

(EMERGENCY) LANEY COLLEGE COUNCIL

Dec. 2, 2009

Room T-450 / 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Minutes

Present: Elnora Webb, Indra Thadani, Donald Moore, Mary Logan, Frank Chong, Karolyn van Putten, Eliza Chan, MaryBeth Benvenuti, Don Petrilli, Shirley Coaston, Newin Orante, Donna Marie Ferro, Steve Lomba, Karin Hart, Margaret Traylor, Evelyn Lord, Carol Dalessio, Ju Hong, Ron Jones

Minutes: Maisha Jameson

- The purpose of this specially called Council meeting is to review, vet and approve all Faculty and Classified HR position prioritizations
- This Friday, 12/4 → The District's Planning and Budget Integration Education Committee is meeting. In this meeting, Laney will be presenting our 2009 -2010 HR permanent position prioritization requests - so that the District-wide recommendations can be presented to the Council before it goes to the Board.
- We are required to do this type of prioritization because we are in a recession and are experiencing extreme budget cuts.
- The Faculty Senate President reminded the group that the likely-hood of us being allotted any funding in order to make any hires for anything is nil. And when hires are approved, they will mostly be for required faculty positions.
- In the recent past, we have submitted requests for 5-8 positions, and have gotten approved for maybe one. Last year we got approved for no positions.
- 1021 Union Rep expressed concern about Classified positions being eliminated or not filled while the District is still continue to hire high paid management positions. Grievances will be filed.
- President Chong noted the priorities expressed by the State and Feds as far as Adult education – PE is on the hit list and is being considered non-essential...Dance and Arts may be on the hit list next. Emphasis and funds will be prioritized for basic skills, vocational, and core classes. Need to keep this in mind when prioritizing and planning for our future.

Faculty Prioritization

- Documents passed out:
 - Prioritization Process for Faculty Positions – Laney College
 - List of Peralta College Vacant Faculty Positions
 - PCCD Unit Plan Templates
 - Justification Form
 - Faculty Prioritization Committee Form (w/ criteria included)
 - Results of the Faculty Prioritization Committee Meeting of 11/30/09
- Process → A joint Committee composed of the Faculty Senate and Office of Instruction was brought together for the prioritization process. This body

- suggested proposed priorities that went before the President to make a final recommendation. All Faculty were required to submit justification forms with information detailing any position requested.
- The positions requested should ideally be aligned with the requests stated in the Unit Plans and Program Reviews. The Prioritization body then met to prioritize each of the positions. Those departments that have vacant positions were given higher priority.
 - All Faculty positions were grouped in Groups A – C with A being the highest priority. All departments that currently have no FT Faculty positions were assigned to Group A.
 - Group A + Group B = funded positions and are prioritized.
 - Group C = not funded and not prioritized.
 - ECT included in Group A because of its importance within the current workforce trends
 - MaryBeth Benvenuti will need to confirm that there is a vacant Counseling position.
 - Laney has never agreed to give up any of the vacant positions. Positions are in the book, but the money went back to the District. In 2002 the District took the money and positions back.
 - Shirley Coaston – wants Laney to continue to fight to get the money and positions that have maintained at the District, sent back to the Colleges
 - Evelyn Lord – Suggested that we submit and present the Group A priorities as “urgent”, Group B as “short term - essential and budgeted positions”, and Group C to be presented as not budgeted and/or a long term need.
 - Don Petrilli – Suggested to give grouped positions a title that provides an insight to the necessity of the program (i.e. program maintenance or viability)
 - Newin Orante – Suggested we focus/emphasize the reinstatement of already funded positions in B category.
 - Elnora Webb – We need to be consistent as to what is the bottom-line, i.e. being here for students to advance their success and learning
 - The general consensus of group is to approve the recommendations as proposed and submit them.

Classified Prioritization

- Documents passed out:
 - Interim HR Classified Prioritization Committee (listing charge and make-up)
 - Classified Hiring Prioritization Matrix (detailing criteria)
 - Laney College Classified Prioritization Scores
- Process – Donald Moore and David Reed co-chaired the Interim Classified Prioritization Committee who’s charge was to prioritize all of the classified HR positions for 2009/2010
- Had one week to do this
- Invited 11 Committee members to join, and 9 ended up being active members
- Criteria for prioritization was developed
- There were no classified position justification forms to work from, and hence the Interim Committee had to make many determinations about what support was needed based on descriptions of need included in the Unit Plans

- It was agreed that the Unit Plans, as they were written, were not meant to be a document that is used to make these types of position prioritization determinations. Many of the Departmental support requests were unclear. For example, it was rarely stated that the department needed a .5 Clerical II vs. a FT Instructional Assistant.
- Karolyn van Putten – Insisted that we need to include the Lab Techs because they are such a critical need campus-wide
- It was suggested that if the positions was already funded, and it becomes vacant, that that Dept. should have the priority in terms of requests.
- We don't give-up our Classified positions.
- The position being prioritized are all new positions. They are being requested from the General Fund.
- It was pointed out that the Instructional Assistant for the Photography Dept. is an already funded position that just needed to be for more time.
- These were the type of determinations that were not clear from the Unit Plans, and hence unclear to the Prioritization Committee.
- It was indicated that the rest of CTE needs a Tech Support (specifically Mac support) position.
- There were no custodians on the list. The Committee Chair indicated that this may be an error because it was a prioritized position.
- The question was asked how the ranks/scores were added-up? Ex. How did the 17 departments under CTE rank lower in terms of priority than one Lab Tech in photography?
- Elnora Webb asked Donald Moore to re-do the list so that there are no ambiguities or errors, and asked what is the most efficient way to move forward to make sure we are prepared for Friday's presentation?
- Karin Hart – suggested the Classified position prioritization process be more clear like the Faculty process...The impact of state and federal law mandates - including health and safety mandates – should be taken into consideration as well.
- Mary Logan – Noted that we just laid-off some of the same positions that we are requesting to add.
- We need to use existing, current & accurate titles for positions in order for the District to actually move to prioritize this list.
- We need to simplify this list and emphasize the impact.
- It was agreed that the Classified Prioritization documents that were submitted to the Council be maintained as internal document only...We need to keep what we present to the district very simple, clear and succinct. Be precise. Don't include unnecessary detail.
- The Business Manager, and the two VPs will meet tomorrow to plan for Friday's presentation.
- The list has not been prioritized yet...The question was asked how will the positions be further prioritized and presented by Friday?
- Elnora Webb – noted that she has an issue with us pursuing a request for any part-time position. Why would we not request FT positions and just leverage them across the various departments?
- Donald Moore – Noted that the Classified Prioritization Committee did not critique or eliminate any positions

- The Council's consensus of the prioritization done by this group was to submit the Classified HR position requests on a higher/global level because there was not sufficient information provided by the Unit plans in order to know exactly what position/ type of positions were being prioritized, and why.
- The Council decided to request the Classified positions as such: Ex. We need X number of positions for *this* reason as they will affect the campus' students and services in Y way if we don't get them.
- All Council members were encouraged to be there at the meeting on Friday.

Meeting adjourned at 4pm