

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

MINUTES

Present

Elnora Webb, Louis Quindlen, Heather Sisneros, James Blake, Antoine Mehoulley, Peter Crabtree, Anne Agard, Suzan-Tiemroth-Zavala, Lisa Cook, Sonja Franeta, Mark Rauzon, Mildred Lewis, Elnora Webb, James Blake, Josefina Baltodano, Evelyn Lord, Amy Bohorquez, Carl Oliver, Irina Rivkin

Absent

John Nahlen, Lilian Chow, David Raughton, William Highsmith

Minutes: Maisha Jameson

Handouts:

- October 30, 2013 College Council Meeting Agenda
- PCCD Curriculum Process (Draft)
- 2013 Laney Student Success Scorecard
- DRAFT Laney College-wide Goals 2013-14
- PCCD Chancellor's Allocation of New Positions to Laney College (Fiscal Yrs. 2011-12 & 2013-14)
- March 20, 2013 College Council Meeting Minutes
- April 17, 2013 College Council Meeting Minutes
- September 18, 2013 College Council Meeting Minutes
- Curriculum Committee Report for College Council – October 2013
- Institutional Effectiveness Shared Governance Report
- Recommendations Based on Review of Laney College Participatory Governance Administration Structures (2007) and Institutional Effectiveness Shared Governance Report (2013)
- Laney Institutional Data – 9.30.2013
- Memo to VC Gerhard – Positions Missing from Laney Budget Fall 2013

i. Welcome and Introductions

- President Webb provided a report back of her meeting today at CSU East Bay (CSUEB). There was a clear message re: transfers to CSUEB. The numbers reported were not as great as we believe they should be. For this year it was 188 students (only 300 applications) successfully transferring. What's concerning is the number of those applying with insufficient courses/credits for the degree(s) for which they are applying. This speaks to a bigger issue of preparing students to come up with a sound education plan. We need to have a college-wide discussion about success and a completion

agenda. Where are we and where ought we be? We need to backtrack to ensure that we have what we need in place.

- Anne Agard reported on an interesting presentation at the Student Success Conference – There was a researcher who did a thorough analysis and provided stats on the CA community colleges. One of the pieces of data that was shared was a pie chart that showed the purpose for students coming to CCCs. It showed that 1/3 came to transfer or graduate (completion), 1/3 came to take course just because, and the last third of students were not here for either reason and were labeled skill builders. Many of these students are within CTE and this group's success rates were really high. Anne Agard will look-up the name of this researcher and send the information to Dr. Webb so that we can retrieve/share this report/study/data with the entire college community.
- Amy Bohorquez, Curriculum Committee Chair noted that we really could and should have more transfer degrees in order to ensure that students have the right courses to move on to 4 yr. universities. Our course outlines need to match the CID descriptors from the State. Amy shared the concern that we will have to provide evidence as to why we choose certain pre-requisites, and indicating that it is due to the CID descriptors is not being accepted as a sufficient reason.
- President Webb noted that a significant number of our students start at Laney to receive their general education (GE) basic requirements and then go to one of the other colleges to transfer because we don't have the transfer degrees here. We need more degrees here. We don't want to be an institution where you get your foundation skills only. We offer too few degrees. We have many that we can offer. We need to do this work. We need to leverage our capacity there. President Webb shared that she wanted to hold a meeting with the new VPI (once on-board), Curriculum Comm. Chair, Amy Bohorquez, and the Faculty Department Chairs of those units where we could do transfer degrees. The purpose of the meeting will be to find out what is needed from Faculty in order to get this work done.
- Lisa Cook shared feedback from the Student Voice Project – There was a Laney student who shared that they were very successful here and then transferred to UC Berkeley. They wished they had more preparation, specifically in writing instruction. Lisa Cook indicated that at the beginning we need to introduce our students to the type of college writing that they will need to do, prior than a couple of semesters before they move on. Might be a worthwhile discussion to determine how we are really preparing students. This student also shared that they struggled with reading (the breadth) of reading. We as educators need to focus on designing backwards in order to give students a sense of what steps to take and what they need to do/know in order to get there.
- Evelyn Lord noted that many students likely need more help with their education (ed) plans. The question was asked - Is there a way to find out from those students who applied to the CSUs and UCs but didn't get accepted, why they feel they did not get accepted. President Webb indicated that we will need to come back to this discussion when we bring on the researcher/program coordinator.
- Many Colleges are in the process of developing an online ed plan process. Many Districts have had this for many years. We need to help our counseling plan to develop this.

- Louis Quindlen read several years ago when we were doing the Carnegie stuff that we can track how our students do in english and math once they transfer on to CSUEB. We have not done this in many years, but we have access to this data and it is very powerful data that can inform what we need to do. President Webb noted that we need to request/get this data.
- Josefina Baltodano noted that this is an exciting time for our transfer center. Should we identify a faculty member researcher to be over this work and be a part of our transfer center? UC Berkeley may be able to provide some additional research students to help with this work.
- Sonja Franeta suggested that we meet with english and math faculty within the CSU system in order to better/more appropriately plan? Many of the folks here at Laney are “skill-builders” who are planning their pathways to jobs/careers...Career Pathways.
- An update was provided on the Dia de los Muertos Event held here at the campus. It was a great event. Please check out the Art Gallery downstairs to see the exhibit.
- President Webb asked the group who had laptops? Some did. The President asked the group to bring laptops to future meetings so that we can move away from paper.
- It was noted that given the lack of many outlets, we will need to bring in a power-strip for this meeting for all to power-up. Antoine Mehouelley to work on this so that we are prepared for next week.

II. Minutes

- The minutes for the March 20, 2013, April 17, 2013 and September 18, 2013 College Council Meetings were voted on for approval. Louis Quindlen moved to approve all three sets of meeting minutes. Mark Rauzon seconded the motion to approve all three sets of minutes with the following change to be made to the September 18, 2013 meeting minutes → Rebecca Bailey is the Co-Chair of the Accreditation Institutional Self-Evaluation Committee, not Leslie Blackie as noted on page 1. James Blake – abstained from voting.

III. College-wide Goals

- President Webb informed the group that most of the group already had an opportunity to provide input on the 2013-14 College-wide Goals via the College-wide Retreat in August, or at one of the Administrative Leadership Council (ALC), Augmented Administrative Leadership Council (AALC), and/or College Council Meetings.
- President Webb shared the document for further review and feedback by the Council.

GOAL# 1 – Student Success

- Amy Bohorquez suggested that we state in the Goals that we will complete 100% of what we conveyed to the State that we would complete. We need to meet the goals we have set. It is to be noted, however, that we will not meet the deadline this year for the Journalism transfer degree.
- A question was asked related to Goal 1C1 – What does “accelerated schedule for educational program” mean? Does it mean that we will speed-up the pace of the class

to finish earlier? Evelyn Lord offered alternate language. ACTION Add → “Develop at least one educational program with an accelerated program.”

- Question asked - Where did this idea come from to indicate that students want to accelerate programs? Answer – The intention is to look at the progression of students through basic/foundation skills. President Webb added that we already know that a 17 week schedule for most students is too long. So many institutions have moved to a 16 week or less semester. This is an accelerated schedule. Research shows that it appeals to, and maintains, more students. We tried taking certificate programs and breaking them up into chunks (cohorts), ex. 8 weeks. At the end of the 8 weeks we acknowledge their completion with a certificate. It’s really about students being engaged. They tend to learn more in a contextualized environment, as it leads to accelerated results.
- Sonja Franeta shared that the English 1A pilot program is an example of this.
- Irina Rivkin suggested that we explore the option of providing a 9-week basic skills course. Some students are coming in part-way through the semester.
- Lilian Chow noted that it is important to distinguish between an accelerated schedule (more hours per week) vs. accelerated curriculum or learning (how it’s being taught in an accelerated form) - the later needs curriculum design.
- President Webb shared that the intent is to ensure we have an accelerated program that ensures accelerated success for students. Leading to an increased number of students completing their academic goals, finishing and completing here at Laney. If there is different language that should be used to make this clear, President Webb welcomes it.
- Louis Quindlen suggested that an important accelerated class that we should do in basic skills is an accelerated GED program. Currently, the GED requirement for financial aid is a road-block for some of our students.
- Mildred Lewis noted that Urban Strategies is currently doing research on this topic – Opportunity Youth (OY) which targets youth 18-24.
- It was noted that in California, we are already serving many disadvantaged students (majority in this state), and there are conversations going on about how to address these students. They need not only clearer pathways, but also on-ramps so that they can live – in addition to securing an education. It is important to note that projections have provided a 2042 deadline for when people of color will be the majority in the US.
- Irina Rivkin agreed with the suggestions for an accelerated GED program. After students complete the GED program, they can be provided the opportunity to re-test (or be re-assessed) in order to get into the transfer program areas.
- Goal 1C1 – ACTION – Change language → “develop at least one accelerated pathway in an educational program”.
- Amy Bohorquez noted that we need to be mindful to keep track of what is actually approved by the State, and only offer those courses/programs.
- ACTION – Add to Resources Goal → “Update the College website.” ASLC President, Carl Oliver to be included in this work group.

GOAL# 2 - Accreditation

- President Webb thanked all who have signed up on a committee to move this Institutional Self Evaluation process along.
- It was suggested that we need to highlight the new administrative capacity in this document because this is important.

GOAL# 3 - Assessment

- Evelyn Lord – Assessment applies to everything on the table... We need SLOs for all of our courses, programs, etc.. Need to have an assessment method for what we are trying to do. Also really need data entered into Task-Stream. Feels that we should add an assessment method that is related to getting the data into Task-Stream.
- ACTION → Change Goal 3A to “Increase and report SLO and PLO assessment to achieve 100% compliance.”

Goal #4 - Resources

- It was noted that professional development is going to be more compelling at the State Level. Faculty are going to be expected to be more updated in their teaching and in their enthusiasm for work. Within the efforts of the Student Success Task Force, professional development was an important component. ACTION - Should be added to Goal 4A – “Recruit, hire, train and provide professional development for all staff/employees – administrators, faculty & staff”.
- Carl Oliver suggested that we implement some kind of Peer Counseling -- Recruiting students to do peer-to-peer counseling for workshops and basic skills. Paying students to do this. Augmenting tutoring staff with support from students to take on some of this work. ACTION → Add this to Goal 4A because of the related resource necessity.
- Suggestion – ACTION → Add to Goal 4E – “and also add a staff position and work space”.
- Irina Rivkin shared that a good example of a similar program is the Wellness Recovery Action Program (WRAP) led by Jacinda Marshall at Laney.
- James Blake asked a question related to Goal 4C – Would this require us moving fully to the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) as far as allocation of resources to the College? President Webb inquired whether the group wanted to add a Goal that speaks to full implementation of the BAM? James Blake answered “Yes. Under resources”. We are currently working with \$1.2 million less than what we ought to be allocated according to the BAM. BCC and Laney are not getting their fair share. Once we do move to full BAM implementation, we will be much better off. ACTION → Add Language - “Advocate for full implementation of the BAM and fund Laney based on this model.”
- James Blake – From the stand-point of data and evidence, we also need to capture the impact of not doing so.
- President Webb asked to add to the Drop Box for the next Council’s agenda a discussion on the BAM.
- Lilian Chow suggested to remove the language “drop-in tutoring”.

- The EOPS Program has used peer advising for years and it has been very successful. We could use the funding piece as a model. Peer advising through EOPS is paid for via federal work-study. The peer-to-peer advisors work in support of the counselors. The students need training around the leadership piece. There is a two-quarter training at CSUEB for peer advisors.
- Webb asked for the group to approve a Motion to approve the Goals – JAMES BLAKE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE GOALS WITH THE AMENDMENTS MADE IN THE MEETING. EVELYN LORD SECONDED THE MOTION. NO ABSTENTIONS. NO DISAGREEMENTS. PASSED.
- All administrators have specific sections of these College-wide goals embedded within their evaluation goals for the year.
- The best measure of an institution's effectiveness is their ability to reach the pre-set goals.

IV. Laney College Participatory (Shared) Governance (SG) Structure – Evelyn Lord & James Blake

- By February of 2014, President Webb noted that she wants to have a new revised Participatory Governance Document.
- James Blake & Evelyn Lord met earlier this week and did a review of this document, taking into consideration the Institutional Effectiveness Committee's (IEC) research on the campus' shared governance (SG) committees. They summarized their recommendations in email to Maisha Jameson (included in handouts). Comments were divided into three categories.
- They addressed the representation of those serving on these SG committees so as to ensure proper representation in SG committees. The purpose is to ensure not to conflict with union rights and responsibilities as it relates to SG. They agreed that it is appropriate to maintain the union/negotiating bodies representation on the College Council and SG committees, but in a non-voting capacity. They suggested keeping union representation within these bodies as members so that their advice and input is honored and included. There would be some exception on SG Committees that deal with employee wages and working conditions (Ex. Facilities).
- The terms of service for those serving on SG committees was also addressed. New members could serve up to 3 years to ensure historical/institutional knowledge and to avoid replacing the entire membership at one time.
- All other suggestions are included in the cover letter.
- A question was asked about whether the Learning Assessment Committee (LAC) should have representation on the College Council. It was answered that either they should, or there needs to be a system in place for informing this body with pertinent LAC information.
- Taking into consideration the results of the IEC data, this task force is recommending that:
 - ✓ As a college we update the Committee template for the Participatory (or Shared) Governance structure
 - ✓ Each Committee completes the new template

- ✓ Each respective committee review its' charge and membership representation (i.e. who appoints the position, the term served, etc.)
- ✓ Each Committee maintains and updates a committee specific website (some already do).
- James Blake & Evelyn Lord made these recommendations to the Council for suggested changes, and to request that others provide their perspective and input.
- It was noted that there is a need to have the other master planning documents, mission, etc. to be reflected.
- A question was posed - For the Faculty Senate Committees, i.e. the LAC (mainly faculty) & Curriculum Committee (not all faculty), should these committees report to the Faculty Senate, and then the Faculty Senate representatives report to the College Council on their behalf?
- The Planning & Coordinating Committee and the LCPAC groups are to be deleted from the document.
- Louis Quindlen & Don Petrilli proposed that our SG structure and committees be aligned along the College's 3 main mission points: Career Technical Education, Foundation Skills, and Transfer Education. For example, representatives from a Transfer or Foundation Skills Committee reporting back to the Council.
- CTE Advisory and Transfer are not currently represented on the Council – other than division faculty. This leads to the question...Should we have a Transfer Committee?
- James Blake posed the question, "Should we have some representation from the Student Services and Instructional sides to represent as well?"
- Lilian Chow noted that some of the SG committees already did complete some of this work and completed templates for the IEC.
- It was noted that there is some confusion with regard to the language of the Questionnaire vs. Template language. The IEC felt that the Participatory Governance document didn't include enough information. It was decided that we should use the clearer/simpler and less verbose template included in the participatory document as opposed to the IEC template.
- The question was asked, "How do we effectively ensure that these committees are doing what we are asking via the recommendations"?
- There should be a place on our website where all committees are reflected, and where they post updated information for the College community to be aware of. We should be less concerned about how this document or website is structured and be more concerned about content – relevancy, membership and charges of the committees.
- Still need to address some of the details in terms of a setting in place a mechanism for how to deal with the committees' actual work and reporting.
- It was noted that the issue of union participation in SG is also being brought up at the District level (PBC).
- Committees themselves will be reviewing their membership with guidelines provided as to who appoints who.

- Mark Rauzon shared that he felt that the LAC & Curriculum Committee should go through the Senate to report to the Council.
- Carl Oliver suggested that we add more student representation to serve on the Council, as well as on other SG committees. After this weekend, the students are going to the Student Success Conference and the College should see more students who want to be involved.
- Amy Bohorquez noted that having a student serve on the Curriculum Committee has been really helpful. Evelyn Lord noted the same is true for the LAC.
- James Blake also suggested to have the ASLC President or VP included as a member of the Accreditation Steering Committee.

v. Accreditation – Laney College Self-Evaluation

- Mark Rauzon and Rebecca Bailey are the Co-Chairs for the Laney College Institutional Self-Evaluation efforts. Mark Rauzon provided an update on their work. They have had several meetings with the Institutional Self-Evaluation Committee (IEC) and have identified teams who are moving forward with outlines and preliminary reviews of data.
- The College is in need of a fiscal manager to move a lot of this work forward.
- Dr. Webb led the 2009 Self-Evaluation process and she has also served on various other evaluation teams. Her expertise is appreciated.
- A Drop Box was created for this work. It is password protected.
- This Evaluation process requires a robust set of data to substantiate what we write. This is an evidence-based process. Need those involved to try to get as much data as possible to substantiate your claims. We need to create an evidence folder within the Drop Box, organized by the ACCJC standards and sub-standards.
- When gaps are identified as far as what is needed vs. what we actually have, we will need to document this, as it will inform our planning agenda.
- An Accreditation Survey will be going out soon.

vi. Staffing Changes – Administrative, Faculty, Classified

- President Webb shared a memo she wrote to Vice Chancellor Ron Gerhard indicating the various Laney College vacant positions that need to be added back to the College's budget. These vacancies reflect over \$600K. Once the funds for these vacancies have been added, the budget will be right-sized incredibly.
- It was noted that a change needs to be made → Denise Richardson's position should be included given that she is now an administrator.
- Each College received one position in Fall 2012. But Laney advocated for an additional position. These dollars were to be added to the College's budget. Only one was. We filled these positions.
- During Fall 2013, we filled a number of faculty positions that were assigned to Laney College - 15 total added for 2013. 17 total have been added since Fall 2012.
- The question was asked, do we know how many Classified positions we have added recently? Dr. Webb answered that the list of the vacancies (and statuses of those

vacancies) does not include all classified positions. President Webb will work with Brandi Howard to update this list so it can be shared with the Council.

- Amy Bohorquez suggested that if we have a good enough pool, can we try to hire two individuals from the existing pool for the 2nd Academic Support Services Specialist (ASSS) that is being hired? The President's Office will follow-up on this suggestion.
- President Webb shared her plan for a long-term solution to address the need in this area → We have a history of relying on one person to have the competencies to carry out a role (ex. Eleanor Liu). We have some exceptional classified support serving in support of our Deans, and these individuals want more responsibility and deserve better compensation. President Webb will be meeting with them about expanding their duties (if interested) so that some of these ASSS duties can be transferred to these existing support staffers. Desk audits will be handled, as necessary, in order for these positions to be reclassified.
- Lilian Chow asked the question..."Can we get for Laney some electronic scheduling software?"
- Amy Bohorquez indicated that the District needs to work on the in-putting of data in order to make searches easier by modifying modules within the system so that they are usable. We shouldn't be doing anything manually.

Meeting Adjourned 4:30pm