



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

COMMITTEE: COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING DATE: Wednesday, October 22, 2014

LOC./TIME: T-850, 2-4pm

ATTENDEES: Elnora Webb, Jim Cave, Anne Agard, Lilia Celhay, Rebecca Bailey, Lisa Cook, Irina Rivkin, Antoine Mehoulley, Carl Oliver, Roxanna Post, Trudy Walton-Keys, Louis Quindlen, Evelyn Lord, Shiela Simon, Lilian Chow, Denise Richardson James Blake, Kim Bretz, Mark Rauzon, Miguel Avila, Chuen Chan, Phyllis Carter

ABSENT: William Highsmith, Tina Vasconcellos, Tamika Brown, Heather Sisneros, Peter Crabtree, Sonja Franeta/Miriam Zamora-Kantor, David Raughton

MINUTES: Maisha Jameson

HANDOUTS:

- Meeting Agenda
- Past College Council Meeting Minutes - May 14, 2014 & September 17, 2014
- Summary of Laney 204-15 Budget vs. Actuals by Fund
- PASS Proposal Docs: Laney PASS Proposal Scoring Rubric, PASS Rubric Rating Instructions, PASS Scores – Original Request, PASS Scoring Totals – Second Request PASS Scoring Spreadsheet-Final
- Accreditation ISE Timeline
- VPI Celhay’s PASS Powerpoint Presentation

NEXT MEETING: November 19, 2014

Item	Description (Agenda Item and Discussion)	Action Item
<p>I. Welcome and Introductions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Webb asked all to introduce themselves and share their word of the day. • James Blake – Spoke about how we as a District and College need to be “walking our talk” and be accountable for our actions/non-actions, and do this in an efficient way so that it is unambiguous that we are serving students. James shared a strong urge that we not talk about student success short of actually demonstrating an investment in it as a priority. • There is still work to be completed with regard to setting our College-wide Goals for the current (2014-15) school year. President Webb shared that she will assign a Dean to lead the work-group designated to synthesize the data and feedback that will inform the Goals. This group will move this process ahead to solidify goals and to determine the measureable benchmarks for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete Participatory Governance Document. Dr. Webb to assign a Dean to lead this project. To review past year’s Council Meeting minutes to determine what consensus’ were agreed to with regard to voting representation.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

this year. They will make a recommendation to College Council as to what those goals and measurable benchmarks will be. President Webb went over the general overarching Goals for the year. This group needs to meet soon. Within 24 hours it should be communicated when this group will convene a meeting.

- Question: What is the process to determine the College Goals?
Answer: Review the details that came out of the May and August College-wide Retreats, along with the research data that we received from the District and assessed at the first Retreat, and from those results, make a recommendation to the College Council.
- Faculty Senate Lisa Cook shared that she wants to make sure that we are following the College's planning cycle that is documented within the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and all of the other plans of the College. This planning cycle describes that we would have a report on the achievement of the goals from the previous year, and report on/track what we had NOT achieved with regard to these goals.
- Question: Do we also have to align the District's goals with ours?
- President Webb is also going to assign a Dean to spearhead and move forward the process of updating the College's Shared/Participatory Governance structure and document to complete it.
- James Blake made a copy of the minutes from the October 2013 College Council meeting. In that meeting it informs how we would proceed in this regard. The Council also made some recommendations with regard to the make-up of the membership of the College Council and other Shared Governance (SG) Committees. The recommendations who would have voting rights, and who would (i.e. unions and senates).
- The group who is working on this project noted that they are working to move forward with all SG Committees so that they establish websites to ensure that minutes and agendas are available for all to review in order to enhance transparency.
- Evelyn Lord worked on putting together the draft of the revised participatory governance document and shared that she hadn't received the minutes from last year prior to her work. Need to determine what consensus' were decided upon in those meetings.
- President Webb spoke to the challenges we are experiencing with regard to the Website
- Need to provide training for faculty to update their webpages. President Webb said for all to give their information to Brandi Howard to populate their pages if they are not able to do so.

- Complete the work of determining the College-wide Goals and Measurable Benchmarks for the 2014-15 school year. Dr. Webb to assign a Dean to lead this project.
- Brandi Howard to set up webpages/framework for committees so that they have website to add agenda notes and minutes, etc.
- By next Friday evening, the website will be back up and this will be our permanent solution
- Upgrade the Wordpress system to avoid viruses
- Provide training to faculty in how to update their webpages.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

<p>II. Approval of the 5/14/14 and 9/17/14 College Council Minutes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council members were asked if they have time to review the previous meeting minutes that were being submitted for approval (May 14, 2014 and September 17, 2014). Irina Rivkin made a correction to the September 2014 College Council Meeting minutes. Add “certificates & degrees” to the statement about the Completion Campaign where it notes requirements for “transfers to CSUs” (Page 7) President Webb called the vote to determine approval of the previous College Council meeting minutes. 0 abstentions, 0 nays, 22 Yays. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the suggested corrections from Irina Rivkin to the September 2014 College Council Meeting Minutes and re-send the them to the Council.
<p>III. Basic Skills Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lisa Cook shared that those working on the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) report are asking for a November 14th due date extension. The original deadline of October 10 was already extended to October 24. There are expenditure report issues that need to be addressed. The report requirements have changed and hence we needed more time to answer them, specifically as they related to the expenditure report portion. In November we’ll share the Final Basic Skills Report. It will go through the Faculty Senate as well as to College Council for review. Some other challenges included the procedures for scheduling classes. Where does it go in the schedule? Need to confirm this process for learning communities so that it is done the way it is supposed to. Matching of college funds is supposed to occur as well. The Foundation Skills Pathway should be marketable for Spring. Trying to find ways to contact students in basic skills. Need to stop waiting for students to fail in order to intervene. We should be able to identify students as they walk in the door in order to address their needs for success from the beginning. Need to institutionalize this effort. Still working on the Equity Plan. These reports are linked 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lisa Cook & Dean Mildred Lewis to follow-up on approval of extended due-date. Schedule a time for the report to go to the Faculty Senate, and then to College Council. Do follow-up work to confirm process for class scheduling for learning communities.
<p>IV. Accreditation – Institutional Self-Evaluation – (Rebecca Bailey & Lilia Celhay)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rebecca Bailey and VPI Lilia Celhay provided a summary of the status of where things are with regard to the writing and completion of the Institutional Self-Evaluation (ISE). Currently working on the ISE in pieces – by standard. VPI Celhay gave an overview of the timeline for deadlines for the ISE drafts to be turned into the Board of Trustees (BOT) and then ultimately to the ACCJC (11/6 submission date for the 11/18 board meeting, and 11/26 submission for the 12/9 board Meeting. 1/6/15 submission of final document to the ACCJC.) Pieces of the ISE are currently in Moodle. Need to be in one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of the ISE for two BOT reviews and then ultimately to the ACCJC in January. All Council Members were asked to review the ISE via the Moodle site and provide



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

	<p>complete draft document by the November 6 date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Asked for all to send in their comments ASAP so that the team can work to incorporate the feedback. Will still be able to incorporate changes and feedback after the 11/6 submission – before the final draft goes to the Board at the end of November.• There are existing gaps in the information we have. Please identify and provide evidence that could be used as you read the various sections. The window of time is really short. Work to be done in parallel.• Need to include assessment that has not been reported or included yet (what’s not in TaskStream) and especially curriculum changes (as it relates to assessment) that have been done.• James Blake suggested for all to go to the ACCJC’s evaluator Manual/Matrix to determine what the Commission will be looking at to determine whether we meet any particular standard. This will be helpful in understanding the process.• Louis Quindlen suggested that we review the ISE document in study groups along with other faculty in order to feedback off of each other and frame our thoughts as far as what we will submit to the group.• Actionable Improvement Plans (Planning Agendas) – There is a certain number that can be submitted. Laney’s ballpark/aim is about 10. They will be organized by theme, not by department, standard or prompt of the standard, so as to provide a broad/general overview.• James Blake expressed concern about the flavor/framing of the materials that have been offered. It feels like more of an “us” and “them” feel, instead of a combined “we”. Mr. Blake also noted that the framing of “one voice” and the editing of the document is a concern to him. Concerned about how much of the truth will make it to the final document that is submitted. He urged all to tell the truth. And shared that we’re just obligated to do something about things once we’ve identified the gap. How are we addressing this document as it relates to our challenges? The “one voice” may end up being more like censorship. And this is an issue.• VPI Celhay shared that the “one voice” relates to the editing being done by English faculty, Antonio Watkins. He is editing not to change the content, but to change the flow from one section to another, such that it reads as one document from the College’s standpoint and not pieces of several separate	<p>feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All to submit in their comments and evidence ASAP so that the team can work to incorporate this into the document.• Rebecca Bailey to post the matrix to the Moodle site.
--	--	---



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

	<p>documents. Also, consistency of grammar, tense, etc. are being looked at.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Webb is reviewing the standards as well. Additionally, Joseph Bielanski, Linda Sanford and the BOT are reviewing it as well at the District. • President Webb shared that this will be “Laney’s” ISE. This will not be the Peralta Community College District’s ISE. And Laney will dictate what that voice will sound like. The feel of the report is related to the “tone” as well. The important thing is that we have substantive information that leads to something. The intent of the District leadership is to ensure that the Colleges’ have a robust document. There may be some interests that want the document to say certain things, but this is a Laney document. • Question (Jim Cave): In responding within the sections of the ISE, when we come to a point when there is an improvement plan that requires action of the District, what do we put as our improvement plan, when the truth is that we as a College can’t really do anything? Answer: We should frame things in terms of our communication with the District in order to advocate for action on behalf of the College. • Louis Quindlen shared that Accreditation is a great chance for change. Use this opportunity to shed the light with facts. • We can do this and still talk about things in a positive way. Demonstrate continuous improvement. It’s similar to when you have to write a self-evaluation as a part of a performance evaluation. Be honest, and also include challenges. 	
<p>V. PASS Prioritization Proposals (Lilia Celhay)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VPI Lilia Celhay summarized the PASS Proposal process to-date and the challenges experienced with regard to the change in the funding amount and the timing allowed for the process to take place. • Faculty Senate President Lisa Cook and VPI Lilia Celhay, as Co-Chairs of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, were charged with prioritizing and make recommendation(s) to the College President with regard to the PASS funding dollars. • Lilia Celhay provided an overview of the prioritization rubric and the timeline provided. • Shared Governance (SG) reviews of the proposals included the Presidents of the Faculty Senate, Classified Senate and ASLC, along with the Administrative Leadership Council. All were provided access to review the proposals and provide feedback. • The top scoring PASS proposals were shared with the group. They were: 1. AFFIRM (Academic Force For Inspiration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work-group/IEC to continue the work to make a recommendation to the President as to which proposals to fund and at what amount. • Get out a communication to the College Community about the process and status of the PASS Proposals • Lilia to provide



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

Retention and Matriculation) Learning Community, 2. Laney College Career Services Center (Career Center), 3. Leadership in Civic Engagement (English), 4. Grant Writer for Disabled Students (DSPS), 5. 41-Ohz: Five Ten Minutes Tales about Oakland/The Fusion Theatre Project (Laney Theatre Arts Dept.), 6. Asian & Pacific American Student Success Program (APASS), 7. Associate Degree Program and Certificate Programs – Broadband Technology & Communication, 8. Laney College Veteran’s Student Success Project (Veteran’s Affairs).

- The balance of the PASS funding left available to allocate was shared with the Council = \$354,895. \$864,385 was the amount actually allocated to the College (down from the original \$1.2mill originally communicated and promised by the Chancellor). The Chancellor decided to take funding from the original amount allocated for each College in order to create a District initiative to address the success of the students of color. Then the College President pre-approved three of the PASS proposals and funded them off the top of the funds that the College received →They were the 1. ASLC Leadership/Independent Study Program, 2. Career Center and 3. FAB LAB proposals.
- Louis Quindlen served on the prioritization committee and shared that it was confusing to rate the proposals given the information provided and the changing overall dollar amount available. There was not a lot of time or information provided in order to guide this process. Left lots of room for error.
- James Blake noted that the Parcel Tax funding is supposed to go towards supporting the areas of Math and English. Some of the proposals supported areas outside of these subject areas. We need a citizen review board functioning with regard to the oversight of the partial tax dollars received.
- It was noted that meanwhile, many of our core and sometimes mandated programs are struggling to be maintained.
- James Blake asked what process was used to determine what proposals have already been funded. The IEC was supposed to do this work, but it looks like half of the money was already allocated before they were included in the process.
- Anne Agard – Shared that it seemed to her that what is happening here is not what voters thought they were voting for. She shared that she thought it was to address the lack of core offerings and services students needed to succeed, and that the voters thought funding was going towards hiring

information on the scorers who served on the IEC (total of 12 individuals)

- Proposals need to go through the typical planning cycle of the College to assure the College invests in the ownership of the projects.
- Determine whether the rollover of any un-used PASS dollars will affect the allocation for the following year. Need to get this in writing.
- President Webb (along with Executive team) to determine which projects gets the PASS funding and to get out a response to the College Community.
- To determine a process for this in the future.
- Those who submitted proposals may need to resubmit their project budgets given the actual funding available (ex. minus funding requested for administrative positions).



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

more teachers and counselors and strengthening already existing offerings. She warned that this may come back to roost. She shared that a lot about this whole thing makes her unhappy.

- Lisa Cook – Shared that she doesn't like when people are misdirected to do things that do not meet intent of the voters.
- Irina Rivkin shared that there were some very strong programs that were identified during the voting process. She asked if we could contact those who submitted proposals that met much of the intent of the Measure (B), and inform them that they may need to alter their proposals to meet the language from the ballot?
- Carl Oliver asked if each proposal needed to meet ALL three criteria (maintain core services in math & sciences, transfer and training students for careers) of the Measure? President Webb answered: No they don't. But they should at least strengthen all of them.
- President Webb shared that she wanted the Council to provide a recommendation to the College President on the proposals that were prioritized.
- Lisa Cook noted that the IEC believed that they were sharing information only at this meeting, as they were not at the point to make a recommendation because the proposals need to go through the typical planning cycle of the College to assure the College invests in the ownership of the funded programs.
- Carl Oliver shared that he thinks we need to make a decision now. People have been waiting. Also doesn't think that a grant writer fits the ballot language. Proposed that we fund the AFFIRM proposal.
- Louis Quindlen asked if we are we going to get PASS money next year. If not, the proposals before us are not worth funding. President Webb answered that the funding is for 3 years and that the money is also supposed to roll over as well.
- Evelyn Lord shared that it seems like the 2nd list of prioritized proposals that we have includes all that was submitted. Were there some proposals that the IEC decided would not qualify? President Webb answered that the DSPS and the Veterans proposals will be funded by SSSP dollars.
- Irina Rivkin – seconded Carl's suggestion about funding AFFIRM with some changes. Would recommend that they remove funding for any positions that are not appropriate for



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

the Measure.

- Irina Rivkin shared that the CTE Program Funding would need to go through so many internal College steps to be implemented in order for it to be feasible. Maybe we should suggest that they go through those steps and then re-submit.
- James Blake shared that it is important to remember our commitment to the language of the Measure in order to make sure we are submitting to the objectives of the voters. We need to remove those pieces that are not fundable. We can capture the outstanding gaps and include them as a part of our planning agenda. We don't want to rush the process without staying within the restrictions of the approved ballot Measure for these funds. Need to reflect this in our funding decisions.
- President Webb assured the group that she is sensitive to ensuring that we maintain adherence to the legalese of the Measure's funding.
- It was asked, does the rollover amount affect (count against) the allocation for the following year? Need to get this in writing.
- Carl Oliver shared that he has concerns about the Director position being included in the Career Center proposal. President Webb responded that we will ensure that it is appropriately reduced.
- Carl Oliver proposed funding the Leadership & Civic Engagement Project – felt it addressed all of the stated criteria and requirements.
- Louis Quindlen noted that hiring faculty to do the same things we are doing is not helpful. Suggested that we fund proposals that are innovative like AFFIRM and APASS, and pull their administrative positions. Maybe we can group this work under a shared coordinator position and they can coordinate Puente, APASS and AFFIRM. He noted that he was surprised there wasn't a Puente Proposal included. President Webb noted that a Puente proposal was supposed to be there, but the proposal was not written. It will be funded.
- Laney student Miguel Avila asked the group if Puente could be renamed MeCHA.
- Louis Quindlen made a MOTION and Evelyn Lord seconded the motion to move ahead with funding the AFFIRM and APASS proposals, with qualifications that they remove the administrative costs and submit a new budget for review. The College would also have to determine where the



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

associated administrative oversight (and related costs) would come from. [Carl Oliver objected to this motion because those two programs would take more than half of the remaining funding and he felt that the success of the ASPASS students is not an issue, i.e. that there are no gaps in achievement of these students. President Webb responded that there are indeed gaps in the achievement of this population. She also noted that there are federal dollars for APASS, but it is substantially lower than what is needed.] A VOTE was taken → 7 YAYS - 0 NAYS, 6 ANSTENTIONS

- Lisa Cook shared that she agrees that there is a glaring need at the College for an African American learning community, but that the process of the College is still a concern.
- President Webb noted the leadership will take a look at the proposals, remove what's not appropriate, make a decision for the PASS funding, and communicate to the College community about the outcome.
- Trudy Walton-Keys asked how quickly this communication would go out? President Webb responded that the timeline is up to them.
- Carl Oliver made a MOTION to approve the Leadership & Civic Engagement Proposal. Chuen Chang seconded. A VOTE was taken → 3 YAYS, 3 NAYS, 7 ABSTENTIONS.
- Lisa Cook shared that she wants to see a process to vet the proposals for funding, including their budgets. Many of these proposals were written by individuals who didn't have the benefit of receiving help or guidance from colleagues and administrators. Some got that attention, and others did not. Additionally, "ownership" of the implementation of these programs is an issue. "Who is the bird that will sit in this nest to make these things happens." There was not a process that leads to that ownership by the College.
- Lilia Celhay suggested that we all try to see the PASS funding through the lens of having additional money to make things happen. This is not a systematic process. We need to reframe how we as a college can spend the funds.
- President Webb shared that she appreciated all of the responses and comments. When she sits down with Executive team, they will review the feedback to decide the appropriate process to determine her decision. She will have a decision by Nov. 1 and will be asking the shared governance leaders to weigh in for understanding. Will spend all of the PASS funding this fiscal year. We will also establish some



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (FINAL)

	<p>kind of process for the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Cave asked how do we determine a process for mentoring folks through all of this? • Irina Rivkin – We may need to ask those who submitted proposals to reduce their budgets and make the necessary adjustments as far as what they would then be able to do with less funds. • Kim Bridges noted that if we pull out the directors from the proposal funding, then this would mean that these positions would have to be funded through some other source(s). How will this affect other critical needs of the institution? President Webb shared that we will leverage existing resources and use already existing Directors to take on additional programs. 	
<p>VI. Updates -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resources 2. Committees & Work-groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carl Oliver noted that he made recommendations for proposed changes to the Shared Governance (SG) Document that have not yet been incorporated. • Many are not able to access Dropbox because of the inept wifi in the Tower Building. May need to continue to provide copies of the materials at the meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Chairs to update websites with Committee minutes and documentation. • Get Kim Bretz access to the College Council DropBox • Continue to provide copies of the materials for meetings.

Meeting Adjourned 2:10 pm.