given their provision of Nursing and Aviation. Analysis of the cost of CTE programs is needed to do to a true assessment of the fairness of the BAM.
- James Blake passed out a comparison of Peralta Peer Districts. He suggested that we analyze the data and make changes based on what the data suggests. Mr. Blake shared that he found that there is no significant change indicated in our ability to provide student success by allocating money for administrators (specifically at the District).

Hence, would suggest then to allocate more of the human resources closer to the students.

- The State will soon be issuing performance-based funding...Very important for us to pay attention to this change.
- Joe Bissell shared that this year Laney's total budget was approx. \$40mill. \$27mill = people and \$2.9mill is in discretionary funding that we can use as we deem necessary to meet operational needs.
- Directors and management determine the way to allocate the un-restricted and categorical funds. Will be bringing summary boards to the meeting with VC Gerhard and will put this information online for others to view. Also, Joe Bissell will bring to the Council the tentative budget, once it is set.
- Karolyn Van Putten and Denise Richardson are going to the State Plenary. The Faculty Senate submitted a resolution regarding the involvement of the Faculty in matters of facility planning. There is State training to inform Faculty on issues related to sitting at the table to take part in making these decisions.
- President Webb made mention of a document that details what the Administrative Leadership Council (ALC) did related to working with the campus leads to determine the allocation of the discretionary dollars.
- Once approved, this tentative budget goes to VC Ron Gerhard to determine the college's discretionary funds. The District will then send the full budget back to the College to recommended further changes.
- A question was asked about redirecting funds from facility rentals to other areas in need. President Webb answered that this is decided at the recommendation of the President. However, we are not currently making money in this position. We are running to catch-up. We are re-advertising for the Facility Services Specialist position which is to be paid out of the rentals revenue. A percentage of the rental revenue also goes to Athletics and the Theatre (after expenses are paid). There are insufficient funds to pay for upkeep of the facilities infrastructure needs. Deferred maintenance is increasing.

VII. Facilities Resource Priorities – Marco Menendez

- The Facilities Planning Committee thought it was important to acknowledge the year that a request was initially put in. Question posed: How do we weigh old requests with new requests?
- Handout passed out (Dean Marco Menendez to send this document to Maisha Jameson electronically)
- Five set criteria were used to rank the requests
- There were two master lists – Category A (College-wide facility needs) and Category B (Department-specific facility needs)
- Everything has been documented. The FPC also assessed the process itself in terms of how to improve the process going forward. The process timeline and the Program Review template are examples of things to change to better the process.

- The list remains long because not a lot of requests have been filled in the last couple of years.
- The list that is being presented is a comprehensive list, and hence the FPC will have to regroup and develop the short-term and long-term emergency projects. We are hoping that the District will look at this list and move forward on it. All of the requests have been checked against the Facilities Master Plan (FMP).
- There are multiple units responsible for fulfilling facility-related requests and work orders. Our Custodians are responsible for the local campus cleaning and basic up-keep. The staff at the District include Bob Beckwith, responsible for maintenance and grounds and the Johnny Fudge who is responsible for capital projects.
- As staff we are required to submit work orders for all requests – ex. From changing light-bulbs to fixing a pipe in a bathroom. The timeline for turn-around on work orders can range from 5 minutes to never. Dean Menendez encouraged all to go through the process of submitting a work order every time, for all facilities needs.
- The FPC mentioned the idea of Laney having its' own local fund (line-item) in the budget to provide funding for some of these items.
- Pending existing health hazards → Carpet in the Forum – mold from the heavy leaks there...There are cracks still in the ceiling.
- Walkways and breezeways now a priority because someone has tripped and is suing the District.

VIII. Facilities Planning Committee Resolution – Funding for Campus Repairs and Refurbishment of Educational Equipment

- Resolution for equipment repairs. The cost for the repairs needed are estimated to be over the budget for the whole college. Students are suffering and paying for things with own funds. The FPC proposed to create a line-item (and fund that line item) within the College's budget. The resolution passed the FPC and also the Faculty Senate.
- Louis Quindlen made a MOTION to pass this resolution through College Council. Irina Rivkin seconded the motion. There was unanimous support to approve this item through the Council.
- President Webb and Joe Bissell to meet in this regard in order to include this item in the budget to be submitted.
- It was noted that the District wide Facility Committee included mentioned of this need as well. Estimated need identified was approx. \$2.5mill for repairs...for Laney. Also recommendation to hire an additional staff member to handle this.
- It was noted that the Equipment /Library fund has dried up.

Meeting Adjourned 4:30pm