

Laney College Council
May 14, 2014
T-850 / 12:00-1:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Present

Elnora Webb, Matthews Jackson, Evelyn Lord, Denise Richardson, Louis Quindlen, Phillippa Cadiera, Mildred Lewis, Anne Agard, Mark Rauzon, Amy Bohorquez, David Raughton, Antoine Mehouelley, James Blake, Lilian Chow, Peter Crabtree, Carl Oliver

Absent

Trudy Walton-Keys, Phyllis Carter, William Highsmith, Tina Vasconcellos, Sonja Franeta/Miriam Zamora-Kantor, Jim Cave, Lisa Cook, Irina Rivkin

Minutes: Maisha Jameson

Handouts:

- **Meeting Agenda**
- **April 23rd College Council Meeting Minutes**
- **Shared Governance Committee Guidelines Draft for College Council Discussion**
- **Participatory Governance Document**

I. Welcome and Introductions

- Update from President Webb
 - Shared with the Council that her contract has been extended another year. Thanked everyone for their support.
 - Provided an update on the Graduation, specifically noting the controversial keynote speaker and that the venue has been moved back to Eagle Stadium. Spoke to the protests and activities that have led up to this point, and those that are expected to occur at the actual graduation ceremony.
 - Shared that she has promised community organizations that we would open up the College as a venue to discuss immigrant rights and the issue as a whole.
 - President Webb shared that she sent-out a survey to poll the graduates about their thoughts on these matters. Deadline to respond is today.
 - President Webb spoke to the ASLC resolution and how she's heard that it was not the actual resolution that they voted on. She will go to the ASLC Meeting this Thursday to follow-up and discuss this with the students. Has not yet been invited.
 - Asked the College Council their thoughts on this matter and requested that everyone be honest. The group went around the table sharing their thoughts/recommendations on the matter.
 - M.Rauzon – Feels the threat of the protests disrupts the graduation so much that he does not see the upside of this. Personally supported Janet Napolitano, but the fall-out is getting to be more than we can take on.
 - A.Agard - Thinks she was a poor choice as a keynote speaker. Having a celebratory and positive experience for their graduation is important and she doesn't feel that this is taking place.

- L.Quindlen – Feels choosing this keynote speaker sends the wrong message to the community. To have her here represents a policy that many of us find reprehensible. Her policies impact many of our students. Doesn't see how we can support those students and have her as a speaker.
- C.Oliver – Doesn't think inviting her was a bad decision. Feels her actions were the result of a systems issue. However, people are having a problem with her being related to the issue of immigration, and the graduation is becoming more about those issues. That being said, people are outraged. Not sure that the protests will be all that disruptive though.
- A.Mehouelley – One of the things that he noticed is that we are supposed to be talking about graduation, but instead we are talking about one person. This country should respect people speaking their minds and using their voice.
- There was a unified sense shared that the graduation is and should be about our graduates and as such, it should be a celebration for them. Many noted that independent of the intent, the controversy surrounding the keynote speaker has caused the opposite to occur and that rather than being about the graduates, this has all turned into being about the commencement speaker, and then the venue. It was proposed that, as a result of this, it would be wise to consider uninviting Janet Napolitano and sending the message to the college community that they are heard, honored, and that we want them to be celebrated and feel respected.
- E.Webb – Looking forward to engaging more of the external community and exposing them to the college, because this campus is a public institution. The degree to which we address a sensitive issue like this, we could inform thousands. Maybe through our own discussions, we could actually make a difference. Interested in valuing all voices on this matter. As soon as she is able, she will craft something that will go out to the college community. There are graduates that are demanding her. They are just not doing this publicly. Those doing it publicly are in the minority. The graduation committee is to identify a graduation speaker, however, only once since she's been here, have they done this. Each year, President Webb has been approached at the last minute to find a speaker. Students are encouraged to find a speaker, but we as administrators need to work with students, faculty and staff to help them with this task. The speaker needs to be identified six months in advance. Systematically we have an obligation to our students and staff to do this work.

II. **Minutes Approval (2/19/14 and 3/19/14 College Council Meetings) – Council**

- C. Oliver made a motion to approve the Council minutes for the months of February and March 2014. M. Rauzon seconded the motion – Minutes approved by the Council. There were no objections and no abstentions.

III. **Laney Participatory Governance Structure - Evelyn Lord & James Blake**

- J. Blake, C. Oliver and E. Lord met a few weeks ago to review the document and to make changes to the shared governance process and document.
- C. Oliver made some suggestions, and E. Lord and J. Blake didn't feel they could include those proposed changes in the document yet because they hadn't discussed his proposals. They still want to have his voice heard/reflected.
- Some of those proposed changes included general guidelines for the College that all committees would abide by. C. Oliver expressed concerns regarding the Brown Act being followed by the Council and other shared governance committees. E. Lord shared that shared governance committees are not legally under the Brown Act. C. Oliver noted that what he is concerned about is that there are certain elements that we want the College to follow...like having clear agendas sent out in advance.
- C. Oliver noted that committees that are decision-making or advisory to the Chancellor are also under the Brown Act. Sub-Committees must abide by the Brown Act.
- It was shared that abiding by the Brown Act allows committee members to participate effectively.

- E. Lord noted, and has in writing, that the PCCD General Counsel has confirmed that only the Senates and Board Meetings need to legally abide by the Brown Act.
- It was expressed that some would like to read through the document so that the Council could provide input
- Some aspects of the proposed changes were shared (see below):
- The responsibilities of the committee chairs were read aloud.
 - The section regarding agendas was also read aloud
 - Minutes should provide attendance information.
 - All actions taken by the Committee should be noted.
 - Post committee documents to the committee website. Basically maintain the committee website.
- President Webb shared that want to make sure that we don't over-burden ourselves. At a minimum, we need to have notes taken of the actions taken as a committee.
- A. Bohorquez indicated that the polling and voting record of each committee/senate member needs to be reflected in the minutes. E. Lord and A. Bohorquez will talk with DAS President Karolyn van Putten about this.
- Maintaining and approving minutes should be done because it's professionally prudent to do so.
- Committee appointments section was read aloud. Need to keep record of the appointing of individuals.
- In an ideal world, we'd have the shared governance schedule and calendar set by July, not the Fall. Student & faculty availability is an issue.
- Websites are critical because changes can be made there regularly& updated in real-time, and then be easily referenced for info.. Need to maintain our websites with current information. Need to support the committee chairs to keep up on this maintenance. Need to build this culture here so that folks can depend on it.
- L. Quindlen shared concern that in many of our shared governance committees we come together, discuss, vote and leave...Who is responsible for execution and follow-up on action items? We are not a working body. It seems as though the function is to have shared governance, but not to get the work done. Need to have a working mindset as to how to get things done, note timeline, and note who's responsible. Need to have a steering committee who meets more regularly in between the monthly meetings in order to drive actions. Can't conduct business with meeting once a month. Too high level of communication required to get things done in nine meetings a year. What role does this group have in ensuring that the necessary actions are taken? This steering committee should meet weekly. This steering committee would feed down and back up and empower the President in dealing with the District. This would help with advocacy at the District level. This group can also share information so that we are more transparent.
- Amy Bohorquez shared that if or when we switch to an automated APU and change to the Curricunet functionality instead of Taskstream, there is a module built within which will allow us to monitor actions and track/push action items and projects through to completion. Ex. the encompassed digital APU would provide lists (faculty and facility prioritization requests) and track them via the implementation plan built into the system.
- The District is revising the governance structures at the District and E. Lord submitted a recommendation that addresses hearing back on recommendations made to the District level committees. At the other colleges, there is a form that is used when they submit their recommendations, and then the President can respond..."Accept", "reject" or "accept with these changes". We need something like this.
- P. Crabree – E. Lord & J. Blake's proposed shared governance changes are really good in terms of recommending new structure to the committees. L. Quindlen is jumping ahead to help with how we accomplish things. Each Committee needs a mechanism for getting things done. The purpose of each

committee needs to be folded into how each respective committee folds into the rest of the College. Need to do this in order to connect the dots.

- Committee meeting schedules – all meetings should take place during Fall and Spring semesters.
- L. Quindlen disagrees with this...We are a 12 month operation. If we think we are a 9 month operation, that's how effective we will be. Our students want results year-round. This summer, if we don't get enough work done to complete the work, we're in trouble. We need to expect that work needs to get done during the summer, because it does.
- J. Blake – during the summer we close out the previous year as it relates to budget, and we also launch the changes for the upcoming year. Administration still meet and any decisions/changes made may have a drastic impact on faculty and staff. It is pressing that we find some type of mechanism to maintain that engagement during the summer. Should maintain the meetings with the shared governance leaders at least.
- Also, there are faculty who have 11-month contracts.
- A quorum should consist of 50%+1 of voting membership.
- A committee cannot function without regularly attending members. What if a committee member never shows up, what do we do then? Do we limit committee membership to those who fall under a specific number of unexcused absences (ex. 3)?
- A. Bohorquez – suggested that instead we make this maximum number of meetings be a percentage of the total number of meetings missed, as some Committees meet more than once a week.
- It was noted that the President MAY (at his/her discretion) remove a consistent non-attending member.
- E. Lord noted that she would make the appropriate changes per the feedback shared.
- E. Lord asked if the Council could approve the proposed membership.
- It was noted that ASLC President C. Oliver has other ideas for College Council and its membership that are rather dramatic and warrant further discussion.
- President Webb noted that we should have further discussion online in this regard.
- ASLC President, Carl Oliver is proposing that 25 percent of the membership for the College Council be students. He suggested that this change be instituted across all shared governance committees.
- Dr. Webb referred back to the membership list and noted that it is top heavy with Administrators. She questioned whether this is the best usage of time and how this may not be the best model in recognition of Carl's statement.
- L. Cook asked questions about the charge of the College Council. E. Lord read the charge.
- P. Crabtree stated that members should have a functional reason for being a participant of any committee.
- Co-facilitators of the shared governance task force, E. Lord & J. Blake noted that they would like to continue discussions about the membership make-up next year.
- The flowchart for shared governance needs to be placed in the handbook. Wants feedback on the process. President Webb indicated that she would have Brandi Howard upload this document into a Visio flowchart. We should spend at least half of an hour on this during the upcoming College Retreat.
- Carl Oliver is requesting advocacy and support from the President to re-create the structure aggressively.
- L. Quindlen suggested creating college courses that teach Student Leadership as transferable/unit classes.
- L. Cook shared that some of those classes are already on the books. She also mentioned that the Foundation Skills Committee targets students based on their assessment. There are Pathway Programs to support students with low scoring test results. Excited about the Foundation Skills Committee for the coming year. Will bring together all of the learning committee and create a needs assessment such that they can support one another.

- President Webb noted that the first hour of the Retreat would be devoted to sharing how well our students have performed and how well we as a College have performed in achieving our College-wide goals and related benchmarks for the year. The rest will be dedicated to gaging student success. We'll explore student success data based on ethnic group, gender, age, etc.. Data analysis will be delivered to the team in a drop box by May 23rd. The structuring of our learning communities needs to be data driven. Will use dollars from the parcel tax to fund initiatives that come from this meeting. By the end of June, we are going to look at the previous program reviews, as well as proposed student success initiatives which will be funded using the PASS money, and present to the Chancellor the figures needed for additional funding, if necessary. Student Success Plan due in October. Equity plan due in November.
- Amy Bohorquez requested to have groups participate by communicating their eligibility requirements (ex. EOPS, CalWORKS, GTC) with handouts, and integrate an assessment piece into that. Showing results is a great way to bring assessment into what we do.

IV. Shared Governance/Council member updates

- Louis Quindlen states that we must make hiring a priority right now. We need to staff the summer hiring committees and he is willing to participate in committees as needed.
- Dr. Webb asked for people to reach out and locate faculty that are teaching during the summer such that we will have faculty in place by Fall. Specifically Evelyn Lord & Lisa Cook are to identify 20 faculty to be available to participate on the hiring committees.

Meeting Adjourned 1:58 pm.

DRAFT